

# **GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR COLLEGE OF BUSINESS FACULTY EVALUATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL DECISIONS RELATED TO ALL TENURE-EARNING FACULTY**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This document articulates general guidelines for faculty recruitment and evaluation, consistent with the College of Business (COB) and University goals. A general set of evaluation guidelines and criteria congruent with the long-range goals and objectives of the College and the University is both desirable and feasible. These Guidelines apply to all tenure-track faculty regardless of campus assignment. The COB recognizes that faculty evaluation must reflect assignment based primarily on accomplishments in instruction, research and other scholarly or creative endeavors, and service, as described below and as amplified at the department level. Procedures for the granting of tenure are covered in University Regulation 5.006 (Tenure Procedures). The COB procedures are compatible with the current "Criteria for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Faculty," Revised February, 2022 and issued by the Provost.

## **PERFORMANCE CRITERIA FOR PERSONNEL DECISIONS**

The professorial role has three major dimensions of performance: 1) instruction; 2) service to the University, the professional community, and external constituencies; and 3) contribution to new knowledge via research and publications. Each of these three dimensions supports the COB goals of academic excellence.

Given individual differences in skills and interests, stages of career development, and assignments, individual faculty members will reflect various combinations of contribution to these three major dimensions of performance. This document is not intended to prescribe a single stereotype of effective performance across ranks. Rather, examples of excellence and good performance are suggested that will serve as benchmarks for individual planning, goal setting, and evaluation of performance. Faculty members and their Department Chair or Director must agree on how individual goals can best be integrated with College and University goals of excellence. For tenure, the COB does not subscribe to a compensatory model for the three dimensions of performance.

The College recognizes the importance of solicitation and receipt of external funds for support of activities across the spectrum of its activities. National research grants from agencies such as NSF or NIH or non-profit charitable and professional organizations are recognized as indicators of excellence in all three categories discussed below. These grants are distinguished from paid consulting activities undertaken by faculty.

The following sections discuss the concept of collegiality underlying the three dimensions, solicitation of external grants and the general guidelines for criteria in each of the three dimensions of performance. Each of these dimensions is discussed and sample evaluative criteria are suggested. The criteria for each dimension are divided into two categories: "indicators of exceptional

performance" and "indicators of good performance". The list of indicators is intended only to be suggestive and not exhaustive.

Underlying the three dimensions is an assumption that accomplishments are conducted in the spirit of faculty collegiality and the cooperation of the candidate in making a positive contribution to the activities and goals of the department, College, and University. According to the American Association of University Professors,<sup>1</sup> "collegiality is not a distinct capacity to be assessed independently of the traditional triumvirate of teaching, scholarship, and service. Evaluation in these three areas will encompass the contributions that the virtue of collegiality may pertinently add to a faculty member's career." Collegiality should not be confused with sociability or likability. It is a professional, not a personal, criterion relating to the performance of a faculty member's duties. Are the candidate's professional abilities and relationships with colleagues compatible with the unit's mission and long-term goals? Has the candidate exhibited an ability and willingness to engage in the shared academic and administrative tasks? Does the candidate maintain high standards of professional integrity?

### Instruction

The previously cited statements of objectives for the University and the College of Business explicitly recognize the importance of quality instruction and student development. This dimension is fundamental to the professorial role. Our goal of excellence in our growing undergraduate enrollments, our Masters programs, our Ph.D. program in Business Administration, plus the continuous development of our respective subject matters, requires that faculty be proactive in developing and delivering quality instruction.

All faculty members are expected to contribute in the area of instruction and student development, to be effective in the classroom, to strive continuously to improve their teaching effectiveness, and to contribute to the development of our instructional programs. Overload instruction is not to be considered for personnel decisions and the record of such instruction should not be submitted by the candidate as part of materials for tenure and/or promotion.

### *Indicators of Exceptional Instruction*

- \* Development of a new course(s) or major revisions of existing courses (assuming the need can be clearly documented);
- \* Development of innovative pedagogical methodologies and materials;
- \* Outstanding evaluations of teaching performance as indexed by student evaluations;
- \* Department Chairpersons or Directors interviews with honor students and student leaders; peer reviews and other documentation;
- \* Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials; e.g., cases, readings, books, software applications, or learning simulations;

---

<sup>1</sup> The American Association of University Professors, in its statement *On Collegiality as a Criterion for Faculty Evaluation* (2016).

- \* Significant contribution to new instructional program development; e.g., MBA, MACC, Executive MBA, Ph D;
- \* Significant community engagement educational activities, especially those involving undergraduate students;
- \* Innovative instructional improvement in content, assignments or pedagogy in response to assurance of learning outcomes;
- \* Chair, Ph.D. Dissertation Committee with evidence of significant progress.

### *Indicators of Good Instruction*

- \* Evidence of rigorous and equitable grading;
- \* Average or above average student evaluations; Average or above average peer evaluations;
- \* Evidence of active involvement as member of doctoral committees;
- \* Completion of programs/workshops resulting in improved teaching methods;
- \* Coordination of multi-section courses;
- \* Development of a new course(s) or major revisions of existing courses;
- \* Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced instructional effectiveness;
- \* Published reviews of textbooks;
- \* Inclusion/revision of syllabi to include topical issues in the field;
- \* Direct involvement with assurance of learning activities by providing data or information used to assess activities:
- \* Use of critically acclaimed, up-to-date teaching materials (books, readings, etc.);
- \* Modification of instructional content, assignments or pedagogy as a result of assurance of learning outcomes;
- \* Mentoring and teaching through undergraduate and graduate research, including directed independent study/research students;
- \* Involvement with community engagement educational activities, especially those involving undergraduate students.

An important goal of new faculty members is to demonstrate good performance in instruction early in their careers. However, regardless of rank, faculty have a continuing responsibility to perform effectively in instruction.

Performance should be evaluated at least annually in accordance with administrative guidelines. Failure to demonstrate continuing good performance in instruction over a period of two consecutive semesters should constitute grounds for termination after a probationary period.

Furthermore, failure to demonstrate evidence of good performance in instruction is sufficient grounds for denial of tenure, promotion to any rank, or, in the case of tenure-seeking faculty, issuance of terminal contracts.

The assessment of instruction using student evaluations should be done carefully and preferably based on statistical corrections of evaluation to increase the fairness of the data. Consideration must be given to rigor in grading, the particular courses taught, class sizes, course levels, time of day, new preparations, number of preparations, campus, actual student learning and

other factors that have been shown to be correlated with student evaluations.

### Service

A professional school such as the College of Business must effectively serve several constituencies if it aspires to excellence. The academic profession, the business and business-related professional community, the public, and the University are among our major constituencies.

A variety of service roles can contribute to attainment of our excellence and national prominence goals. No attempt is made here to prescribe what specific service roles individual faculty members should play. However, all faculty members are expected to contribute in the service areas. As is noted in subsequent sections, the amount and nature of the service contribution is likely to differ as a function of individual skills, interests, and stages of career development. Community or professional activities that receive more than nominal compensation shall not be considered part of the service component. Service should be an important component in merit compensation decisions and a necessary, but insufficient, component in promotion and tenure decisions. While indicators of *exceptional* and good performance are proposed below, an underlying assumption is that a high quality of service is provided for each indicator. For faculty aspiring to promotion and/or tenure, the burden is on the candidate to clearly establish the quality of the service.

#### *Indicators of Exceptional Service*

- \* Editorship of a leading journal;
- \* Board of Editors of a leading journal;
- \* Officer in a national professional organization;
- \* Program, division, track, or area Chair of a national meeting;
- \* Development and/or coordination of successful new executive development programs;
- \* Service on a major state or federal government commission, task force, board, or committee;
- \* Service for the State of Florida public schools;
- \* Attraction of significant external development support;
- \* Chair of major College or University committees, including assurance of learning;
- \* Committee Chair of major national professional organizations;
- \* Coordination of community engagement activities;
- \* Leadership in the coordination of programmatic efforts

### *Indicators of Good Service*

- \* Editorship of a non-leading journal;
- \* Board of Editors of a non-leading journal;
- \* Frequent reviewer for leading journals in the discipline;
- \* Officer, program, or area Chair in regional professional organizations;
- \* Service on active University, College, and department task forces and committees;
- \* Contribution to external development efforts;
- \* Advisor to student organizations;
- \* Presentations at executive development programs;
- \* Pro bono speeches and/or consulting for major practitioner groups;
- \* Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced service effectiveness;
- \* Participation on task forces and committees for national associations;
- \* Involvement with coordination of community engagement activities for the department;

### Research and Publication

The statements of objectives for the University and the College identify high- quality research and publication as fundamental to attaining the goals of academic excellence. Faculty contributions to the body of knowledge are critical to our academic reputation for excellence.

Research should be an integral part of University education; it is a primary activity which keeps the content of education current, pertinent, and challenging to college students. Each generation of faculty must add to the learning it has received.

Both quality and quantity of research and publication are important. However, quality of contribution to the body of knowledge is the major criterion. Indices of quality include (but are not limited to) publication in the leading scholarly journals in the relevant disciplines; peer recognition via research or publication awards; citation of work by others in the discipline; membership on prestigious editorial boards; and significant external funding from leading national organizations for research.

Collaboration in research and publication is desirable. However, individuals are encouraged to develop a balanced publication record that includes individual contributions to the body of knowledge and an indication that the candidate was the most important contributor to the work.

Funding or other awards from external sources also count independently as measures of research productivity and/or impact. This is particularly true when competing for Federal grant support, including from the NSF, NIH, or other agencies. Funding from other sources such as research institutes, policy institutes or corporate foundations, will also help in establishing that one is a respected, known scholar.

The primary basis for assessing the quality of research should rest with faculty evaluation after reading the research. However, it is assumed that the consensus view of any research will correlate with an empirical assessment of the quality of publication outlet. The most frequently used criteria regarding quality are departmental journal ratings or rankings, published articles reporting consensus opinion collected via survey, academic association rating systems (e.g. the ABS system), the frequency a publication is used and cited in subsequent published research by others, and journal impact indices. Faculty should consult with the Department Chair or Director, the Dean's Office, tenured faculty members and members of the COB P&T committee for the best sources of information for these criteria. For publication outlets not listed or ranked as a leading journal through these sources, the burden is on the candidate to make an argument that the outlet nonetheless constitutes a high level of quality. The quality of the publication outlet will be evaluated in the context of the cross-disciplinary effort. Candidates also need to identify publications that are on-demand, supported by subventions, and Open Access, or are the product of work on a student's thesis or dissertation committee. The impact factor and acceptance rates of the journal, citations for the article, and discipline-based indices are important means of external validation.

Research and publications outside of the candidate's principal discipline are encouraged. Additionally, research involving undergraduates and/or graduates is encouraged and should be clearly identified.

Community-engaged research (CER), the collaborative process between the researcher and a community partner with the goal of contribution to the discipline and strengthening the well-being of the community, is also included in this section. Supervising an inquiry or investigation conducted by an undergraduate that is an original intellectual, technical, or creative contribution to the discipline or practice, or applied research, where the student uses discipline-appropriate data to address a research question/problem for which no clear answer exists may also meet the criteria.

While major conference presentations (and Proceedings) indicate of research accomplishment, they are generally not a substitute for publications in refereed journals. The assumption is that a conference paper should lead to submittal and publication in an academic journal. Although there may be exceptions, book chapters generally are not to be considered equivalent to publications in leading academic journals.

#### *Indicators of Exceptional Research and Publication*

- \* Publications in the leading refereed journals of appropriate disciplines;
- \* Publication of scholarly book(s);
- \* Publication of critically acclaimed book(s);
- \* Recognition from peers in the field; e.g., Fellow, research awards, publication awards;
- \* Grant reviewer for national research organizations; e.g., NSF, NIMH;
- \* Significant external funding from leading national organizations for research;
- \* Publication of external funded research in subsequent scholarly work;

- \* Publication in refereed journals of appropriate disciplines co-authored with undergraduate students in support of the University's Quality Enhancement Program in undergraduate research.

### Indicators of Good Research and Publication

- \* Publications in refereed journals in appropriate disciplines;
- \* Publication of graduate-level textbook(s);
- \* Publication by research sponsor of technical reports or monographs;
- \* Presentation of competitive papers at major meetings of appropriate disciplines;
- \* Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book;
- \* Competitive papers in proceedings of regional or national meetings (refereed);
- \* Publication in non-refereed but widely recognized professional journals;
- \* Invited colloquium at major institution of higher education;
- \* Clear contribution to the research of others;
- \* Publication of a professional book;
- \* Recognition for Community Engagement/Undergraduate research by publication in the University Undergraduate Research outlet or written recognition of use of the research/engagement by the involved community agency;
- \* Involvement with undergraduate students in support of the University's Quality Enhancement Program in undergraduate research
- \* Significant self-development activities leading to increased research effectiveness;
- \* Other creative scholarship; e.g., published cases, software development.

## **PROMOTION, TENURE, AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT**

### Annual Evaluations

The nature of faculty contribution is expected to vary as a function of skills, interests, and stage of career development. This document does not seek to specify a single stereotype of faculty contribution. However, modal patterns of emphasis can be described that are most likely to lead to career development and to positive evaluation.

It is essential that Annual Evaluations and Third Year Reviews be conducted within the context of the academic unit's tenure and promotion criteria. Faculty need to be afforded guidance on what is essential for achievement of tenure and promotion. Such guidance may be offered by the Department Chair and/or a personnel committee.

All faculty members will be evaluated on their assignments and their Annual Evaluations. Those with atypically large assignments to any dimension of the faculty role will be evaluated accordingly. Faculty members with assignments emphasizing teaching and/or service should work carefully with the Department Chair to be certain the quality of these contributions can be assessed.

Annual evaluations in the context of annual assignments must always be considered for any personnel decision.

### Third Year Reviews

All appointees to tenure track positions who do not have tenure, regardless of rank, shall receive, in the third year of service, a formal review at both the department/school and College level. This third-year review provides useful information to the candidate about his or her progress toward promotion and/or tenure. The purpose of this review is to provide a more comprehensive assessment of progress toward tenure and, if necessary, specific recommendations for areas in need of improvement.

The *Faculty Tenure Timeline*, completed at the time of hire, should indicate when the Third Year Review will be conducted. By intent, it is to review three years of work and is conducted at the end of the spring semester of the third year, or no later than the beginning of the fall semester of the fourth year. Faculty who are granted years toward tenure at time of hire need to be advised that those years must be part of the Third Year Review. If a faculty member is hired with three years of credit toward tenure, they shall undergo a Third Year Review during their first year of service at FAU.

The Third Year Review process begins at the departmental/school level. The Dean will initiate the process, identifying the candidates to be reviewed in a given year and establishing a time line for completion of faculty ePortfolios, completion of the department review, and submission of department reviews and faculty portfolios to the Dean's Office.

Candidates will assemble a Third Year Review ePortfolio. At a minimum, the ePortfolio must include:

1. Up-to-date Vita;
2. Copy of Annual Assignments;
3. Documentation on instructional activities, including data from SPOT and two peer reviews from tenured faculty;
4. Documentation on scholarship, research, and/or other creative activities;
5. Documentation on assigned service and/or administrative activity;
6. Department/school/college criteria;
7. Annual employee performance evaluations; and
8. A self-evaluation of no more than 10 double-spaced pages will be included and will address each of the following areas: Instruction, Research, and Service.

The section on scholarship, research, and/or other creative activities will describe published and unpublished work clearly indicating the length, publication status, and significance of the work and, where appropriate, information such as the venue and/or peer review process of the work.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to prepare the ePortfolio materials in the manner specified. All materials should be uploaded into the case created for them in Interfolio Review, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT). All candidates will be notified via email once a case has been initiated.

The portfolio will be reviewed by a departmental committee constituted according to policies adopted by the department or, if such a committee doesn't exist, by all members of the department eligible to vote on the candidate. The relevant group will hold a meeting to discuss the candidate's progress towards tenure.

The discussion shall use the relevant criteria for promotion and tenure to evaluate the candidate's record and should include consideration of annual assignments and performance evaluations. The review needs to include an assessment of the candidate's participation in the shared tasks, activities, and goals of the unit and assist the candidate in developing a long-term career path in the academy.

One member of the group will be selected to write a narrative account of the discussion that is acceptable to all members. The account should accurately summarize the different points of view expressed during the discussion and solicited from the department. It should describe the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's record, a written assessment of progress toward tenure, and constructive recommendations and a plan of action. A vote of the eligible faculty members will be taken and included in the narrative. The narrative is then uploaded to the candidate's ePortfolio.

Following the department/school review, the chair shall write a letter reviewing the candidate's progress towards tenure, considering the candidate's record, the departmental evaluation, and the relevant criteria.

The Dean, taking into account the candidate's ePortfolio, department level review, and the chair's letter shall write a letter reviewing the candidate's progress towards tenure, considering the candidate's record, the departmental evaluation, and the relevant criteria.

Further, as materials are added (e.g., the department narrative, chair's letter, or Dean's letter) or are changed by anyone, the candidate must be notified and given five (5) days to respond. The candidate may attach a brief response within 5 days of the receipt of the added material. The ePortfolio cannot move forward for 5 days after the candidate has received the report, unless, before the 5-day period has expired, the candidate indicates there will be no response. The response should be filed in the same section as the letter or materials being responded to.

A positive or negative appraisal of progress toward tenure and/or promotion is not binding on any level of review or recommendation in the tenure and promotion process, and not binding on the President's discretion and ultimate decision, but is meant to provide guidance from the department/school/college.

## Tenure

An “Annual Progress Toward Tenure Appraisal” form needs to be completed for every tenure track faculty member who does not have tenure, regardless of rank. This form will provide constructive advice and a plan of action for the coming year(s) so the candidate will be able to make the best possible case for promotion and tenure. All tenured faculty in the department will vote annually on the faculty member’s progress toward tenure.

Faculty must submit portfolios for tenure consideration at the beginning of their sixth year of continuous service in a tenure-earning position, unless there is a written agreement to accept prior service credit. If the employee was credited with tenure-earning service at the time of hire, they may request that all or a portion of such credit be withdrawn only once, prior to formal application for tenure. This requires a written request from the candidate, a recommendation from the supervisor and dean, and approval of the Vice Provost. A decision to submit a portfolio earlier than the sixth year needs to be made by the candidate in consultation with the chairperson/director, senior faculty (Professors and Associate Professors) in the unit, and the dean. The final decision is made at the College level and a written letter of approval from the Dean of the College must be in the ePortfolio. Once the decision is made and documented, no further justification in the portfolio is required. No candidate may submit a portfolio for tenure more than twice.

With one exception, only tenured faculty at or above the rank of the candidate may vote on tenure. The only exception is when an Associate Professor represents his/her department on the P&T committee and the case concerns the tenure of a Professor from this department. For this case, the P&T representative may vote on the candidate’s tenure. Department Chairs/Directors and tenured faculty below the rank of the candidate may participate in discussions but cannot vote. Discussions at pertinent faculty meetings are strictly confidential. Only summaries of deliberations, without attribution, can be reported. Faculty on sabbatical or other research leaves are eligible to vote. Faculty in “DROP” are still employed by the University and eligible to vote. Faculty in the Phased Retirement Program have retired from the University and are not eligible to vote.

For tenure, the COB does not subscribe to a compensatory model for the three dimensions of performance. An exceptional record of research accomplishment is absolutely necessary for tenure. The candidate must also demonstrate a record of good performance in instruction. No level of performance in the other dimensions can compensate for failing to meet both of these standards. Service assignments should be minimal and focused on departmental and College academic affairs until research and instructional competencies are well established. Only those candidates who are Associate Professors, Professors or meet the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor will be considered for tenure.

The number of articles required to make tenure is dependent on the quality of the outlets and the extent to which the candidate has contributed to the research. As a minimum requirement, three to five articles in leading journals, depending on the quality of the outlet, are necessary to make tenure

(see applicable sections for a relevant discussion regarding faculty who have been granted credit toward tenure as a condition of employment). The assessment of tenure must be made with consideration toward the annual assignments and the annual progress toward tenure.

For Assistant Professors aspiring to tenure who have been granted credit toward tenure as a condition of employment, the record of accomplishment in teaching, research and service accumulated at FAU will be given greater deference than accomplishments prior to joining the FAU faculty. Accomplishments in research prior to joining the faculty must be considered in the deliberative process and contribute toward the assessment of the quality and quantity of research accomplishments. Regardless of the record of accomplishment prior to joining the FAU faculty, clear indication of excellence in the form of publishing in leading journals as an FAU faculty member is required. For tenure or promotion, the acceptance for publication of a minimum of one article in a leading academic journal for every two years while the faculty member is employed by FAU (rounded down) is required for any faculty member granted credit toward tenure.

For Associate Professors aspiring to tenure who have been granted credit toward tenure as a condition of employment, the record of accomplishment in teaching, research, and service accumulated at FAU will be given greater deference than accomplishments prior to joining the FAU faculty. Accomplishments in research prior to joining the faculty must be considered in the deliberative process and contribute toward the assessment of the quality and quantity of research accomplishments. Regardless of the record of accomplishment prior to joining the FAU faculty, clear indication of excellence in the form of publishing in leading journals as an FAU faculty member is required. For tenure or promotion, the acceptance for publication of a minimum of one article in a leading academic journal for every two years while the faculty member is employed by FAU (rounded down) is required for any Associate Professor granted credit toward tenure.

For Professors aspiring to tenure who have been granted credit toward tenure as a condition of employment, the record of accomplishment in teaching, research, and service accumulated at FAU will be given greater deference than accomplishments prior to joining the FAU faculty. Accomplishments in research prior to joining the faculty must be considered in the deliberative process and contribute toward the assessment of the quality and quantity of research accomplishments. Regardless of the record of accomplishment prior to joining the FAU faculty, clear indication of excellence in the form of publishing in leading journals as an FAU faculty member is required. For tenure, the acceptance for publication of a minimum of one article in a leading academic journal for every two years while the faculty member is employed by FAU (rounded down) is required for any Professor granted credit toward tenure.

## *Granting Tenure as a Condition of Employment*

Before promising a prospective faculty member that he or she will be recommended for tenure as a condition of employment, the Dean must solicit the vote of the COB P&T committee. Although it might not be possible to assemble a complete tenure packet for such candidates, the packet must include at least an up-to-date resume, a record of the professor's tenure at other universities, a sample of the candidate's major research accomplishments, letters of recommendation solicited as part of the recruitment as per the Provost's guidelines,<sup>2</sup> a vote of the tenured faculty of the department/school involved, and letters of recommendation from the Department Chair/School Director and the Dean (which includes the vote of the COB P&T Committee).

### Promotion to Associate Professor

An untenured assistant must apply for promotion to associate professor at the same time he or she applies for tenure. While both promotion and tenure may be considered at the same meeting, the general principle is that promotion must be discussed and voted on before tenure. The criteria for promotion to Associate Professor are the same as those for granting tenure except that the promotion to Associate Professor is based on accomplishments to date and the tenure decision on collegial judgments about the likelihood that the candidate will make continuing and valuable contributions to the institution and his or her discipline.

Only tenured faculty can vote on promotion cases, and only those at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires can vote on promotion. Tenured faculty at the rank of the candidate may participate in discussion of the candidate. Department Chairs/Directors and Deans may participate in discussions but cannot vote. Discussions at pertinent faculty meetings are strictly confidential. Only summaries of deliberations, without attribution, can be reported. Faculty on sabbatical or other research leaves are eligible to vote. Faculty in "DROP" are still employed by the University and eligible to vote. Faculty in the Phased Retirement Program have retired from the University and are not eligible to vote.

### Promotion to Full Professor

The College and each School/Department should comprise a group of scholars in a range of subjects who are experts in their respective fields. Full professor is the most senior rank in the academy, and promotion to full professor is a signal that the faculty member has made sustained, high quality, original and meaningful contributions to knowledge in such a manner that the faculty member is recognized as an expert in their area at a broad regional, national, or even international level.

At any time, faculty or the faculty's direct supervisor may request an appraisal of their progress toward promotion to Professor. This form will provide constructive advice and a plan of action for the coming year(s) so the candidate will be able to make the best possible case for promotion. All full professors in the department will vote annually on the faculty member's progress

---

<sup>2</sup> "Criteria for the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty" Provost's office, Revised February 2022

toward promotion to full. This annual appraisal may be waived by the faculty member. Such waiver will be indicated on the form.

Appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor is recognition of demonstrated achievement and **distinction** over the span of an individual's academic career, with evidence of longstanding leadership and substantial contributions both within and outside the university. Examples of distinction include, but are not limited to, solo authorship, publications in top journals, citations, independent research program, and reputation within a focused area of research.

For promotion to Professor the candidate must demonstrate, at a minimum, distinction in scholarship/research/creative activity and outstanding in teaching and service. While the decision involves the candidate's entire career, the candidate's record shall demonstrate significant additional achievement beyond that demonstrated at the time of promotion to Associate Professor. While demonstrated merit, not years of service, shall be the primary factor in determining the case for promotion to Professor, no earlier than five years completed in rank from the year that the promotion became effective, may be considered the norm for promotion from Associate to Professor. In addition, years in rank are particularly important. For those applicants who were hired as an associate professor, sustained scholarship/research/creative productivity at FAU consistent with expectations of distinction is required.

Only tenured faculty can vote on promotion cases, and, with one exception, only those at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires can vote on promotion. The only exception is when an Associate Professor represents his or her department on the P&T committee and the case concerns promotion to Professor from this department. For this case, the P&T representative may vote on the promotion. Tenured faculty at the rank of the candidate may participate in discussion of the candidate. Department Chairs/Directors and Deans may participate in discussions but cannot vote. Discussions at pertinent faculty meetings are strictly confidential. Only summaries of deliberations, without attribution, can be reported. Faculty on sabbatical or other research leaves are eligible to vote. Faculty in "DROP" are still employed by the University and eligible to vote. Faculty in the Phased Retirement Program have retired from the University and are not eligible to vote.

Although there could be exceptions based on incontrovertible accomplishments in research, the minimum number of years required for promotion to Professor are five. Relative to consideration for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the standard for achieving an exceptional record in instruction or service is higher for faculty seeking promotion to Professor.

## **DOCUMENTATION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

The University issues procedural guidelines and schedules for promotion and tenure review annually. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure should comply with University requirements regarding ePortfolio materials. Departmental requirements at variance with COB or University requirements should be fulfilled by submitting separate documents in the ePortfolio. Prior to the consideration of the employee's promotion (or tenure), the employee shall have the right to review the contents of the promotion (or tenure) ePortfolio and may attach a brief response to any material

therein. It shall be the responsibility of the employee to see that the ePortfolio is complete. Misrepresentation of the candidate's record in the ePortfolio, either by false information or omission of information, will result in disciplinary action, which might include termination.

The ePortfolio should follow the University requirements with the following clarifications / exceptions.

1. External Letters of Evaluation – the ePortfolio must contain a minimum of three current letters from referees outside the university from an R2, R1, or their international equivalents, who are at the rank the candidate is aspiring to or higher.

2. Internal Letters of Evaluation – the College does not expect the ePortfolio to include internal Letters of Evaluations unless required by the University. If required by the University, their guidelines for such letters should be followed.

The ePortfolio will be reviewed by a departmental committee constituted according to policies adopted by the department or, if such a committee doesn't exist, by all members of the department eligible to vote on the candidate. Small departments/schools/colleges with fewer than three eligible voting faculty must include faculty from similar departments/schools/colleges to establish the minimum of three eligible voting members. In no situation can the departmental Chair or other administrator vote at the department/school/college level. The relevant group will hold a meeting to discuss the candidate's application. The discussion shall use the relevant criteria for promotion and tenure to evaluate the candidate's record and should include consideration of annual assignments and performance evaluations. The review needs to include an assessment of the candidate's participation in the shared tasks, activities, and goals of the unit and assist the candidate in developing a long-term career path in the academy.

One member of the group will be selected to write a narrative account of the discussion that is acceptable to all members. The account should accurately summarize the different points of view expressed during the discussion and solicited from the department. It should describe the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's record. Votes of the eligible faculty members on promotion and tenure, if applicable, will be taken and included in the narrative. Committee member names, voting and non-voting, must be listed in the narrative. The written report, however, shall preserve the anonymity of the voting but shall also convey, as best as can be discerned, the reasons for the vote. Committee members who have a conflict of interest should recuse themselves from the discussion and the voting on the candidate with whom a conflict of interest exists. The narrative is then uploaded to the candidate's ePortfolio case and shared with the candidate.

Following the department/school review, the chair shall write a letter reviewing the candidate's promotion and tenure, if applicable, considering the candidate's record, the departmental evaluation, and the relevant criteria.

The ePortfolio will then be reviewed by the College P&T committee. The committee

will hold a meeting to discuss the candidate's application. The discussion shall use the relevant criteria for promotion and tenure to evaluate the candidate's record and should include consideration of annual assignments and performance evaluations. The review needs to include an assessment of the candidate's participation in the shared tasks, activities, and goals of the unit and assist the candidate in developing a long-term career path in the academy.

The committee chair will write a narrative account of the discussion that is acceptable to all members. The account should accurately summarize the different points of view expressed during the discussion. It should describe the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's record. Votes of the committee members on promotion and tenure, if applicable, will be taken and included in the narrative. Committee member names, voting and non-voting, must be listed in the narrative. The written report, however, shall preserve the anonymity of the voting but shall also convey, as best as can be discerned the reasons for the vote. Committee members who have a conflict of interest should recuse themselves from the discussion and the voting on the candidate with whom a conflict of interest exists. The narrative is then uploaded to the candidate's ePortfolio case and shared with the candidate.

The ePortfolio will be forwarded to the Dean together with the department and college recommendations on promotion and/or tenure. The Dean shall meet with the college P&T committee to discuss the committee's vote and take the discussions into consideration prior to writing his or her letter. The Dean shall make a recommendation to the Provost. The Dean's letter shall include an evaluation of the candidate's record on the basis of appropriate criteria. The letter is then uploaded to the candidate's ePortfolio case and shared with the candidate. The college recommendation and Dean's letter are only recommendations to be considered in the process, and are not definitive

Further, as materials are added (e.g., the department narrative, chair's letter, or Dean's letter) or are changed by anyone, the candidate must be notified and given five (5) days to respond. The candidate may attach a brief response within 5 days of the receipt of the added material. The ePortfolio cannot move forward for 5 days after the candidate has received the report, unless, before the 5-day period has expired, the candidate indicates there will be no response. The response should be filed in the same section as the letter or materials being responded to.

## **CONTINUING EXPECTATIONS FOR COB PROFESSORS**

Leadership in the pursuit of exceptional performance and national prominence will come primarily from our Professors. Such leadership can be manifested in a variety of ways, such as continued major contributions to the body of knowledge, contribution to the development of junior faculty, leadership in one or more of the areas of exceptional performance in service, and leadership in one or more of the areas of exceptional performance in instruction and student development. While there will likely be great heterogeneity in the nature of contributions of our Professors, excellence in one or more areas plus good performance in the other areas is expected.

## MERIT COMPENSATION

Merit compensation represents an opportunity to reward shorter term contributions to excellence, recognize progress toward promotion and tenure, and to continue to reward the contributions of tenured faculty.

For tenured and non-tenured faculty, merit compensation evaluations should be based on all three dimensions where an overall good record across the dimension is required for the minimum merit compensation.

The accumulation of "activities" does not constitute the basis for favorable merit compensation. Rather, degree of excellence in these activities is crucial to the merit compensation decision. Individual faculty members, in consultation with their Department Chair, should identify the specific contributions that will best integrate the individual's skills, interests, and goals with the College's goals of excellence and national prominence.

## SUMMARY

This document provides general guidelines for faculty evaluation. Since the nature of scholarly enterprise requires flexibility and freedom, a "point system" of evaluation or a single stereotype of effective performance is explicitly rejected. The COB approach is to provide a general set of guidelines with modal patterns of emphasis and example indicators of exceptional and good performance. Within this general set of guidelines, a variety of contributions to our goals of excellence and national prominence is possible. Indeed, such heterogeneity of contribution is itself a component of our pursuit of excellence.

Approved by the College of Business P&T Committee on October 17, 2022.

Approved by the College of Business Faculty Assembly on November 14, 2022.

Reviewed and Submitted to Provost Office by Dean Daniel Gropper on January 23, 2026.



Dr. Daniel M. Gropper, Dean  
Kaye Family Professor