

BY-LAWS
FINANCE DEPARTMENT
HASLAM COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

[Ratified by faculty, May 16, 2005]

[Appendix A Revised by Faculty, April 2006]

[Appendix A revised by faculty, August 31, 2010]

[By-laws amended by faculty vote: November 24, 2009; March 30, 2017; January 9, 2017]

[Version from January 9, 2018]

The purpose of the by-laws is to establish the overall organization of the Department of Finance and to provide for the cooperation, advice and consent of the Faculty in the conduct of the department's affairs, all within the organization and regulations of the Haslam College of Business and The University of Tennessee. Several University of Tennessee (UT) and Haslam College of Business (HCB) documents are incorporated herein by reference:

Faculty Handbook (<http://provost.utk.edu/facultyhandbook>),

Manual for Faculty Evaluation (<http://Provost.utk.edu/evaluation/>)

HCB Bylaws (<https://haslam.utk.edu/sites/default/files/files/Haslam-Bylaws.pdf>)

I. Faculty Membership in the Department

MEMBERSHIP of the Finance department faculty shall consist of all those holding regular or temporary departmental tenure and non-tenure-track appointments.

Voting members of the faculty are faculty members in tenure-track positions, including those who have not yet earned tenure. This includes persons on joint appointments between the department and other units of the University of Tennessee. Tenure-track faculty members on full- or part-time leaves of absence, or on reduced time, are voting members of the faculty. “Participating” NTT (non-tenure track) faculty members in the department are considered voting members of the department for program-, departmental-, and college-level decisions brought to the department, with the following parameters. 1) “Participating” NTT faculty members may vote on all issues except for any issue or procedure involving the evaluation of tenure track faculty or where the UT Faculty Handbook prohibits their participation, e.g., promotion and tenure decisions. 2) NTT faculty members who have less than a 75% appointment and/or are considered “Supporting” will not be considered voting faculty members.

Special voting requirements for promotions in academic rank and the granting of tenure are specified in the Faculty Handbook and take precedent over this document.

II. Departmental Business

A. Academic Policy

Generally, academic policy matters concerning the Finance Department shall be determined under a democratic system consisting of departmental faculty meetings, standing committees, special committees and other appointments as set forth in subsequent sections.

B. Routine Decisions

Other, more or less, routine items of business affecting the day-to-day operations of the department such as teaching assignments, class schedules, committee appointments, budgetary decisions, assignment of office space, personnel matters, etc., shall be reserved to the discretion of the Department Head. Situations may arise in which routine matters require a faculty decision, but to defer action until a scheduled faculty meeting will unduly delay moving forward with regard to the specific action. At the discretion of the Department Head, a vote of the faculty may be taken by mail/e-mail. For votes taken in this manner, the decision will be based on a simple majority of those voting. When voting in this manner, one option available to the faculty will be to request deferral of the vote until discussion is held at the next scheduled faculty meeting. Deferral will occur if 10% or more of the faculty members who cast a vote so request.

Searches for, and hiring, of non-faculty departmental staff shall be in accordance with University policies.

C. Budget Issues

The faculty will be consulted by the Department Head on major departmental budgetary issues.

D. Department Faculty Meetings

1. Department Faculty Meetings shall be held at least twice a semester during the academic year, and as necessary to facilitate the work of departmental faculty committees as outlined in these bylaws. Additional meetings may be called by the Department Head or upon written request of 25 % of the faculty. One-half the voting membership of the faculty shall constitute a quorum. Voting members who are absent, but who have appointed a proxy who is present, shall be considered present when determining if a quorum is constituted. A simple majority of those voting shall decide any issue.
2. A voting member who will be absent from a faculty meeting may either vote an absentee ballot on specific issues that are expected to arise, or may assign a proxy to vote in his or

her place. An absentee ballot must be received either in writing or via email by the Department Head one half hour before the meeting's scheduled starting time. A proxy must be appointed with notification to the Department Head, either in writing or via email, one half hour before the meeting's scheduled start time.

3. A voting member may request to be present via an electronic "teleconference." The Department Head will allow this provided a) the requestor arranges for a telephone (or equivalent technology) to be placed in the meeting room and b) the requestor participates in the meeting via speakerphone (or equivalent technology). It shall not be the Department Head's responsibility to arrange for the teleconference, nor shall this provision be deemed to require that an absent member be telephoned to solicit a vote. In the absence of an absentee ballot or proxy assignment, the failure of communications during a teleconference meeting shall be the same as if the member attending via teleconference were absent.
4. The Department Head (or another voting member duly appointed by the Head) shall preside over department meetings.
5. The initial agenda for regular departmental meetings shall be prepared by the Department Head and circulated in written form among the faculty at least one week prior to the meeting. Additional items may be suggested by individual faculty and, at the discretion of the Department Head, added to the agenda for the forthcoming meeting. Alternatively, items may be placed on the agenda by written petition of 25 % of the voting faculty. In addition, agenda items may originate in departmental committees as described elsewhere in these bylaws.

E. Conduct of Meetings

1. All meetings shall be conducted in accordance with acceptable parliamentary procedures. Minutes of all meetings, results of all votes taken, and copies of all reports submitted shall be retained and made available to the faculty.
2. Procedures for voting by faculty at scheduled meetings are as follows:
 - A faculty member on leave may vote in absentia as indicated in section II.D.2 above.
 - Additional item: In the absence of arrangements specified in items II.D.2 or II.D.3, a faculty member who is absent from a meeting will lose their voting privilege on votes taken in that meeting.
 - A secret ballot vote may be called for by any voting member on any issue that requires a vote.
 - A simple majority of those voting shall decide any issue.

III. Departmental Committees

A. Standing Committees

The following standing committees shall be created to assume the responsibilities described.

1. Undergraduate Program Committee

- (a) This Committee shall be concerned with all matters relating to the undergraduate curriculum. Proposals with regard to such matters may be submitted to the Committee by individual faculty members or by the Department Head. It shall be the duty of the Committee to discuss such proposals and to place them, along with a Committee report, on a departmental faculty meeting agenda if departmental action is required. Final decisions on these matters shall rest with the department.
- (b) The Committee, appointed by the Department Head, shall consist of the Department Head and at least four other faculty members.
- (c) The Committee shall meet as often as necessary to ensure timely action on matters under its jurisdiction. The time and place of meetings shall be announced to the entire faculty, any of whom shall have the right to attend and be heard. Minutes of Committee meetings shall be kept and made available to faculty upon request.
- (d) A member of the Undergraduate Program Committee shall be assigned by the Department Head to represent the department in matters relating to undergraduate advising.

2. MBA Program Committee

- (a) This Committee shall be concerned with matters relating to the MBA program as they impact the Finance Department. Proposals with regard to such matters may be submitted to the Committee by faculty members or by the Department Head. It shall be the duty of the Committee to discuss such proposals and to place them, along with a Committee report, on a departmental faculty meeting agenda if departmental action is required. Final decisions on these matters shall rest with the department.
- (b) The Committee, appointed by the Department Head, shall consist of the Department Head, and at least three other faculty members.
- (c) The Committee shall meet as often as necessary to ensure timely action on matters under its jurisdiction. The time and place of meetings shall be made known to the

entire faculty, who shall have the right to attend and be heard. Minutes of Committee meetings shall be kept and made available to the faculty upon request.

- (d) A member of the MBA Program Committee shall be assigned by the Department Head to represent the department in matters relating to MBA advising.

3. PH.D. Program Committee

- (a) This Committee shall be concerned with all matters relating to the Ph.D. curriculum, courses and programs as they impact the Finance Department. Proposals with regard to such matters may be submitted to the Committee by faculty members or may be generated by the Department Head. It shall be the duty of the Committee to discuss such proposals and to place them, along with a Committee report, on a departmental faculty meeting agenda if departmental action is required. Final decisions on these matters shall rest with the department.
- (b) The Committee, appointed by the Department Head, shall consist of the Department Head and at least four other faculty members.
- (c) The Committee shall meet as often as necessary to ensure timely action on matters under its jurisdiction. The time and place of meetings shall be made known to the entire faculty, who shall have the right to attend and be heard. Minutes of Committee meetings shall be kept and made available to faculty on request.
- (d) The Committee, through its chairperson, shall be responsible for the coordination of student advising, and one member shall be appointed as primary advisor of Ph.D. students.
- (e) This Committee shall be concerned with the recruitment and evaluation of applicants for admission to the doctoral program. Within standards and guidelines established by the University, the Haslam College of Business and the Finance Department, it shall decide, by majority vote, whether individual applicants are to be admitted. It also shall make recommendations to the Department Head concerning graduate assistantships and other forms of financial aid to be granted.
- (f) For the benefit of the Committee and the department, the primary advisor of the Ph.D. students shall be responsible for the maintenance and retention of all graduate students' records, qualifying and comprehensive exam scores, copies of examination questions, and all other student related information necessary to the operation of the Ph.D. program.

B. Ad Hoc Committees

The Department Head may assign faculty to ad hoc committees, such as those necessary to address faculty appointments, annual performance evaluation, and promotion and tenure decisions, as specified elsewhere in these bylaws, or as deemed necessary to address other issues that come before the department.

IV. Faculty Appointment, Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure

A. Criteria for Appointment, Retention and Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty

Criteria for promotion, retention and evaluation of tenure-track and tenured faculty members are as set forth in the *Faculty Handbook and UT Manual for Faculty Evaluation*.

B. The Process for Appointment to a Tenure-track Position

Departmental faculty will nominate potential search committee members from which the Department Head will select a search committee. The committee shall be comprised of no less than two (2) faculty members from the Department, and may include one faculty member outside the Department. The Committee shall follow University and College guidelines appropriate to the type of search. The Committee will screen candidates according to the agreed position criteria and recommend principal and alternate pools of candidates to the Department Head and Dean. After approval from the College and University, the Committee will schedule interviews. Subsequent to the interviews, the tenured and tenure-track faculty will evaluate and vote on the candidates and make a recommendation to the Department Head. The recommendation may be negative for all candidates interviewed, or in favor of a single candidate, or in the form of a definitive ranking of candidates. The Department Head will make an independent recommendation to the Dean for approval before extending a formal offer. If the head's recommendation diverges from that of the faculty, the head must explain his or her reasons in detail to the faculty, who have the right to meet with the dean and chief academic officer about the recommendation.

C. The Process of Annual Performance Evaluation for Tenure-track Faculty

The annual performance evaluation process for departmental faculty is specified in Appendix A: *Finance Department Faculty Evaluation Policy and Procedures*.

D. Appointment and Evaluation of Non Tenure-track Faculty

The search process should be the same as for tenure-track faculty, except for part-time instructional (non-faculty) personnel, who may be hired to fill temporary needs that may arise. In the latter cases, the Department Head shall have the discretion, subject to University guidelines, to hire qualified personnel as necessary to fulfill the departmental teaching mission, e.g., to cover courses when a member of the faculty is on professional development leave. Non-tenure track faculty performance evaluation shall be in a manner consistent with their assigned duties, and, as applicable, with the rank description in the Faculty Handbook, but otherwise follow the same procedural policies as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that they are reappointed annually. Specific procedures are found in Appendix A: Finance Department Faculty Evaluation Policy Document and Procedures.

E. Tenure and Promotion Committees

1. Committee on Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

- (a) A special departmental Committee consisting of all tenured or tenure-track Professors and Associate Professors in the department shall be appointed to make recommendations to the Department Head with regard to candidates requesting promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.
- (b) The Department Head shall chair all meetings of this Committee which shall be called as often as necessary to consider requests for promotion. The time and place of meetings shall be made known to Committee members two weeks in advance.
- (c) With respect to all promotion decisions, the Committee shall be provided with all information necessary to consider in depth the teaching, research, and public and institutional service effectiveness of individual candidates.

- (d) Two-thirds of the Committee membership being in attendance shall constitute a quorum. Issues shall be decided by a simple majority of votes cast. Voting shall be by secret ballot, with votes to be counted independently by two Committee members designated by the Chairperson.
- (e) Absentee ballots shall be allowed if the absentee voter is willing to relinquish any claim to anonymity vis-à-vis the two Committee members counting the votes. An absentee ballot carrying the signature of the absentee voter must be delivered in writing to the Committee members discharging this responsibility. There shall be, however, no further disclosure of the nature of the vote. In unusual circumstances, operational procedures may be altered by majority vote of the Committee.

2. Committee on Promotion to Rank of Professor

A special departmental Committee, consisting of all tenured or tenure-track Professors in the department shall be appointed to make recommendations to the Department Head concerning all candidates requesting promotion to the rank of Professor. Operational rules for this Committee shall be equivalent to those indicated above in IV.E.1, (b), (c), (d), and (e).

3. Tenure Committee

A special department Committee, consisting of all tenured members of the department faculty, shall be appointed to make tenure recommendations to the Department Head. The Department Head shall chair all meetings of this Committee which shall be called as often as necessary to consider requests for tenure. The time and place of meetings shall be made known to Committee members two weeks in advance. The operational rules for this Committee shall be equivalent to those indicated above in IV.E.1, (b), (c), (d), and (e).

F. Salary Adjustments

Annual salary recommendations are made by the head, after due consideration of annual and cumulative annual performance evaluations, and otherwise in accordance with University and College guidelines.

V. Appointment and Evaluation of the Department Head

A. Appointment

The process for appointment of the Department Head shall be in accordance with that set forth in the Faculty Handbook.

B. Evaluation

The Department Head will be reviewed annually according to University and College procedures as set forth in the Faculty Handbook and HCB Bylaws.

VI. Other Department Offices, Committees, and Representatives on College or University Committees

Other Department, College or University offices and/or committee assignments may be required from time to time. Such positions may be filled by Department Head appointment, or by the Dean of the Haslam College of Business. In some committees, confidentiality may be essential, in which case only committee members will participate in such committee meetings.

VII. Leave of Absence

Requests for paid or unpaid leaves of absence shall be evaluated by an ad hoc committee consisting of at least three tenured or tenure-track faculty members who are not requesting a leave of absence. The committee shall be appointed by the Department Head. The committee shall provide to the Head a ranking of the requests and an independent recommendation of whether each request should be approved. The Department Head shall take the rankings and recommendations into consideration when evaluating leave requests. Differences in opinion between the Department Head and the ranking committee shall be reported in writing as the requests move forward. The criteria for the rankings and recommendations are as follows:

A. Paid Leaves of Absence

1. All proposals for paid leaves of absence are to be evaluated primarily on merit, which is defined herein to be the extent to which the activities to be undertaken during the leave contribute to the missions of the Department, College, and University. Secondary criteria that may enter into the evaluation are: time since the faculty member's last leave of absence, and the result of any previous leave of absence. Seniority shall not in itself be considered.
2. Full-time tenured faculty with a minimum of six years full-time campus service since

any previously granted professional leave are eligible to apply for Faculty Development Leave. Specific requirements are given in the UTK Chancellor's statement on Faculty Development Leave. Faculty members are encouraged to take advantage of the program, and the Department Head will make reasonable efforts to facilitate Finance faculty participation in the program. Since Faculty Development Leave is a paid leave of absence, the terms of the previous paragraph apply.

3. Within three months of returning from paid leave, the faculty member shall submit to the Department Head and the evaluation committee a report of activities undertaken. The report will be used in evaluating the faculty member's future applications for professional leave. The report on the leave may also be used as part of the considerations for merit raises and subsequent promotion.

B. Unpaid Leaves of Absence

A request for an unpaid leave of absence is to be evaluated on the basis of whether it serves the department's interests.

VIII. Grievance and Hearing Procedures

Faculty members are entitled to fair, impartial, and honest resolutions of problems that may arise in relation to employment. All tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty have a right to bring complaints or grievances as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

IX. Ratification and Amendment of These Bylaws

Ratification and subsequent amendment of these by-laws may be accomplished by two-thirds majority vote of the voting faculty as defined herein. Appendix A to this document, "Finance Department Faculty Evaluation Policy and Procedures" and Appendix A1, "Journal Classifications" may be amended and ratified separately by a two-thirds majority of the voting faculty, as defined herein, without requiring a vote on the complete by-laws.

Ratified: May 16, 2005 _____

James W. Wansley, Department Head

Appendix A (to departmental by-laws)

Finance Department Faculty Evaluation Policy and Procedures

Finance Department
Haslam College of Business
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996

April 23, 2005

Approved by faculty vote on April 23, 2005
(Amended by faculty vote, April 12, 2006)
(Amended by faculty vote, November 24, 2009)
(Amended by faculty vote, August 31, 2010)
(August 30, 2012)
(Amended by faculty vote, March 30, 2017)
(Amended by faculty vote, January 9, 2018)

Finance Department Faculty Evaluation Policy and Procedures

Preface

The quality of the University is sustained through the dedicated and creative work of the faculty. Procedures for the fair, systematic, and thorough appraisal of each faculty for continued appointment, for promotion in academic rank, and for granting of tenure are extremely important to furthering the University mission. The UTK *Faculty Handbook* (<http://provost.utk.edu/facultyhandbook>) and *Manual for Faculty Evaluation* (<http://provost.utk.edu/evaluation/>) provide expectations of faculty performance and an outline of procedures for performance evaluation. If any provision of the Evaluation policy and Procedures conflicts with any provision of the handbook or board policy, the *Faculty Handbook* and The University of Tennessee Board of Trustees' Policy control.

Achieving a fair, systematic, and thorough evaluation process is a primary responsibility of the administrative leadership within the Haslam College of Business, including the Dean and Department Heads. Departments have the primary responsibility for developing and implementing faculty evaluations that are consonant with general University procedures laid out in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation.

Objectives and Purpose of Faculty Evaluations

Appropriate selection, retention, and evaluation of faculty are critical to the professional growth and development of faculty, and for the continuing success of the Haslam College of Business. An important element in the faculty growth and development process is the mutual agreement and understanding of their performance measures. Regular constructive feedback to each faculty member in the form of annual faculty reviews assists faculty members to plan and implement their specific goals and to understand how their performance enhances the visibility and stature of the Department in the academic and professional communities. It is understood that the objectives of such feedback are the mutual understanding of expectations and the assistance such feedback can bring in helping faculty improve performance.

The Haslam College of Business and the Department of Finance embrace the discovery and dissemination of knowledge for the benefit of students, business professionals, and the academic community. Individual faculty members have different skills and opportunities to contribute to the success of the College and Department. While retaining the basic expectation

that every tenure-track and tenured faculty member contribute in the areas of teaching; research, scholarship, and creative activities; and service, each faculty member's responsibilities and performance expectations may differ.

Annual Faculty Performance Review (approved March 30, 2017)

All full-time faculty are evaluated on an annual basis. This includes tenured/ tenure track faculty, who are evaluated subsequent to each academic year, and non-tenure track individuals, who (beginning in 2017) are evaluated subsequent to each calendar year. Following the timeline determined by the Provost's Office, faculty submit a Faculty Accomplishment Form (FAF) and/or any other requested documents for review by the Department Head. Once the Department Head has completed his/her review, the faculty member has an opportunity to review the scores given and any narrative comments, then to respond if he or she chooses. The Department Head's review and recommendation and any other documentation are then forwarded to the Associate Dean for Research & Faculty. The Dean's office forwards all recommendations and responses to the Chief Academic Officer. More details on the evaluation process can be found in the Faculty Handbook and Manual for Faculty Evaluation from the Provost's web site.

The purpose of this departmental bylaws addendum is to provide greater clarity about how the Department Head will determine assessments across the various categories of the university's annual review system. Specifically, the Department Head will consider the following general definitions, principles, and guidelines when performing an annual faculty performance review:

Teaching

1. Teaching is at the core of the duties for most faculty members. Excellence in the classroom is a basic expectation across all ranks for both tenured/tenure track and non-tenure track faculty when teaching is a job assignment. The criteria for evaluating teaching should be standard across all faculty. However, the extent to which different criteria should be used to evaluate a given faculty member should consider both experience in a course and sophistication of course preparations assigned in the total workload.
2. In evaluating teaching, the Department Head should consider not just student-generated SAIS scores, but should also consider other factors that contribute to the overall teaching mission of the department, college, and university. There is much more to the evaluation of teaching than

simply SAIS scores that reflect a faculty member's "deep and sustained commitment" to teaching. Therefore, in addition to SAIS scores, the Department Head should also consider broader types of mission-directed contributions when evaluating teaching, including, but not limited to:

- a. Any peer reviews (or other formal reviews) of teaching performed during the reporting period.
 - b. The rigor of the course being taught, when considered in light of intended learning goals and/or pedagogy.
 - c. Any department, college, or university awards (or finalists for awards) given for excellence in the classroom.
 - d. The grade distributions assigned by the instructor when submitting final grades.
 - e. Willingness and demonstrated ability to teach multiple course preparations, or step in and take new preps when the department is in need, as appropriate to teaching workload.
 - f. Willingness and demonstrated ability to teach in multiple programs (undergraduate, masters and PhD programs) as per departmental and college needs, as appropriate to rank.
 - g. Willingness and demonstrated ability to generate innovative offerings (particularly those that have the ability to impact significant numbers of students).
 - h. Any other inputs deemed relevant by the Department Head due to their containing valuable information for assessing faculty teaching effectiveness.
3. The basis for comparison for all teaching performance review scores is the rating of "meets expectations." The Department Head shall review teaching performance based on the criteria noted above, such that a faculty member rated at this level is considered:
- a. a competent instructor who is teaching the core learning objectives in the course(s) assigned,
 - b. as applying appropriate rigor,
 - c. experiencing no major organizational or pedagogical problems in the courses taught,
 - d. achieving a reasonable student satisfaction level when controlling for the nature of the course and the professor's experience teaching the course, and
 - e. is meeting department expectations with respect to grade distributions, topical coverage, rigor, etc.

Other performance evaluation scores than "meets expectations" should be thought of as deviations from the basic standard.

4. The inherent challenge and subjectivity of these assessments is acknowledged, though the Department Head should make every effort to provide rigorous and equitable evaluations across courses, faculty members, and faculty groups.

Research/Scholarship

Research is generally only expected from tenured/tenure-track faculty, as determined by assignments made through the workload policy. Research/Scholarship is considered from a multifaceted perspective. While academic journal articles published during the three-year review period are the central consideration in assessing a research portfolio for research faculty, other types of contributions during the review period are also recognized as adding value. Examples of other types of contributions recognized as adding value include:

1. Indicators of an active and strong research pipeline. Examples include papers accepted for presentation at conferences or submitted for review at journals in the department's journal list.
2. Indicators that scholarly activities are having an impact on the external visibility of the faculty member, the Department and the College. Examples include invited presentations, invited panels, and media citations.
3. Any other inputs deemed relevant by the department head due to their containing valuable information for assessing the faculty member's research/scholarship accomplishments. Examples include best paper awards at conferences and journals and research awards.

In keeping with the central focus on academic journal articles, the greatest weight will be given to articles accepted for publication during the review period by journals in the department's journal list, with the weight decreasing with journal quality classification, Premier being the highest quality classification. The following are general guidelines to be used in the determination of evaluation scores for research for various faculty levels.

Assistant Professors are expected to show promise in developing a program in disciplinary research and scholarship that is gaining external recognition. The probationary (pre-tenure) period is intended to allow time for an Assistant Professor to develop a research portfolio targeted at Premier journals that will show clear achievement of this goal. Thus, the annual reviews should shift focus from "promise" to "accomplishments" over the course of the probationary period. For assistant professors, "meets expectations" in research represents steady progress towards the establishment of a portfolio that establishes a scholarly reputation in their field, including research published by Premier journals, that

would be well regarded by our peer institutions. Consideration of progress relative to peers at other institutions is a valid input for the evaluation of an assistant professor.

Associate Professors are expected to continue to target Premier journals and produce scholarly output that enhances their professional reputation and makes them a widely-recognized contributor in their discipline. A rating of “meets expectations” for research should reflect an appropriate combination of quality journal contributions (per the department-approved journal lists) and other scholarly contributions. Positive deviation from “meets expectations” for research are most heavily influenced by academic journal articles, most significantly by articles published by Premier journals, and progress towards being a recognized scholar within their field. The Department Head should also consider other factors that contribute to the overall research mission of the department and college. Examples include activities that enhance the scholarship of the department, such as chairing dissertations, collaborating with doctoral students, and supporting research efforts of junior faculty. Consideration of progress relative to peers at other institutions is a valid input for the evaluation of an associate professor. Consideration of the workload units assigned to research is highly relevant in all of these assessments since, with more units comes greater output expectations.

Full Professors are expected to continue to produce scholarly output that enhances their professional reputation and makes them a widely-recognized contributor in their discipline. It is acknowledged that the mix of scholarly output may change somewhat for some full professors with longevity. A rating of “meets expectations” for research should reflect an appropriate combination of quality journal contributions (per the department-approved journal lists) and other scholarly activities that contribute to the overall research mission of the department and college. Examples include activities that enhance the scholarship of the department, such as chairing dissertations, collaborating with doctoral students, and supporting research efforts of junior faculty. Consideration of the workload units assigned to research is highly relevant in all of these assessments since, with more units comes greater output expectations.

Service

Service to the department, college, university, and discipline is a necessary and important element of being a valuable faculty member. Service can also take many forms including both internal and external roles. The performance evaluation score for service reflects the relationship between service workload units and service activities. Generally speaking, service expectations for tenure track faculty are lower during the pre-tenure (probationary) period than for tenured faculty. An evaluation score of “meets

expectations” for service generally reflects competent participation in service roles in such a way that is respected by peers and adds value to the department, college, university, or discipline.

Professionalism

The professionalism evaluation criterion reflects a combination of attributes which we associate with a strong and valued faculty member (regardless of rank or tenure track / non-tenure track status). These include descriptors such as professionalism, collegiality, supportiveness, responsiveness, dependability, honesty, integrity, and so on. A rating of “meets expectations” reflects someone with a high level of these sort of attributes as we hold ourselves to high standards of professionalism in this college.

Appendix A1: Journal Classifications

Journal list is separate.