

# **David Eccles School of Business Policies and Procedures for Reappointments and Performance Reviews of Auxiliary Faculty**

**November 27, 2007**

University policy requires both annual and periodic major performance reviews for auxiliary faculty, particularly in conjunction with reappointment of such faculty. The purpose of this document is to outline the procedures and criteria for such reviews and reappointments. The overarching standard for reappointment in both annual and major reviews is that auxiliary faculty are satisfactorily making a demonstrable contribution to the Department, School, or University consistent with their assigned responsibilities.

Annual performance reviews of auxiliary faculty members shall be conducted by the department chair. In addition to annual reviews and reappointments, University policy requires more thorough "major reviews". Major reviews shall take place at 1) the time of a multiple-year reappointment, 2) a promotion review (promotion policies and procedures for auxiliary faculty are specified in "David Eccles School of Business Policies for Promotion of Auxiliary Faculty" (approved Jan. 2005, hereafter referred to as the PPAF), or 3) at least every five years in cases where faculty have single year appointments but serve for longer than four years.

## **1.1 Criteria for Assessment for Reappointment and Major Reviews**

The criteria for evaluating auxiliary faculty are set forth in the PPAF. These criteria apply also to reappointment reviews that do not involve promotion decisions.

**1.1.1. Lecturing and other Teaching-Focused Faculty.** Multiple indicators of teaching quality must be used in reviewing lecturing faculty. The following criteria for lecturers (and other teaching-focused faculty such as adjuncts hereafter referred to as lecturers) are adapted from the PPAF (p. 4):

Teaching is the primary mission of lecturing faculty. Competence in teaching should be evaluated using the same sources as those used to assess tenure-track faculty (student evaluations, teaching awards, review of syllabi and teaching portfolio assembled by the candidate). Observation of a lecturer in the classroom by peers (lecturers of a higher rank or tenure-track faculty) is also an appropriate means of evaluation.

Additional evaluation criteria may include participation in curriculum or other college committees and work toward maintaining academic or professional qualifications.

**1.1.2. Clinical Faculty.** There are few precedents for clinical faculty in the business school, but there is also a diverse set of possible roles in which clinical faculty might serve. Thus, only very general guidelines are offered in evaluating clinical faculty who are candidates for promotion.

In judging a candidate, a balanced set of measures of clinical performance should be considered. For example, measures regarding the volume and quality of the clinical services offered by the candidate should be identified where possible. (PPAF, p. 7)

**1.1.3. Research Faculty.** Because research faculty's primary function is to create knowledge through leading edge research, the criteria for review are similar to those of tenure-track faculty except that expectations regarding teaching and service will typically differ.

Research faculty are assessed on their ability to conduct and publish research that stimulates academic thinking about issues important to businesses and society and/or that significantly affects the way managers approach business problems. They must demonstrate this scholarly competence by publishing in top-tier, peer reviewed outlets. In addition, research faculty are expected to receive research grants that provide substantial support for their own salaries and research activities. (see PPAF, p. 6)

## **1.2 Data for Reappointment and Major Reviews**

### **1.2.1 Lecturing and Teaching-Focused Faculty**

Lecturing faculty members being reviewed should provide a summary of their activities, either by supplying copies of the materials indicated below or by updating the faculty database (in a manner similar to an annual review). This summary should include:

- Evidence pertaining to the maintenance of Academic Qualification (AQ) or Professional Qualification (PQ). Criteria for AQ and PQ are established by AACSB.
- Teaching evaluations
- Course syllabi
- Summary of teaching accomplishments. This can include information such as new courses taught or developed, teaching innovations, etc.
- Statement of teaching philosophy
- Summary of service to the School, University, and Profession
- Responses to any unsolicited statements placed in the file by other faculty or administrators (optional)
- Any other teaching contributions related to the teaching of the David Eccles School of Business.

The Department Chair and other faculty may also add to the faculty member's file. Such items might include commendations for outstanding teaching or service, evaluations of the faculty member based on observation of teaching or service, or any statements that may assist the review committee (see Section 1.3.1) in their deliberations.

### **1.2.2. Clinical Faculty**

There are no recent precedents in the David Eccles School of Business regarding the evaluation of clinical faculty. Also, potential clinical roles may vary widely in their nature and scope. Thus, there are no specific guidelines as to what data should be provided to the review committee. Generally, however, clinical faculty should provide data regarding the quantity and quality of their clinical activities that is appropriate to their clinical role.

### **1.2.3. Research Faculty**

Research faculty should provide data regarding their research productivity as well as any service or teaching. Research faculty should provide a list of research grants awarded and a list of publications. Information should also be provided where necessary about the quality of the faculty member's publications and publication outlets. Such information may include (see PPAF, p. 6):

- Citations in other top-tier outlets
- External reviewer comments (three letters)
- Influence on subsequent research (that builds upon the candidate's work )
- Journal quality
- Research awards from recognized organizations and institutions
- Cross-citation index and impact factors
- External reviewer comments
- Journal rankings
- Peer and other institutional feedback

## **1.3 Procedures for Reappointment and Major Reviews**

**1.3.1. Auxiliary Faculty Review Committee.** Each department shall appoint an Auxiliary Faculty Review Committee to review auxiliary faculty members. The Committee shall consist of three faculty members. The Auxiliary Faculty Review Committee (AFRC) should consist of the two department members of the David Eccles School of Business' Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Advisory Committee along with one additional faculty member. The Department Chair shall appoint the third member of the AFRC. The third committee member may be an auxiliary faculty member of equal or higher rank than the auxiliary faculty being reviewed in a given year.

### **1.3.2 Procedures for Reviewing Candidates**

**1.3.2.a. Candidate submits file.** Departments are strongly encouraged to conduct reviews in the spring semester. It is recommended that auxiliary faculty being considered

for reappointment submit their materials for review by **February 1** of the next to last year of their multi-year contract.

**1.3.2.b Review by the AFRC.** The Department Head with the help of the AFRC shall conduct major reviews of auxiliary faculty members in cases where promotion is not being considered. In cases involving promotion, the guidelines in the PPAF shall govern the process.

The AFRC shall then conduct their review and make a recommendation to the Department Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Advisory Committee. The AFRC should provide documentation of their decision by **March 1**. (The guidelines for documentation, notification of candidates, etc. shall follow those specified for RPT decisions).

**1.3.2.c Candidate has an opportunity to respond to the AFRC Recommendation.** Candidates have the right but not the obligation to respond to the AFRC recommendation. Candidates shall have one week from the time of receipt of notification to respond to the AFRC decision.

**1.3.2.d Department Appointments Advisory Committee** The Department Appointments Advisory Committee (as defined in the PPM 9-5) shall meet to consider and vote on the recommendations of the AFRC by **March 31**. The David Eccles School of Business allows full-time auxiliary faculty members to serve on the Appointments Advisory Committee in addition to regular faculty. The Committee's deliberations and vote should be documented in a manner consistent with the procedures specified for RPT decisions.