



**PCSB Policy and Procedure:
*Tenure & Promotion Guidelines***

Policy: Tenure & Promotion Guidelines	Date Initially Approved by Faculty: 4/7/2009
Oversight Committee: Intellectual Contributions Committee	Dates Revised: 9/28/2011, 12/4/2015, 1/8/2016, 1/13/2016, 4/19/2016, 8/18/2016, 1/5/2017

Initially approved by the PCSB on:
April 7, 2009

First revision approved by the PCSB on:
September 28, 2011

Second revision approved by the PCSB on:
September 21, 2016



Table of Contents

The Third Year, Tenure, and Promotion Review Process	3
Preamble	3
Third Year, Tenure, and Promotion Criteria	3
Teaching	3
Scholarship	4
Service	4
Third Year and Tenure Review Processes	4
Early Preparations for the Third Year and Tenure Review Processes	4
Third Year Review Process	5
Preparations Immediately Preceding the Tenure Review Process	6
Tenure Review Process	7
Promotion Process	8
Early Preparations for the Promotion Process	8
Preparations Immediately Preceding the Promotion Review Process	9
Promotion Review Process	9
Evaluation of Term Faculty	10
Appendices	
Appendix A: PCSB Peer Teaching Evaluation Policy and Procedure	13
Appendix B: Summary of Dossier Requirements	16
Appendix C: Annual Chair Evaluation Guidelines	18
Appendix D: Suggested External Scholarship Review Process	19
Appendix E: Yearly Faculty Review Process	21
Appendix F: Types of Service Reviewed During the Tenure and Promotion Process	23
Appendix G: Calendar of Third Year, Tenure, and Promotion Events	24
Addendum: Maintenance of Academic Qualifications	25

The Third Year, Tenure, and Promotion Process

Preamble

The process that follows outlines and explains the steps by which a Providence College School of Business (PCSB) candidate is evaluated for third-year review, tenure, and/or promotion. This process is based on several fundamental principles:

- The critical role of faculty hiring, and subsequent support of new hires, in mission achievement and faculty retention
- The importance of fostering continuous improvement in faculty teaching, scholarship, and service
- Preserving the rights of the faculty while protecting the interests of the institution

Mindful of the college's tradition, our full-time faculty search committees seek qualified candidates in their academic disciplines, normally holding the terminal degree; who have demonstrated excellence, or who have the potential for excellence, in teaching and scholarship; and who the committee believes will affirm and contribute to the college mission and core values, as well as to the mission of the PCSB.¹

The procedures that follow should be construed in the spirit of this preamble and every effort should be made to protect the rights of individual faculty members while protecting the interests of the institution.

Third Year, Tenure, and Promotion Criteria

The *Faculty Handbook* specifies the qualifications for tenure (§ 3.5.3) and promotion (§ 3.4.2). The PCSB augments these specifications as follows.

Teaching

The PCSB draws on at least two major sources of data in evaluating faculty teaching: quantitative student course evaluations (such as IDEA forms) and peer teaching evaluations. Letters from former students, unedited comments from course evaluations, course content inventories, and teaching materials included in the dossier augment these sources.

In evaluating teaching, the PCSB looks for evidence of (1) continuing effective performance in and out of the classroom, (2) ways in which the teaching practice supports the strategic teaching/learning objectives articulated by the PCSB, and (3) evidence of a commitment to continuous instructional improvement.

¹ To preserve that character and further its mission, the College appoints to the ordinary faculty, without national searches, Dominican Friars qualified in their academic disciplines.

Scholarship

Prior to 2013, AACSB required two peer-reviewed² publications over five years, however, the PCSB holds its faculty to a higher standard. AACSB current standards for scholarship reflect the desire that the faculty's intellectual contribution have meaningful impact on the theory, practice, and teaching of business. As such, candidates must produce evidence that their work is not only sufficient in quantity, but also aligns with the mission and values of the School and produces significant impact. See the *Addendum* ("Maintenance of Academic Qualification for AACSB").

Review of the candidate's scholarly work will include (1) an evaluation of the quality, quantity, external recognition, and impact of this work, (2) the ways in which the work supports the mission and core values of the PCSB, and (3) the likelihood that the candidate will continue to demonstrate growth and development of his/her scholarship throughout his/her career at Providence College.

Service

The PCSB recognizes and values service to the department, School, College, discipline, and community, and considers each of these types of service as relevant to the candidate's tenure and promotion consideration. *Appendix F* provides details on the types of service that may be taken into consideration in tenure and promotion decisions.

Third-Year and Tenure Review Processes

Early Preparations for the Third-Year and Tenure Review Processes

The associate dean for faculty development will serve as a formal mentor to each probationary faculty member during that individual's first year at Providence College. The associate dean for faculty development continues to act as a coach throughout the candidate's probationary period, reviewing and commenting on the candidate's yearly *Faculty Development Plan* (FDP) (see *Appendix E*). FDPs, with comments from the associate dean for faculty development, are considered developmental.

Peer teaching evaluations (PTEs) and student teaching evaluations play a critical role in construction of the candidate's third year and tenure case for teaching. It is the responsibility of the School to organize student course evaluations for distribution on a semester-by-semester basis. It is the responsibility of the candidate to administer student course evaluations. It is the chair's responsibility to coordinate and oversee the PTE process and to maintain official copies of the PTEs for eventual submission to the Provost's Office. *Appendix A* provides information on procedures related to PTEs, including the *Peer Teaching Evaluation Form*.

² Peer reviewed is defined by AACSB as, "An independent, transparent review process done prior to publication by an editorial board/committee widely acknowledged as possessing expertise in the field."

To aid in development and provide departmental faculty with additional information, candidates are requested to make presentations, typically during their second and fifth years. Presentations feature a paper, published or in progress, followed by a broader discussion of the candidate's scholarly agenda, past successes in meeting that agenda, and future plans to continue to grow or change the agenda. All PCSB faculty members are invited to attend these presentations.

Early in their first year, candidates are encouraged to consult with their chairs about service opportunities and appropriate levels of service for probationary faculty. Candidates are encouraged to serve on one PCSB committee during the bulk of their probationary period, and many find it advantageous to serve on a College-wide committee at some point during this period.

By June 15th of the candidate's first academic year, he/she is urged to have an up-to-date dossier, which can be added to or subtracted from as the candidate progresses through the probationary period. Materials to be included in the dossier are listed in *Appendix B*. Based on the dossier, the chair conducts a written yearly evaluation of the candidate, to be completed no later than July 15th, which is shared with the candidate during a formal discussion held no later than the start of the academic year. The candidate has the option of appending comments to the evaluation. Topics to be covered in the evaluation are included in *Appendix C*.

Third-Year Review Process

It is the responsibility of the chair, with input from the tenured members of the department, to evaluate the candidate's achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service in the spring of the third contract year. Individuals who were awarded one year of credit toward tenure at the time of initial appointment will follow the same timetable as those on the full tenure clock. Individuals who were awarded two years of credit toward tenure at the time of the initial appointment will undergo review in the spring of their second year.

Dossiers must be complete, including all materials listed in *Appendix B*, by January 15th of the year in which the third-year review takes place. External scholarship reviews and letters from former students are not solicited as part of the third-year review process. On or before this date, the candidate must upload all required materials to the appropriate site as directed by the associate dean.

The associate dean informs the department chair that the dossier is available and the chair is responsible for uploading copies of Peer Teaching Evaluations and Annual Chair Evaluations. Access to the site is then granted to all tenured faculty members who are expected to read the dossier and appended materials, including journal articles or other submitted scholarly materials.

The chair sets a meeting date no later than February 20th for the department's tenured faculty at which they discuss their evaluations of the candidate and his/her dossier. A written record of this meeting, in the form of a memo to the candidate, is completed by the chair and submitted to the dean for review by March 1st. The memo includes a summary of departmental discussion of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses relative to the tenure standards for scholarship, teaching, and service.

By March 15th the dean completes a separate memo including his/her assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses relative to the tenure standards for scholarship, teaching, and service, as well

as his/her rationale for any points of divergence from the departmental memo, plus any additional points of discussion he/she believes salient to the case.

If there exists a divergence between the department memo and the dean's memo, the dean meets with the tenured members of the department to verbally share and discuss any points of divergence.

Once these memos are finalized, a summary memo to the candidate is written by the chair in which the candidate is informed of any mixed or negative votes in terms of teaching, scholarship, or service. Without revealing confidential details, feedback is provided to help the candidate best prepare for his/her future review. A meeting is held between the dean, chair, and the candidate to review this memo.

The third year review is developmental. However, the chair may reference it in assessing progress during subsequent evaluations.

Preparations Immediately Preceding the Tenure Review

For Faculty Hired Prior to 2015 Who Choose the Option of Being Reviewed under the 10th Ed. of the *Faculty Handbook* (dates designated "OLD"):

At the end of the academic year prior to the tenure review, the candidate is encouraged to identify individuals he/she wishes to serve as external scholarship reviewers so that the chair may begin the process, outlined in *Appendix D*, of securing these letters in a timely fashion. Letters from external reviewers must be submitted directly to the chair.

At the end of the academic year prior to the tenure review process, the candidate may optionally wish to begin soliciting letters from up to five former students who have already graduated.³ These letters must be submitted directly to the chair.

Dossiers must be complete, including all materials listed in *Appendix B*, by September 15th of the year in which the tenure review takes place. On or before this date, the candidate uploads his/her dossier to the appropriate site and delivers two copies to the Provost's Office for distribution to the members of the Committee on Academic Rank & Tenure (CART). Although the candidate may consult with the associate dean for faculty development, the chair, and/or other members of the department in compiling the dossier, he/she is fully responsible for developing, maintaining in a complete and accurate fashion, and submitting the dossier on time.

By September 25th of the year in which the tenure review takes place, the chair is responsible for compiling and uploading letters from external reviewers, letters from former students if available, all Peer Teaching Evaluations (with the exception of the first developmental PTE), all Annual Chair Evaluations, and the Third-Year Review Evaluation.

For Faculty Hired After 2014, or Those Who Choose the Option of Being Reviewed under the 11th Ed. of the *Faculty Handbook* (dates designated "NEW"):

³ Candidates going through the review process prior to the sixth year may solicit letters from graduates of their former institution(s).

At the beginning of the academic year of the tenure review, the candidate is encouraged to identify individuals he/she wishes to serve as external scholarship reviewers and begin the process, outlined in *Appendix D*, of securing these letters in a timely fashion. Letters from external reviewers must be submitted directly to the chair.

At the beginning of the academic year of the tenure review process, the candidate may optionally wish to begin soliciting letters from up to five former students who have already graduated.⁴ These letters must be submitted directly to the chair.

Dossiers must be complete, including all materials listed in *Appendix B*, by December 15th of the year in which the tenure review takes place. On or before this date, the candidate uploads his/her dossier to the appropriate site and delivers two copies to the Provost's Office for distribution to the members of CART. Although the candidate may consult with the associate dean for faculty development, the chair, and/or other members of the department in compiling the dossier, he/she is fully responsible for developing, maintaining in a complete and accurate fashion, and submitting the dossier on time.

By January 15th of the year in which the tenure review takes place, the chair is responsible for compiling and uploading letters from external reviewers, letters from former students if available, all Peer Teaching Evaluations (with the exception of the first developmental PTE), and all Annual Chair Evaluations.

Tenure Review Process

It is the responsibility of tenured members of the department to evaluate the candidate's achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service.⁵ Upon receiving the dossier and appending required materials, the chair informs the faculty that the candidate will be proceeding through the tenure process and makes the dossier available to the faculty. All tenured faculty members are expected to read the dossier and appended materials, including journal articles or other submitted scholarly materials.

The chair sets a meeting date no later than October 5th (OLD) or January 31st (NEW) for the department's tenured faculty at which they discuss their evaluations of the candidate and her/his dossier. Prior to executing a secret ballot on the elements relevant to the candidate's tenure, the candidate is given the option of joining the meeting to answer questions posed by the tenured faculty members or to provide clarification on any relevant issues. The candidate is excused and discussion and voting take place in accordance with the process described in the Faculty Handbook (section 3).

⁴ Candidates going through the review process prior to the sixth year may solicit letters from graduates of their former institution(s).

⁵ Candidates given credit for prior teaching experience, and therefore eligible for tenure review prior to the sixth year, may submit teaching materials from their prior institutions, including course evaluations (no more than three years' worth in total, including any from Providence College), and scholarship completed prior to the tenure review for consideration during the review process.

Prior to the close of the meeting, the chair counts the ballots on all three questions, and informs the departmental faculty of the result. An official written record of this meeting addressed to the provost is completed by the chair and submitted to the dean by October 10th (OLD) or February 10th (NEW), including a list of faculty present, the vote of the faculty, and the major points of discussion. Appended to this document is a separate memo from the chair documenting his/her recommendation on the candidate's fitness to receive tenure in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service, and his/her rationale for any points of divergence from the departmental faculty vote, plus any additional points of discussion he/she believes salient to the case.

By October 15th (OLD) or February 15th (NEW), the dean completes a separate memo including his/her recommendation on the candidate's fitness to receive tenure in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service, and his/her rationale for any points of divergence from the department or chair's vote, plus any additional points of discussion he/she believes salient to the case. Prior to finalization of the dean's memo, the candidate is given the option of meeting with the dean to answer any questions or to provide clarification on any relevant issues. This memo, along with the departmental vote and chair's recommendation, is sent to the provost no later than close of business on October 15th (OLD) or February 15th (NEW).

Once these memos are finalized and sent to the provost, the dean meets with the tenured members of the department to verbally share and discuss any points of divergence with their votes. At the same time the chair verbally shares and discusses any point of divergence with the vote of the other members of the department.

In addition, once these memos are finalized and sent to the provost, a separate meeting is held between the dean, chair, and the candidate in which the candidate is informed of any mixed or negative assessments in terms of teaching, scholarship, or service.

The Promotion Process

Early Preparation for the Promotion Process

Faculty members who have served as an assistant professor at the College (or an institution of equivalent standing) for at least four years are eligible for consideration for promotion in rank to associate professor. Faculty members who have served five full years as an associate professor at the College, or one of equivalent standing, are eligible for consideration for promotion in rank to full professor.⁶

Faculty members who are considering a bid for promotion may wish to undertake some or all of the preparatory steps advised for those going through the tenure process, for example:

- Consulting with the associate dean for faculty development (having an up-to-date dossier aids in the mentoring process; suggested materials for inclusion in the dossier are listed in *Appendix B*).

⁶ Prior to May 1st of each academic year, the provost notifies faculty of their eligibility to be considered for promotion to associate or full professor. Faculty are only notified once of their eligibility for promotion to a given rank.



- For tenured faculty seeking promotion, requesting that colleagues conduct Peer Teaching Evaluations of their courses.
- Making a presentation prior to the promotion review process. Presentations would typically feature a paper, published or in progress, followed by a broader discussion of the candidate's scholarly agenda, past successes in meeting that agenda, and future plans to continue to grow or change the agenda. All PCSB faculty members would typically be invited to attend these presentations.

Preparations Immediately Preceding the Promotion Review

During the academic year prior to the review, the candidate is encouraged to identify individuals he/she wishes to serve as external scholarship reviewers so that the chair may begin the process, outlined in *Appendix D*, of securing these letters in a timely fashion. Letters from external reviewers must be submitted directly to the chair.

During the year prior to the promotion review process, the candidate may optionally wish to begin soliciting letters from up to five former students who have already graduated. These letters must be submitted directly to the chair.

Dossiers must be compiled and submitted electronically, including all materials listed in *Appendix B*, by December 15th (OLD) or September 15th (NEW) of the year in which the promotion review takes place. On or before this date, the candidate must also deliver two copies of the dossier to the Provost's Office for distribution to the members of CART. Although the candidate may consult with the associate dean for faculty development, the chair, and/or other members of the department in compiling the dossier, he/she is fully responsible for developing, maintaining in a complete and accurate fashion, and submitting the dossier on time.

By January 8th (OLD) or September 22nd (NEW) of the year in which the promotion review takes place, the chair is responsible for compiling letters from external reviewers, letters from former students if available, and any peer teaching evaluations. On or before this date, the chair must upload these materials to the designated site.

Promotion Review Process

It is the responsibility of tenured members of the department who are at or higher than the rank to which the candidate aspires to evaluate the candidate's achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service. Upon receiving the dossier, the chair informs the eligible tenured faculty that the candidate will be proceeding through the promotion process and makes the dossier, and any materials submitted directly to the chair, available to these individuals. All eligible faculty members are expected to read the dossier and appended materials, including journal articles or other submitted scholarly materials.

The chair sets a meeting date no later than January 15th (OLD) or September 30th (NEW) for the department's eligible faculty at which they discuss their evaluations of the candidate and her/his dossier. Prior to executing a secret ballot on the elements relevant to the candidate's tenure, the candidate is given the option of joining the meeting to answer questions posed by the eligible faculty members or to

provide clarification on any relevant issues. The candidate is excused and discussion and voting take place in accordance with the process described in the Faculty Handbook (section 3). the secret ballot proceeds.

Prior to the close of the meeting, the chair counts the ballots on all three questions, and informs the eligible faculty of the result. An official written record of this meeting addressed to the provost is completed by the chair and submitted to the dean by January 22nd (OLD) or October 5th (NEW), including a list of faculty present, the vote of the faculty, and the major points of discussion. Appended to this document is a separate memo from the chair documenting his/her recommendation on the candidate's fitness to be promoted in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service, and his/her rationale for any points of divergence from the departmental faculty vote, plus any additional points of discussion he/she believes salient to the case.

By January 28th (OLD) or October 10th (NEW), the dean completes a separate memo including his/her vote on the candidate's fitness to be promoted in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service, and his/her rationale for any points of divergence from the department or chair's vote, plus any additional points of discussion he/she believes salient to the case. Prior to finalization of the dean's memo, the candidate is given the option of meeting with the dean to answer any questions or to provide clarification on any relevant issues. This memo, along with the departmental vote and chair's vote, is sent to the provost no later than close of business on January 31st (OLD) or October 15th (NEW).

Once these memos are finalized and sent to the provost, the dean meets with the eligible members of the department to verbally share and discuss any points of divergence with their votes. At the same time the chair verbally shares and discusses any point of divergence with the vote of the other eligible members of the department.

Once these memos are finalized and sent to the provost, a meeting is held between the dean, chair, and the candidate in which the candidate is informed of any mixed or negative assessments in terms of teaching, scholarship, or service.

Evaluation of Term Faculty

Practitioner faculty are full-time faculty who are not ordinary faculty and do not hold rank, but who have specialized training, knowledge, skills, competencies, and experience in a particular field relevant to a departmental or programmatic need. Practitioner faculty must have an advanced degree and significant professional experience in their respective discipline as determined to be appropriate by the departmental faculty and dean of the School of Business (PCSB).

Candidates for initial practitioner appointments must submit a letter of interest, CV, three letters of recommendation, a response to the Providence College Mission, and an official graduate school transcript.

Appointments in this category are for one year and are renewable, pending review, by the departmental chair and the dean, of teaching effectiveness and departmental needs. After six one-year contracts, any new contract must be recommended by the department, and approved by the dean of the PCSB, CART, and the provost and will be for a term of three years. Subsequent three-year contracts must also be based on departmental recommendation and approval of dean, CART, and provost.

Following are the expectations for practitioner faculty:

- Exhibit effective teaching.
- Maintain active involvement in their profession as it relates to teaching.
- Engage in student advising (formal or informal as required by the department).
- Provide service, as appropriate, to the College, the PCSB, the department, the business community, the community as a whole, and/or the professional discipline as determined by the department chair in consultation with the dean.

Procedure for Evaluation

Adjunct (part-time faculty) and practitioner (full-time) faculty undergo Peer Teaching Evaluations (PTE) conducted by the chair or his/her designee each semester of their first two years of appointment at Providence College and each semester in which they teach a new course that was not previously part of their Providence College workload; thereafter, they undergo a PTE once each year. The chair reviews the PTE, shares it with the faculty member, and meets with him/her, if necessary, to discuss any concerns.

For one-year contracts, annual reviews by the department chair and the dean of the PCSB will take place during January and practitioner faculty will be informed by the PCSB Dean's Office of an intention to renew (or not renew) an annual contract on or before February 1st.

After six years of one-year contracts (and every three years subsequently), practitioner faculty are responsible for the submission of an application for a multi-year contract. In these years, in addition to the review provided by the chair and the dean, CART and the provost's approval are required. Practitioner faculty must submit an application package to the Provost's Office by November 15th. Along with chair and dean's recommendations, the application will be considered by CART and the faculty member informed of a decision by the provost on or before February 1st.

Multi-year contracts will be based on affirmative evidence of teaching effectiveness and service.

Teaching Effectiveness – Practitioner Faculty

Primary Sources of Data (required):

- Statement of how teaching fits the Providence College Mission and the values of the PCSB.
- Quantitative student evaluations (such as IDEA results).
- Peer teaching evaluations administered by members of the department. (Procedure for administration found in *Appendix A*.)

Other Sources of Data (not required but may be used to support candidacy):

- Evidence of commitment to continuous improvement in teaching quality.
- Letters of support from former, graduated students.
- Evidence of student projects/activities grounded in real-world business contexts.

Service

Service includes service to the department, the PCSB, the College, the discipline, the business community, and the community as a whole. Within the contexts of assisting the College and its students, evidence should be presented that demonstrates substantial engagement with these various constituencies.

Non-exhaustive Examples:

- Participation (both level and quality thereof) in departmental, PCSB, and College-wide initiatives and programs.
- Work with student organizations.
- Work with charitable/civic groups (especially leadership roles).
- Business consulting.
- Writing that appears in trade journals and the popular press.
- Serving as an expert reference for the media.

Appendix A:
PCSB Peer Teaching Evaluation Policy and Procedure

A developmental peer teaching evaluation (PTE) will be conducted by the chair in the first semester of the candidate's first year; this PTE will not be included in the department's tenure deliberations, unless the candidate chooses to include it. After the first semester, all tenured departmental faculty members, including the chair, conduct an evaluative PTE in the probationary faculty's first or second year, and then again once during the third through fifth years. Evaluative PTEs are to be included in the candidate's dossier.

A schedule is developed by the chair allocating classroom visits across the period of time in question to avoid a rush of visits at the end of the evaluation period. All PTEs are to be completed no later than the spring semester before the fall tenure review.

At the beginning of each semester, the probationary faculty makes a copy of his/her syllabi and any other relevant course materials available to the chair in hard copy, who in turn makes these materials available to the other reviewers in advance of their classroom visits. Alternatively, the candidate may make course materials available on Sakai or distribute all materials electronically via email. All evaluators are expected to review these materials prior to the visits. The candidate also provides the evaluators with a list of class sessions for each course when it would make sense for visits to occur. Candidates may wish to include a brief description of the pedagogical approach to be the focus of each class session (i.e., lecture, case analysis, group activity, etc.). Additionally, probationary faculty may seek a meeting with the evaluators to discuss course pedagogy prior to the class visits. Dates listed should start after the beginning of the semester and end at least two weeks before the end of the semester. Visits are unannounced.

Each evaluator is required to submit a completed evaluation form (attached) to the chair within one week of the visit. The chair then passes the form to the probationary faculty who has one week to add comments, if desired, sign the form and return a copy to the chair as well as keep a copy for his/her dossier. The PTE is to be the work of the evaluator, not the result of a negotiation between the probationary faculty and the evaluator. Once all signatures are in place on the form, the chair submits the original PTE to the PCSB Dean's Office for filing.

Peer Teaching Evaluation Report Form

Instructor Evaluated:	
Course # and Section:	
# of Students Enrolled:	
# of Students Present:	
Evaluator:	
Date Conducted:	
Date Submitted to Chair:	
Signature of Evaluator:	
Date Instructor Resubmits Form to Chair:	
Signature of Instructor:	

The purpose of this classroom observation is (1) to provide data for accurate and equitable tenure and promotion decisions and (2) to improve faculty performance.

Please consider each item carefully and assign a rating of either (A) ACCEPTABLE, (NI) NEEDS IMPROVEMENT, or (NA) NOT APPLICABLE. A space is left after each item to add comments. Please be sure to include comments for any item rated as (NI) NEEDS IMPROVEMENT.

1. ____ Defines objectives for the class presentation.

2. ____ Organizes learning situations to meet the objectives of the class presentation.

3. ____ Uses instructional methods that encourage relevant student participation in the learning process.

4. ____ Uses class time effectively.

5. ____ Demonstrates enthusiasm for subject matter.

6. ____ Communicates clearly and effectively to the academic level of the students.

7. ____ Explains important ideas simply and clearly.



8. ____ Demonstrates command of the subject matter.
9. ____ Responds appropriately to student questions and comments.
10. ____ Encourages critical thinking and analysis.

List the strengths you observed.

List concerns regarding what you observed.

List specific suggestions for improving this class.

Please append any additional comments to this form.

Appendix B:
Summary of Dossier Requirements Adapted from Academic Affairs
“Guidelines for Tenure Candidates” and “Guidelines for Promotion Candidates”

NB: This appendix uses two sets of dates depending on whether the candidate, hired prior to 2015, has decided to link tenure and promotion. Should the candidate decide on this linked process, the dates indicated as “NEW” will be relevant. Those who have indicated that they would like to be evaluated under the terms of *Faculty Handbook’s* 10th edition and earlier (no linking of tenure and promotion) must abide by the dates indicated as “OLD.”

Section 1: Curriculum Vitae

- Complete, accurate, and consistent Digital Measures CV.

Section 2: Teaching

Should include any materials the candidate believes reflect on his/her teaching effectiveness, including:

- A statement of the faculty member’s teaching philosophy and goals; a discussion of progress made toward meeting goals. This document should not exceed two pages.
- A list of all courses taught, by year, with number of students indicated and a brief description of curricular innovation or change related to any of these courses.
- Sample materials from representative courses (e.g., lower and upper division; required and elective), including syllabi. Other materials may include sample (i.e., not all) exams or assignments.
- Summary IDEA teaching evaluations from at least the previous three years, including MBA teaching evaluations, and typed sets of student comments from the last three years (not edited; only available for all faculty from spring 2009 on). At the candidate’s discretion, a summary table of “Excellent Teacher” and “Excellent Course” may be included.

Section 3: Scholarship

- A statement of the candidate’s scholarly agenda, including an assessment of past and current achievement and indicating future directions. The candidate is encouraged to include a discussion of how his/her scholarship intersects with his/her teaching. This document should not exceed two pages.
- Off prints/PDFs or preprints of all peer reviewed published or accepted articles or other peer reviewed publications included in the CV. Books or lengthy publications should be submitted to the department chair at the time of dossier submission and forward for examination to the Provost’s Office; these materials should not be included in the dossier itself. The following information should be included for all peer reviewed publications: acceptance rate, any other published information on journal quality (this might take the form of a journal rating list provided that producer of the list provider is expressly noted), published information (or a letter from the publisher) describing the peer review process, statement of the candidate’s contribution to multi-authored journals, and contact information for co-authors.
- Any non-peer reviewed publications the candidate wishes to include.



- Any works in progress the candidate wishes to include, accompanied by a clear statement regarding the degree of completion of the work.
- Note that work completed after the dossier is submitted may be tendered to the department, the dean, or CART up until the time these bodies deliberate.

Section 4: Service

- A statement of the candidate's service philosophy and goals, including a statement of which service activities were particularly important to the candidate and plans for future service. This document should not exceed two pages. The candidate's CV should include a list of all service activities during the review period at Providence College, broken down by department service, College service, service to the profession, and service to the community.

Other Candidate Guidelines

- For **tenure** consideration, a letter requesting tenure is to be submitted to the provost by September 15th (OLD) or January 15th (NEW).
- For **promotion** consideration, a letter requesting promotion is to be submitted to the provost by December 15th (OLD) or September 15th (NEW).
- In the case of either tenure or promotion or the combination of the two, a complete dossier must be uploaded to the relevant site by the above dates and two hard copies of the dossier should be provided to the provost.
- For **third year review**, a complete dossier must be uploaded to the relevant site by January 15th.
- With the exception of off-prints/PDFs and internal and external letters submitted as part of the dossier, the dossier materials should be presented in 12-point type.

The chair is responsible for compiling the following materials:

- Copies of Annual Chair Evaluations for third-year review or tenure candidates.
- No more than five letters solicited from former students, who have already graduated, may be solicited by the candidate. These letters should be mailed directly to the department chair, who will submit them independently to the dean and CART. Letters are not solicited from former students for the third-year review.
- For third-year or tenure review, all peer teaching evaluations, with the exception of the developmental evaluation conducted by the chair in the faculty member's first semester (see *Appendix A*). For promotion, all available peer teaching evaluations are to be included.
- The candidate must secure external reviews from professional colleagues, but no more than four such reviews (see *Appendix D*). They should be directed, not to the candidate, but to the candidate's department chair, who will append them to the departmental report. External reviews are not solicited from external reviewers for third-year reviews.

Appendix C:
Annual Chair Evaluation Guidelines

An annual written evaluation of each probationary candidate's progress relative to PCSB standards in teaching, intellectual contributions/scholarship, and service is completed by the department chair, after consultation with the tenured members of the department, no later than July 15th of each year. The evaluation is shared with the candidate during a formal discussion held no later than the start of the school year. The candidate has the option of appending comments to the evaluation.

Topics to be covered in the evaluation include:

1. A critique of the completeness and appropriateness of the candidate's dossier.
2. An evaluation of teaching performance inside and outside the classroom, which includes a discussion of:
 - a. Quantitative student course evaluations
 - b. Student commentary from course evaluations
 - c. Level of challenge of courses
 - d. Course materials (such as syllabi, tests, and handouts that may be provided by the candidate)
 - e. Peer Teaching Evaluations
 - f. An assessment of the candidate's completion of his/her advising duties
3. An evaluation of intellectual contributions/scholarship which discusses the appropriateness of the quality and quantity of the candidate's work, given where the candidate is in the probationary process and an assessment of changes which might help ensure the candidate's success in the third-year or tenure review process.
4. An evaluation of service, given where the candidate is in the probationary process and an assessment of chances which might help ensure the candidate's success in the third-year or tenure review process.
5. An evaluation of improvements/changes made in teaching, scholarship, or service based on feedback from the prior year.

Every effort should be made to give clear and constructive advice to the faculty member. Suggestions should be as specific as possible, for example writing grants, submission of articles to higher quality journals, videotaping lectures, observation of senior faculty, etc.

Appendix D:
Suggested External Scholarship Review Process

During the academic year prior to the tenure review, the candidate is encouraged to identify individuals he/she wishes to serve as external reviewers and forward the names and contact information to the chair. The chair should first secure the consent of these individuals to serve in this capacity. If there is difficulty in gaining the consent of suggested outside reviewers, the candidate should have the opportunity to suggest additional options.

For tenure consideration^[1], by June 1st (OLD) or September 1st (NEW), it is suggested that a formal letter be sent to those agreeing to serve as reviewers, along with copies of published or unpublished material the candidate wishes to submit. Letters should come from the department chair. If the candidate has additional publications accepted subsequent to this time, and wishes to include these publications in the review, it is his/her responsibility to provide these to the chair who can then forward these additional materials to the reviewers for inclusion in the review.

Reviewers are asked to return their reviews to the chair no later than September 1st (OLD) or December 15th (NEW) for tenure reviews.^[2] If reviews are not forthcoming, the chair should attempt to work with the reviewers to assure timely completion. If the chair is having difficulty communicating with or receiving the reviews, the chair may elicit the aid of dean.

If the candidate has publications that are accepted too late for inclusion in the reviews, the candidate notifies the chair and the chair appends a note to the reviews explaining the situation.

^[1] Dates for promotion consideration would be September 1st (OLD) or June 1st (NEW).

^[2] Dates for promotion consideration would be December 1st (OLD) or September 1st (NEW).

Draft Suggested External Review Letter

Dear _____,

Thank you for agreeing to review and evaluate the scholarly research and publications of Professor _____, who is under consideration for [tenure/promotion] at Providence College. At Professor ___'s discretion, we are enclosing the following publications and works in progress which relate most specifically to your area of expertise:

- [LIST MATERIALS SENT] – it is suggested that the candidate's CV be included.

We appreciate your willingness to assist in the [tenure/promotion] review process by providing an evaluation of the scholarly work included in this packet. Your comments will be most helpful if they bear on the following points:

1. The degree of professional competence demonstrated.
2. The quality of intellect which is reflected in the work reviewed.
3. An estimation of the candidate's potential for future scholarly achievement.

Comments on any other aspects of Professor ___'s scholarship which you consider relevant to our assessment, such as the extent to which it contributes to existing knowledge in its subject area, are most welcome.

Could we ask you to describe your personal or professional relationship with Professor _____? Please forward your evaluation to _____ no later than _____. Your comments will be kept in strict confidence to the fullest extent allowed by law.

Once again, we thank you.

Sincerely,

Chair

Enclosures:

Appendix E: ***Yearly Faculty Review Process***

Policy

The PCSB Faculty Development Plan (FDP) and Review Process is designed to ensure that all full-time faculty members in their efforts to:

- Maintain their currency, as either Scholarly Academics (SA, most preferable) or Scholarly Practitioners (SP), Practice Academics (PA), or Instructional Practitioners (IP), throughout their PCSB careers.
- Contribute to the School's portfolio of intellectual contributions, consistent with our Scholarship and Faculty Qualifications Policy (for non-practitioner faculty).
- Provide quality educational instruction, consistent with our Teaching Policy.
- Maintain their status as participating faculty.
- Provide appropriate levels of service to Providence College, the PCSB, and the community.
- Strive for continuous improvement in their scholarship, teaching, and service.

Toward these ends, it is the policy of the PCSB that all full-time faculty members complete yearly FDPs, addressing (as appropriate to their faculty status) teaching, scholarship, and service, and that they endeavor to achieve the goals set forth in their plans. These plans are designed to be primarily developmental (i.e., their inclusion in tenure or promotion dossiers is not mandated and PC does not have a merit pay system). They are evaluative only in the sense they are used to determine faculty members SA/SP/PA/IP and Participating/Supporting status based on achievement of objective criteria.

The dean or associate dean of faculty development act as "faculty mentors" and are responsible for reviewing and commenting, in writing and verbally, on both the results of the prior years' plans and plans for the forthcoming year. Based on these reviews, the faculty mentor tentatively categorizes faculty as Scholarly Academics, Scholarly Practitioners, Practice Academics, Instructional Practitioners, or "other." The faculty mentor also tentatively categorizes faculty as Participating/Supporting. The dean is ultimately responsible for approving faculty status.

While participation in the Faculty Development and Review Process is an important responsibility of all faculty members, and maintenance of the appropriate status (SA for tenure-stream faculty) is critical to the PCSB, such participation and status maintenance is a necessary but not sufficient criteria for achievement of tenure or promotion.

Procedure

Each PCSB faculty member, whether full-time or part-time, will complete an appropriate FDP form by July 1st of each year. At the time of form submission, the faculty member's Digital Measures CV must be completely up-to-date and a copy appended to the plan.

Between July 1st and December 1st of each year, the faculty mentor reviews each FDP and meets with each faculty member individually to discuss his/her prior year's accomplishments and plans for the forthcoming year. The mentor or the faculty members may request periodic update meetings to discuss mid-year progress on plan achievement. The faculty member may ask that the department chair and/or another faculty member be included in any of these discussions. The dean, in consultation with the associate dean, renders final judgment regarding faculty SA/SP/PA/IP or "other" and Participating/Supporting status upon completion of the review process.

Faculty who fail to submit a FDP in a timely fashion place the PCSB and fellow faculty members at accreditation risk and fail to live up to basic faculty responsibilities as discussed under section 4.2.1 of the *Faculty Handbook*: "...responsibilities include acceptance of the Mission Statement of the Objectives of the College, adherence to College policies, and performance activities associated with teaching, scholarship, and service."

Appendix F:
Types of Service Reviewed During the Tenure and Promotion Process

Department/School service may include but is not limited to (a) Chairing or serving on departmental/School committees, (b) service as department chair, (c) support of departmental/School scholarly and social functions, (d) service as a mentor to other faculty, (e) participation in events such as Family Day and the Major/Minor Fair, (f) facilitating the department's/School's mission (e.g., advising departmental/School organizations).

College service may include but is not limited to (a) representation on College committees, (b) Faculty Senate involvement, (c) directing an academic or administrative program (in some cases, e.g., CTE service, might also represent scholarship in the form of professional development), (d) Undeclared Advising Program, (e) participation in College-sponsored events.

Service to the discipline may include, among others, activities such as, holding office or committee activity in regional/national professional associations, serving as departmental liaison to a professional organization, or serving as a reviewer for a scholarly journal.

Service to the community may include but is not limited to (a) charitable or church-related work, (b) speaking to community groups, (c) advising civic organizations and government groups, and (d) other activities in which the candidate's knowledge or skills are shared with community groups.



Appendix G:
Calendar of Third Year and Tenure Events

Year	Fall Semester	Spring Semester
Year 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informal mentoring meetings with associate dean for faculty development • Chair PTE (developmental) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informal mentoring meetings with associate dean for faculty development (continue in the future as desired by candidate) • Ongoing PTEs • Chair Evaluation completed by July 15th; shared with candidate prior to start of school year
Year 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing PTEs • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scholarship presentation at PCSB Annual Research Summit • Ongoing PTEs • Chair Evaluation completed by July 15th; shared with candidate prior to start of school year
Year 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing PTEs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing PTEs • Dossier submitted by Jan. 15th • Third-Year Review (department by Feb. 20th, chair by Mar. 1st, dean by Mar. 15th) • Chair Evaluation completed by July 15th; shared with candidate prior to start of school year
Year 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing PTEs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing PTEs • Chair Evaluation completed by July 15th; shared with candidate prior to start of school year
Year 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing PTEs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scholarship presentation at PCSB Annual Research Summit • Ongoing PTEs • Suggest student letters solicited if desired • Suggest external reviewers identified • Scholarship sent to reviewers • Reviews received; if not, candidate follows up
Year 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dossier submitted by Sept. 15th (OLD) or Jan. 15th (NEW) • Tenure Review (department by Oct. 5th (OLD) or Feb. 5th (NEW)) 	



Addendum
Maintenance of Academic Qualification for AACSB

Faculty members may retain their academic qualifications over the most recent five year period several different ways relevant to tenure or promotion.

- Completion of three Category A activities from the list below.
- Completion of two Category A activities, one Category B activity, and one Category C activity from the list below.
- Completion of two Category A activities and three Category C activities from the list below.

Category A

- Peer reviewed⁷ journal article or equivalent peer-reviewed publication/other significant exception as determined by the dean.⁸

Category B

- Research monograph
- Books
 - Book, new (textbook professional/practice/trade, and/or scholarly)
 - Book, major revision (textbook professional/practice/trade, and/or scholarly)
 - Editor of a book subject to public scrutiny (professional/practice/trade, and/or scholarly)
- Peer-reviewed proceedings publication
- Editor role or membership on the Editorial Review Board of a scholarly journal
- Appointment to external academic fellow position

Category C

- Conference Presentation or faculty research seminar (research presentation to faculty peers)
- Non-peer reviewed journal articles
- Other
 - Book, non-scholarly
 - Book, chapter in non-scholarly book
 - Cases with instructional materials
 - Publically available material regarding new courses/curricula
 - Instructional software
 - Significant professional or technical reports related to funded projects subject to public scrutiny

⁷ For reference purposes, AACSB defines peer reviewed in the following way, “An independent, transparent review process done prior to publication by an editorial board/committee widely acknowledged as possessing expertise in the field.”

⁸ Potentially equivalents include a scholarly book published by a major press, a first edition of a textbook, or a major revision of a textbook. The burden of proof that these are acceptable substitutions rests with the faculty member.



- Publically available research working papers
- Receipt of a grant by an external agency⁹

⁹ Grants by external agencies may be classified as Category A or B depending on the significance, competitiveness, and prestige of the grant.