**Post Tenure Review (PTR) Evaluation within the College of Business**

Post Tenure Review (PTR) serves as a periodic review of tenured faculty and is designed to foster sustained excellence and professional development and recognize and reward outstanding achievement. PTR is separate and distinct from annual and other employee evaluations in that PTR will focus on long-term accomplishments over a period of five years. Most importantly, the PTR process has been designed to uphold the University’s fundamental principles of tenure, academic freedom, due process, and confidentiality in personnel matters.

The FAU PTR process and procedures are outlined in the University’s Post-Tenure Review document in compliance with BOG regulation 10.003. This document responds to the University requirement to establish college-wide evaluation procedures.

**Department / School PTR Committee**

The Departmental / School PTR Committee shall be composed of all the tenured faculty members from the Departmental / School. Associate professors on the PTR committee may not vote on the PTR review of full professors. If there are less than three tenured faculty in the Department / School, the Department Chair / School Director and the other members of the committee will select professors from within the college so that there at least three professors at the appropriate rank or above serving on the committee. A committee member that is undergoing a PTR may also not participate in the discussions of their PTR case.

**Evaluation File**

The starting point for the PTR evaluation shall be the evaluation file. The evaluation file contains a summary of the faculty member’s activities, and history of professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities to the University and its students during the entire five-year review period. At a minimum, the evaluation file should contain:

* a current curriculum vita that clearly highlights accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service during the period under review
* table (in the form of Appendix 1) providing the annual evaluations over the past five-year and the average evaluations overall, and for research, teaching, and service
* copies of the faculty member’s last five annual assignments and annual evaluations, including any attached written rebuttals by a faculty member under review
* a copy of the report of the previous SPE or PTR, if available
* a copy of the published expectations from the faculty member’s academic department/school (see Appendix 2)
* a brief (2 page) narrative from the faculty member
* other relevant measures of faculty conduct as appropriate

**Evaluation Process**

The office of the Dean of the College of Business shall notify faculty members and the Department Chair / School Director of upcoming PTR Evaluations and the due date for the evaluation file. The Department Chair / School Director shall establish appropriate departmental deadline dates for the PTR process to meet the due date set by the College of Business. The faculty member shall submit his or her PTR file in Interfolio by a date fixed by the College.

The evaluation process consists of multiple reviews at the college level, including the Department / School PTR Committee, Department Chair / School Director, and the Dean of the College of Business. Each evaluation shall consider the entire range of the faculty member’s accomplishments over the five-year review period as reflected in the evaluation file. The evaluation file is reviewed in light of the academic unit’s published performance expectations and assessed whether those expectations have been met. In doing so, the following are considered:

* that faculty members have varying responsibilities within their academic units, as reflected in their annual assignments,
* that faculty can make essential contributions to the University’s mission in various ways,
* that the nature of an individual’s contributions may vary over time,
* that innovative scholarly work may take time to bear fruit, and may sometimes fail,
* that unusual or unpopular scholarship, teaching, and service are not by themselves sufficient cause for a negative evaluation, and
* that faculty are evaluated annually on their annual assignment.

The Department / School PTR Committee prepare a brief report following the review, which is added to the evaluation file. The report summarizes the recommended assessment of the faculty member’s performance during the evaluation period. The report will indicate whether the faculty member’s performance Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, or Fails to Meet Expectations, and cite specific reasons and evidence to support their conclusion.

In addition to reviewing the evaluation file and all reports contained in the file, the Department Chair / School Director reviews the following for the faculty member (referred to as the additional items):

* Personnel file, records of accomplishments and awards, annual evaluations, and faculty responses as applicable during the entire five-year Review Period
* Any findings of a completed and substantiated inquiry or investigation of non-compliance with applicable laws, BOG and University regulations, and University policies within the scope of their University employment during the entire five-year Review Period
* Any records of substantiated unapproved absences during the five-year Review Period
* Any disciplinary action issued by the University during the entire five-year Review Period

The Department Chair / School Chair then prepares a brief report, which is added to the evaluation file. The report summarizes the recommended assessment of the faculty member’s performance during the evaluation period. The report will indicate whether the faculty member’s performance Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, or Fails to Meet Expectations, and cite specific reasons and evidence to support the conclusion.

The Dean of the College of Business reviews the evaluation file, additional items, and all reports contained in the file, and prepares a brief report, which is added to the evaluation file. The report summarizes the recommended assessment of the faculty member’s performance during the evaluation period. The report will indicate whether the faculty member’s performance Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, or Fails to Meet Expectations, and cite specific reasons and evidence to support the conclusion.

All reports should be consistent with the instructions provided in the University’s Post-Tenure Review document.

After each level of review, the faculty member has five calendar days to submit a rebuttal to be included in the evaluation file. After the five-calendar day response period, the evaluation file is forwarded to the next review level.

Approved by the College of Business Faculty Assembly \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2023

Approved by the Dean of the College of Business \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2023

Approved by the Provost \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2023

**Appendix 1**

**Annual Evaluation Table**

**Annual Evaluations s Adjusted**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **Research3** | **Teaching** | **Service** | **Overall 1** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Average 2** |  |  |  |  |

1 The overall ratings for each year are based on the assignment weights in effect for that year.

2 The averages are simple averages across the five years.

3 The department / school criteria may allow for a different research assessment based on publication record over the five-year period. If this alternative research assessment is used, please indicate below:

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ No

**Appendix 2**

**Department / School Post Tenure Review Criteria**

**(Informational Purposes Only)**

**Accounting**

**Meets Expectations i**s achieved if the greater of 1) the average overall rating in the annual evaluations over the past five years, or 2) the revised average overall rating from the annual evaluations over the past five years, where a 3 is substituted for the research rating each of the five years when the faculty member publishes at least two peer-reviewed articles over the past five years, is 3.0 or higher, and does not meet the criteria for Exceeds Expectations.

**Exceeds Expectations** is achieved if the greater of 1) the average overall rating in the annual evaluations over the past five years, or 2) the revised average overall rating from the annual evaluations over the past five years, where a 4 is substituted for the research rating each of the five years when the faculty member publishes at least two peer-reviewed articles in leading journals over the past five years, is 4.0 or higher.

Approved by Accounting Faculty, November 17, 2023

**Economics**

**PTR CRITERIA**

**DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS**

For the purpose of post tenure review (PTR), an individual faculty will be identified with the following relevant data: (a) $w\_{ij}$ where *i* is the prior *five-year* *evaluation* *period* 1*,* 2*,* 3*,* 4*,* 5 and *j* the *three* *categories* research (*r*), teaching (*t*) and service (*s*) and (b) $e\_{ij}$ the annual evaluation score assigned to category *j* in year *i*. Some facts about the nature of this data are noted.

While weights on individual categories add up to 1 each year the weights for a single category across the 5-year evaluation period will likely *not* add up to 1.

Each $e\_{ij}$ (the annual evaluation score for year *i* for category *j*) is a number between 0 and 5.

In view of this, a possible measure that incorporates both annual evaluations and assignments in each year merely constructs a new score by taking the appropriate weighted time average for each category.

1. $e\_{j}=\sum\_{i=1}^{5}\left(\frac{w\_{ij}}{\sum\_{i=1}^{5}w\_{ij}}\right)e\_{ij}$

The data $e\_{r},e\_{t},e\_{s}$ calculated using (1) can now be used to define the performance metric “meets expectations” for each category and overall.

1. *Meets* *Expectations* *for* *research* is achieved if the faculty maintains Scholarly Academic status at the master's level every year for the 5-year evaluation period or $e\_{r}\geq 3$
2. *Meets* *Expectations* *for* *teaching* is achieved with $e\_{t}\geq 3$.
3. *Meets* *Expectations* *for* *service* is achieved with $e\_{s}\geq 3$.
4. If a faculty meets expectations in *all* *three* categories, the faculty will be evaluated as having *met* *expectations* *for* *the* *purpose* *of* *PTR* *for* *that* *evaluation* *period.*
5. *Suggested* *language* *for* *"exceeded* *expectation"*: A faculty that has met expectations according to point 4 above, will be rated as having *exceeded* *expectations* *for* *the* *purpose* *of* *PTR* *for* *the* *evaluation* *period* *under* *consideration* if (a) the faculty is SA qualified under the “doctoral variant” definition of qualification for the year of PTR evaluation and (b) the average annual evaluation in the preceding 5 years is at least 4*.*
6. Faculty can supplement or complement their PTR file by making the case for “meets expectations” and “exceeds expectations” by appealing to qualitative or other quantitative measures of excellence. Such cases will be given the same consideration as the quantitative measures outlined in (1)-(5).

Notes and Comments: All scores computed using (1) and averages of annual evaluations mentioned in (1)-(5) should be rounded off to the nearest ones. For definition of terms “Scholarly Academic” and “Scholarly Academic – Doctoral Variant” please refer to the Addendum on page 2. The addendum replicates information from the relevant portion of faculty approved qualifications based on guidelines provided by AACSB.

**ADDENDUM TO DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS PTR CRITERIA**

**Sustained Engagement Activities for SA**

**Scholarly Academics (SA)**

The SA qualification for most faculty (those who teach masters-level courses or a mix of masters and undergraduate courses in an academic year) requires at least three scholarly publications or activities from appendix categories A or B, a minimum of two must be refereed scholarly journal articles (Appendix category A.1) within the most recent five years. This grouping (undergraduate and masters-level teaching) encompasses the majority of the College’s faculty. Masters programs within the College are professional-focused; we do not offer research masters degrees (typically requiring an original scholarship thesis). Though AACSB standards require a minimum of 40% of faculty resources to be SA, as a doctoral granting institution with high research activity (R2), we strive for at least 60% of our instructional faculty deployment to be SA for the entire College and within each discipline. Other faculty segments (such as by campus, delivery mode, etc.) will meet or exceed AACSB faculty deployment guidance of 40% SA.

*Doctoral variant* (applicable to faculty who teach a doctoral course in an academic year) – instructors in this category are charged with developing new scholars; faculty of this group are expected to achieve the highest level of scholarly production in the College. To maintain SA status, faculty providing doctoral instruction must publish either a Financial Times 50 or Academic Journal Guide of The Chartered Association of Business Schools (AJG) 4\* article, OR at least four scholarly publications or activities from Appendix categories A or B, a minimum of two must be unique, refereed scholarly journal articles (category A.1) within the most recent five calendar years. At least one article must be in an AJG 3 or greater journal, or in an Australian Business Dean’s Council (ABDC) A or A\* journal.

**Appendix – Faculty Publication and Scholarly Activities**

*Note: Repeated instances of each activity count separately towards meeting status maintenance requirements, except those noted by the \*, which are limited to one occurrence.*

Category A – Scholarly Publication Activities

1. Publication of a refereed article in a scholarly journal related to instructional portfolio, course portfolio, or academic programs of the College.
2. Publication of an instructional case study, or instructional simulation software.
3. Publication of a chapter, or original material in a scholarly book.
4. Publication of an academic monograph or textbook where the content of the work comes predominantly from other contributors (e.g. edited books with multiple sections, a compilation of articles, multi-authored textbooks, or multi-authored academic reports or collections).
5. Publication of a second edition (or greater) of a textbook in the field.
6. Publication of a book review in a scholarly journal.

*The following “scholarly publication activities” count as two activities towards maintenance requirements due to the intensive development necessary for highest quality research (counting as two is not applicable to faculty qualified under the* ***doctoral variant*** *as that status requires a minimum of two distinct peer reviewed publications and additional intellectual contributions to demonstrate extensive, high quality scholarly engagement):*

1. An article (Appendix Category A.1) published in a journal in the Academic Journal Guide of the Chartered Association of Business Schools (AJG) at a level 3 or greater OR within the Australian Business Dean’s Council (ABDC) A or A\* publication classifications.
2. Publication of a first edition textbook in the field, or the first edition of a scholarly book where the faculty member is the writer of the book’s original content.

Category B – Significant Scholarly Activities

1. Inclusion of a paper at a regional, national, or international conference program or proceedings related to the individual’s instructional portfolio, course portfolio, or academic programs of the College.
2. Giving an invited scholarly talk or a scholarly keynote speech at a regionally, nationally, or internationally recognized organization/event.
3. Serving as a member of the editorial board for an academic journal within one’s field.
4. Serving in a top leadership position (with substantial scholarly responsibility) of a regionally, nationally, or internationally recognized academic society, or scholarly association.
5. Receipt of a minimum $25,000 externally funded grant.
6. Receipt of a Fulbright scholarship/appointment.
7. Development or maintenance of datasets of interest to the public that are connected to, or informative to ongoing scholarly research.

*Following “significant scholarly activities” count as two activities towards meeting status maintenance requirements due to their intensive nature:*

1. Serving as program or track chair in a nationally or internationally recognized academic conference.
2. Serving as the editor or associate editor for a nationally or internationally recognized academic journal within one’s field.

**Finance**

**Post Tenure Review Criteria-Department of Finance**

For the purpose of post tenure review (PTR), an individual faculty will be evaluated as follows:

1. Meets Expectations for research is achieved if the faculty has published at least 2 peer-reviewed articles over the past 5-years.

2. Meets Expectations for teaching is achieved if the average annual evaluation rating is a minimum of 3 (out of 5) for teaching over the past 5 years.

3. Meets Expectations for service is achieved if the average annual evaluation rating is a minimum of 3 (out of 5) for service over past 5-years.

Alternatively, faculty can provide qualitative measures of performance in each of the areas of teaching and service (as outlined in the University and College P&T document as “Indicators of Good Performance”) to the PTR Advisory committee for evaluation. The PTR Advisory committee may assign a Meet Expectations rating after taking into account the qualitative measures.

If a faculty’s weighted average rating across the three categories (research, teaching, and service) is at least 3.0, the faculty will be evaluated as having met expectations for the purpose of PTR for that evaluation period. In this calculation, i) the weights used will be the 5-year averages of the faculty annual assignment to each of the categories up to and including the most recent academic year, and ii) Meeting Expectations for research will be equivalent to a rating of 3.

“Exceeded Expectations:” A faculty will be considered as having exceeded expectations for the purpose of PTR for the evaluation period under consideration if two of the three categories (research, teaching, and service) equal or exceed an average annual evaluation rating of 4. For Research, any of the following will achieve an average annual evaluation rating of 4:

* three publications in journals rated 3 in the AJG (or equivalent) over the past 5-years,
* one publication in journals rated 4 in the AJG (or equivalent) and two other publications over the past 5-years, or
* one publication in a journal in the FT50 list or in journals rated 4\* in the AJG (or equivalent) over the past 5-years.

Alternatively, a faculty can provide qualitative measures of performance in each of the areas of teaching and service (as outlined in the University and College P&T document as “Indicators of Exceptional Performance”) to the PTR Advisory committee for evaluation. The PTR Advisory committee may assign an Exceeded Expectations rating after taking into account the qualitative measures.

**Information Technology and Operations Management**

The ITOM Department post-tenure review (PTR) criteria are based on a faculty member’s annual performance evaluationsin the areas of teaching, research (scholarship), and service.

* A PTR performance rating of “*Exceeds Expectations*” is achieved if the average OVERALL RATING inthe faculty member’s annual performance evaluationsover the 5-year PTR evaluation period is greater than or equal to 4.0 (out of a maximum of 5.0)
* A PTR performance rating of “*Meets Expectations*” is achieved if the average OVERALL RATING inthe faculty member’s annual performance evaluationsover the 5-year PTR evaluation period is between 3.0 and 3.999 inclusive (out of a maximum of 5.0)
* A PTR performance rating of “*Does Not Meet Expectations*” in a specific area (teaching, research or service) s received if the average of that area’s rating (TEACHING RATING, RESEARCH RATING or SERVICE RATING) in the faculty member’s annual performance evaluations over the 5-year PTR evaluation period is below 3.0 (out of a maximum of 5.0)

The OVERALL RATING in the faculty member’s annual performance evaluationis the SUM of the faculty annual-assignment-weighted ratings of WEIGHTED TEACHING RATING, WEIGHTED RESEARCH RATING and WEIGHTED SERVICE RATING.

Approved by ITOM Faculty, November 5, 2023

**Management**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| Research | The average research rating in the faculty member’s annual performance evaluations over the 5-year PTR evaluation period is between 3.0 and 3.999 inclusive (out of a maximum of 5.0); *and* | The average research rating in the faculty member’s annual performance evaluations over the 5-year PTR evaluation period is 4.0or higher (out of a maximum of 5.0); *and* |
| Teaching | The average teaching rating in the faculty member’s annual performance evaluations over the 5-year PTR evaluation period is between 3.0 and 3.999 inclusive (out of a maximum of 5.0); *and* | The average teaching rating in the faculty member’s annual performance evaluations over the 5-year PTR evaluation period is 4.0or higher (out of a maximum of 5.0); *and* |
| Service | The average service rating in the faculty member’s annual performance evaluations over the 5-year PTR evaluation period is between 3.0 and 3.999 inclusive (out of a maximum of 5.0). | The average service rating in the faculty member’s annual performance evaluations over the 5-year PTR evaluation period is 4.0or higher (out of a maximum of 5.0). |
|  | OR | OR |
| Overall | The average OVERALL RATING in the faculty member’s annual performance evaluations over the 5-year PTR evaluation period is between 3.0 and 3.999 inclusive (out of a maximum of 5.0). This overall rating takes into consideration the annual assignment weightings for each of the three areas. | The average OVERALL RATING in the faculty member’s annual performance evaluations over the 5-year PTR evaluation period is 4.0or higher (out of a maximum of 5.0). This overall rating takes into consideration the annual assignment weightings for each of the three areas. |

Approved by Management Faculty, November 16, 2023

**Marketing**

**Post-Tenure Review Criteria for Marketing Department**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Category** | **Meets Expectations** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| Research | The average research rating in the faculty member’s annual performance evaluations over the 5-year PTR evaluation period is between 3.0 and 3.999 inclusive (out of a maximum of 5.0); *or* a*t* least 2 peer-reviewed articles published over the past 5 years (for calculation purposes, this will be counted as 3.0). Whatever number is greater. *and* | The average research rating in the faculty member’s annual performance evaluations over the 5-year PTR evaluation period is 4.0or higher (out of a maximum of 5.0); *or* a*t* least 3 *publications in AJG 3-rated journals or equivalent over the past 5-years; One publication in AJG 4-rated journals and two others over the past 5-years; One publication in FT50 list or AJG 4\*-rated journal over the past 5-years.* (for calculation purposes, this will be counted as 4.0). But, whatever number is greater. *and* |
| Teaching | The average teaching rating in the faculty member’s annual performance evaluations over the 5-year PTR evaluation period is between 3.0 and 3.999 inclusive (out of a maximum of 5.0); *and* | The average teaching rating in the faculty member’s annual performance evaluations over the 5-year PTR evaluation period is 4.0or higher (out of a maximum of 5.0); *and* |
| Service | The average service rating in the faculty member’s annual performance evaluations over the 5-year PTR evaluation period is between 3.0 and 3.999 inclusive (out of a maximum of 5.0). | The average service rating in the faculty member’s annual performance evaluations over the 5-year PTR evaluation period is 4.0or higher (out of a maximum of 5.0). |
|  | OR | OR |
| Overall | The average OVERALL RATING in the faculty member’s annual performance evaluations over the 5-year PTR evaluation period is between 3.0 and 3.999 inclusive (out of a maximum of 5.0). This overall rating takes into consideration the annual assignment weightings for each of the three areas. | The average OVERALL RATING in the faculty member’s annual performance evaluations over the 5-year PTR evaluation period is 4.0or higher (out of a maximum of 5.0). This overall rating takes into consideration the annual assignment weightings for each of the three areas. |