Full-Time Lecturer Appointment, Review, Reappointment and Promotion Criteria

Preamble

As stated in the Section 24-34 of the Faculty Code, lecturer-track appointments are instructional titles. (See Appendix A for relevant excerpts from the Faculty Code.) Full-time faculty members who are appointed to the lecturer track engage primarily in teaching and service to the University and the public. Lecturer track faculty members need to teach multiple sections of different courses with different preparations and are expected to be the standard bearers of teaching excellence in the School and the University.

The School of Business recognizes that lecturer-track faculty members are critical to the accomplishment of our mission and goals. When a new faculty line becomes available, a decision should be made concerning whether the School of Business would be better enabled to fulfill its mission by filling the position with a tenure-track or lecturer-track faculty member. The primary distinction is that lecturer-track faculty are expected to teach whereas tenure-track faculty are expected to teach and conduct research.

We believe that in different areas, need for lecturer track faculty will be different and the faculty in the area should be the principal judge of how best to deploy the lecturer track faculty resources subject to the overall budget guidance of the University and the school. However, regardless of area, it is desired that lecturer track faculty would pursue and contribute primarily to the teaching mission of the school and with sustained developmental efforts, achieve excellence in due course in that dimension.

It is with these considerations in mind that the School of Business establishes these criteria for appointment, review, reappointment, and promotion of lecturer-track faculty.

To assist in fulfilling these duties, the Dean of the School of Business has established a Lecturer Personnel Committee, which is charged as follows:

The Lecturer Personnel Committee will review the performance of full-time, lecturer-track faculty on an annual basis. The committee will also make recommendations on the reappointment of full-time, lecturer-track faculty with a report.

For promotion to Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer, a committee will be established in accordance with the Guidelines on Non-Mandatory Promotions (see Appendix B). The committee will consist of at least one lecturer-track faculty member who is senior in title to the faculty member who is being considered for promotion.

Appointment

Appointments to the lecturer-track are subject to the general University requirements as specified in the Faculty Code (Section 24-34 B: Qualification for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles:

1. Lecturer and artist in residence are *instructional* titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24–53.

2. Senior lecturer and senior artist in residence are *instructional* titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles and who have extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24–53.
3. Principal lecturer is an *instructional* title that may be conferred on persons whose excellence in instruction is recognized through appropriate awards, distinctions, or major contributions to their field. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24–53.

For additional details regarding lecturer-track faculty appointments, see Appendix A: Excepted Sections from Chapter 24 of the Faculty Code Regarding Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members.

Note that Principal Lecturer is a promotional title only; initial appointment may not be made to this title.

The School of Business also adheres to the Provost’s Guidelines for the Appointment of Full-time Lecturers including:

1. New Hires are generally selected using a competitive recruitment process appropriate for the position.
2. Appointment terms for competitively recruited full-time lecturers are annual or multiple year.
3. Positions appointed on an annual basis should be reviewed for the potential of multiple year appointments after three years.

See Appendix C for the complete guidelines.

To be appointed to the lecture-track faculty, a candidate must have demonstrable competence and interest in teaching and an ability to teach multiple sections of variety of courses with multiple preparations. It is expected that the candidate would have been appointed at a similar institution of higher education and has a Professionally Qualified (PQ) or an Academically Qualified (AQ) status. A faculty member is considered PQ if he or she holds at least a master’s degree and/or a Professional certification (such as CPA) in a field related to teaching responsibilities and has either (a) been employed full-time or part-time within the past five years in a professional capacity (including consulting) that relates to teaching responsibilities, OR (b) engaged in significant professional development efforts such as attainment of professional certifications and attendance at conferences, workshops, or training sessions on an ongoing basis, as detailed in the later section. The requirement for achieving the AQ status is no different from that of a tenure track faculty, who are expected to conduct research and in the process, achieve and maintain an AQ status.

A candidate who does not hold an advanced degree can, in exceptional circumstances, be considered professionally qualified if he or she has extensive professional experience at an executive level.

### Review and Reappointment

#### Annual Review

Each faculty member will provide an annual report outlining accomplishments in accordance with Section 24-55 B of the Faculty Code. A suggested template for this report is shown in Appendix D. This report will be used for the annual merit review to be made by Lecturer Personnel Committee. If a lecturer-track faculty member was hired or reappointed with AQ status, he or she may choose to continue to maintain AQ status as specified in the terms of his or her appointment contract. Alternatively, at the time of reappointment he or she may choose to pursue PQ status.

As part of the annual review process, the Lecturer Personnel Committee shall explicitly rule on whether the lecturer-track faculty member retains his or her AQ or PQ status. A five-year rolling timeframe will be used, and during the five-year period, the faculty member must have at least two professional contributions, four validating experiences, or a combination of one professional contribution and two validating experiences.
The University faculty is committed to the full range of academic responsibilities: scholarship and research, teaching, and service. Individual faculty will, in the ordinary course of their development, determine the weight of these various commitments, and adjust them from time to time during their careers, in response to their individual, professional development and the changing needs of their profession, their programs, departments, schools and colleges, and the University” (Faculty Code, Section 24-32). Therefore, the following criteria will be used in the annual review of lecturer-track faculty:

1. Teaching
2. Scholarship
3. Service

See Section 24-32, subsections A through F in Appendix A for representative contributions of faculty in each of these areas. The weight that each of these factors will receive will be determined in regular conference with faculty as specified in the Faculty Code (Section 24-57 C). This conference will be held with the faculty member and the Associate Dean for Research and Faculty affairs annually for lecturers, at least every two years for senior lecturers, and at least every three years for principal lecturers.

Lecturer rank faculty members are expected to acquire and maintain their PQ or AQ status. PQ status is acquired and maintained by making professional contributions or validating experiences. The Business School supports PQ faculty in their efforts to do so. The School does not provide support for acquiring and maintaining AQ status. AQ is a by-product of research activity and publication which the School supports where appropriate.

Professional contributions indicating scholarship include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Publication of a trade or practitioner journal article
- Publication of a textbook or textbook supplement
- Publication of a popular press book or monograph relevant to management practices
- Publication of a teaching case or teaching note
- Program design and management of an executive education program
- Curriculum design for professional organizations and professional continuing education
- Consulting assignments that lead to a professional report

Validating experiences include:

- Organizing a professional conference
- Presentation at a professional conference
- Active professional certification
- Session chair, panel member or discussant at a professional conference
- Teaching an executive education class
- Involvement at a regional or national level for an academic honor society for students (such as Beta Alpha Psi)
- Serving on a board of directors
- Serving as an expert witness

The current guidelines for faculty management specifying AQ and PQ criteria are contained in Appendix E, which is excerpted from our Maintenance Review Application and Report to AACSB. The list above is more inclusive and supersedes the list shown in Appendix E. For the AACSB review in 2015-2016, we will be assessed under Standard 10 of the Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation as revised on January 31, 2012. Standard 10 is shown in Appendix F.
Teaching

As stated in the Section 24-32 C of the Faculty Code, “The scope of faculty teaching is broader than conventional classroom instruction; it comprises a variety of teaching formats and media, including undergraduate and graduate instruction for matriculated students, and special training or educational outreach.”

Criteria enumerated in the Faculty Code by which teaching effectiveness will be evaluated include:

- The ability to organize and conduct a course of study appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;
- The consistency with which the teacher brings to the students the latest research findings and professional debates within the discipline;
- The ability to stimulate intellectual inquiry so that students develop the skills to examine and evaluate ideas and arguments;
- The extent to which the teacher encourages discussion and debate which enables the students to articulate the ideas they are exploring;
- The degree to which teaching strategies that encourage the educational advancement of students from all backgrounds and life experiences are utilized;
- The availability of the teacher to the student beyond the classroom environment; and
- The regularity with which the teacher examines or reexamines the organization and readings for a course of study and explores new approaches to effective educational methods.

The standardized assessment for course evaluation by students shall be used for obtaining student evaluations of teaching effectiveness. The School of Business requires that these evaluations be completed for each course that is taught by the lecturer-track faculty member.

In addition, full-time lecturer-track faculty will receive a periodic collegial evaluation of teaching effectiveness as specified in Section 24-57 A of the Faculty Code. As stated in the code, “the collegial evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted prior to recommending any renewal of appointment or promotion of a faculty member.” In addition, for faculty with the instructional title of lecturer the collegial evaluation shall be conducted every year. For other faculty with the instructional title of senior lecturer or principal lecturer the collegial evaluation shall be conducted at least every three years. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to organize such a peer evaluation in a timely manner.

Notes

A structure for peer evaluation will be developed.

Scholarship

“The creative function of a university requires faculty devoted to inquiry and research, whose attainment may be in the realm of scholarly investigation, in constructive contributions in professional fields, or in the creative arts” (Faculty Code, Section 24-32, B). The School of Business evaluates scholarship of lecturer-track faculty primarily on the basis of the criteria we have established for faculty to be Professionally Qualified. These criteria emphasize contributions to practice and are specified above. Other evidence of scholarship includes research on learning and pedagogy and contributions to interdisciplinary teaching. As with any evaluation for promotion, the extent, variety and the quality of contribution will be the basis for any promotion decision. Academic research, though not required, will be considered as additional evidence of scholarship based on its quality and relevance to the school’s mission.

Service

The University encourages all members of the faculty to engage in public service. As stated in the Faculty Code, professional and scholarly service includes service to business and industry and other organizations. Also to be
considered is service to the School of Business and to the University including serving on and chairing committees, recruiting and mentoring faculty, and engaging in other administrative work.

Competence in teaching generally will be deemed of greatest importance in judging a lecturer-track faculty member’s qualifications.

**Documentation**

The following documentation should be provided in the dossier for reappointments:

- Curriculum Vita
- Statement of teaching philosophy
- Statement of scholarship
- Statement of service
- List of courses taught during the current period of appointment
- Sample syllabi, exams and assignments
- Examples of innovative pedagogy including sample activities, exercises, assignments and/or exams
- Instructor evaluations of all courses for the current period of appointment
- Peer evaluation of teaching, at least one per year of service
- Annual Report(s) for current period of appointment

Level of detail of documentation will be based on length of appointment and rank. The faculty member may include other documentation that demonstrates performance on the criteria enumerated above.

This documentation will be reviewed by the Lecturer Personnel Committee, which will develop a report containing a recommendation to the faculty of the School of Business regarding reappointment. The report should be addressed to the Dean and remain separate from the dossier. The dossier and report will be available electronically with site access only to those members who will vote on the reappointment.

**Promotion**

In accordance with the Faculty Code Section 24-54 and the Guidelines on Non-Mandatory Promotions (see Appendix B), the promotion process for lecturer-track faculty members begins with the faculty member notifying the Business School dean of desire to be considered for promotion.

Although the Faculty Code allows faculty to initiate a non-mandatory promotion review, generally, the level of accomplishment that we expect for promotion is unlikely to be accomplished unless the individual is in the position for a significant amount of time. Also, significant evidence must be displayed for reconsideration. It is unlikely that such evidence can be compiled within a short period of time. Generally, it would be expected that the faculty member will have served for at least five years in one position prior to promotion, and if promotion is denied, two additional years would generally elapse before reconsideration.

**Senior Lecturer**

The following criteria shall be used in consideration for promotion of Lecturer to Senior Lecturer:

- Consistent evidence of teaching effectiveness as documented by peer and student evaluations
- Evidence of teaching excellence as evidenced by teaching award, special honor, etc.
- Consistent maintenance of PQ status without break or AQ status without break if appropriate
- Teach a broad portfolio of courses and the ability to successfully handle different pedagogy as appropriate
- Service to the Business School and University
- External relations and support to the Business Partners and the Business Community
- Instructional/school leadership
- Extra-curricular student-facing activities (e.g., club advisor)
- Evidence of teaching scholarship
Candidates are encouraged to obtain letters from faculty colleagues to provide additional evidence of accomplishments.

**Principal Lecturer**

In addition to performing at a high level as a Senior Lecturer and fulfilling all the conditions of a successful Senior Lecturer, the following criteria shall be used in consideration for promotion of Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer:

- Exemplary teaching at graduate and undergraduate level
- Consistent evidence of teaching excellence
- Instructional innovations
- Teaching scholarship
- Curriculum development
- Program development such as executive development and conference development
- Teaching-related community service such as class service work within a local organization
- Activity that enhances the reputation of Business School within the community
- Known beyond boundaries of the School of Business and the University of Washington Bothell
- Conducts peer evaluation of lecturer-track faculty
- Repository of teaching excellence
- Recruitment, retention and mentoring of faculty
- Consistent maintenance of PQ status without break or AQ status without break if appropriate

For promotion to Principal Lecturer, review by faculty from outside the University of Washington campus system is required.
Appendix A::
Excepted Sections from Chapter 24 of the Faculty Code Regarding Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members

Section 24–31 General Appointment Policy

The principal functions of a university are to preserve, to increase, and to transmit knowledge. Its chief instrument for performing these functions is its faculty, and its success in doing so depends largely on the quality of its faculty. The policy of this University should be to enlist and retain distinguished faculty members with outstanding qualifications.

Section 24–32 Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members

The University faculty is committed to the full range of academic responsibilities: scholarship and research, teaching, and service. Individual faculty will, in the ordinary course of their development, determine the weight of these various commitments, and adjust them from time to time during their careers, in response to their individual, professional development and the changing needs of their profession, their programs, departments, schools and colleges, and the University. Such versatility and flexibility are hallmarks of respected institutions of higher education because they are conducive to establishing and maintaining the excellence of a university and to fulfilling the educational and social role of the institution. In accord with the University's expressed commitment to excellence and equity, contributions in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that address diversity and equal opportunity may be included among the professional and scholarly qualifications for appointment and promotion outlined below.

A. Scholarship, the essence of effective teaching and research, is the obligation of all members of the faculty. The scholarship of faculty members may be judged by the character of their advanced degrees and by their contribution to knowledge in the form of publication and instruction; it is reflected not only in their reputation among other scholars and professionals but in the performance of their students.

B. The creative function of a university requires faculty devoted to inquiry and research, whose attainment may be in the realm of scholarly investigation, in constructive contributions in professional fields, or in the creative arts, such as musical composition, creative writing, or original design in engineering or architecture. For each of these realms, contributions that address diversity and equal opportunity may be included. While numbers (publications, grant dollars, students) provide some measure of such accomplishment, more important is the quality of the faculty member's published or other creative work.
Important elements in evaluating the scholarly ability and attainments of faculty members include the range and variety of their intellectual interests; the receipt of grants, awards, and fellowships; the professional and/or public impact of their work; and their success in directing productive work by advanced students and in training graduate and professional students in scholarly methods. Other important elements of scholarly achievement include involvement in and contributions to interdisciplinary research and teaching; participation and leadership in professional associations and in the editing of professional journals; the judgment of professional colleagues; and membership on boards and committees. In all these, contributions that address diversity and equal opportunity may be included.

C. The scope of faculty teaching is broader than conventional classroom instruction; it comprises a variety of teaching formats and media, including undergraduate and graduate instruction for matriculated students, and special training or educational outreach. The educational function of a university requires faculty who can teach effectively. Instruction must be judged according to its essential purposes and the conditions which they impose. Some elements in assessing effective teaching include:

- The ability to organize and conduct a course of study appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;
- The consistency with which the teacher brings to the students the latest research findings and professional debates within the discipline;
- The ability to stimulate intellectual inquiry so that students develop the skills to examine and evaluate ideas and arguments;
- The extent to which the teacher encourages discussion and debate which enables the students to articulate the ideas they are exploring;
- The degree to which teaching strategies that encourage the educational advancement of students from all backgrounds and life experiences are utilized;
- The availability of the teacher to the student beyond the classroom environment; and
- The regularity with which the teacher examines or reexamines the organization and readings for a course of study and explores new approaches to effective educational methods.
A major activity related to teaching is the instructor's participation in academic advising and counseling, whether this takes the form of assisting students to select courses or discussing the students' long-range goals. The assessment of teaching effectiveness shall include student and faculty evaluation. Where possible, measures of student achievements in terms of their academic and professional careers, life skills, and citizenship should be considered.

D. Contributions to a profession through published discussion of methods or through public demonstration of an achieved skill should be recognized as furthering the University's educational function. Included among these contributions are professional service activities that address the professional advancement of individuals from underrepresented groups from the faculty member's field.

E. The University encourages faculty participation in public service. Such professional and scholarly service to schools, business and industry, and local, state, national, and international organizations is an integral part of the University's mission. Of similar importance to the University is faculty participation in University committee work and other administrative tasks and clinical duties, including the faculty member's involvement in the recruitment, retention, and mentoring of scholars and students in an effort to promote diversity and equal opportunity. Both types of service make an important contribution and should be included in the individual faculty profile.

F. Competence in professional service to the University and the public should be considered in judging a faculty member's qualifications, but except in unusual circumstances skill in instruction and research should be deemed of greater importance.

Section 24–34 Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles

B. Qualifications for Appointments with Specific Titles

1. Lecturer and artist in residence are *instructional* titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24–53.

2. Senior lecturer and senior artist in residence are *instructional* titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles and who have extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24–53.
3. Principal lecturer is an *instructional* title that may be conferred on persons whose excellence in instruction is recognized through appropriate awards, distinctions, or major contributions to their field. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24–53.

Section 24–41  Duration of Nontenure Appointments

B. Lecturer and Artist in Residence

1. Appointment as a full–time lecturer or artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years.

The normal appointment period of a part-time lecturer or artist in residence shall be for one year or less with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

2. Appointment as a full–time senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years. The normal appointment period of senior and principal lecturers shall be for a minimum of three years with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

The normal appointment period of a part-time senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence shall be for one year or less with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

3. Except as provided in Subsection B.4 below, at least six months (or three months in the case of an initial annual appointment) before the expiration date of an appointment of a full–time lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence, the dean shall determine, pursuant to Section 24–53, whether this appointment shall be renewed and shall inform the faculty member in writing of the decision.

4. A renewal decision in accord with Subsection B.3 above is not required where an initial appointment of a full–time lecturer, artist in residence, senior artist in residence, senior lecturer, or principal lecturer is for one year or less and the appointment is identified at the time of appointment as not eligible for renewal.

5. Part–time appointments as lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, and senior artist in residence are for the period stated in the letter of appointment. If such appointments are to be renewed the procedures in Section 24–53 shall be followed in a timely manner with knowledge of funding availability and staffing needs.
C. A full–time lecturer, artist in residence, or senior lecturer may, prior to expiration of an existing appointment, be considered for appointment as, or promotion to, a senior lecturer, senior artist in residence, or principal lecturer, respectively.

Section 24–50   Conflict of Interest

The procedures set forth in this chapter shall apply in all cases, except that no faculty member, department chair, dean or other administrative officer shall vote, make recommendations, or in any other way participate in the decision of any matter which may directly affect the appointment, tenure, promotion or other status or interest of such person's parent, child, spouse, sibling, or in–law. [See also Executive Order No. 32.]

Section 24–51   Responsibility for Appointments

A. The President and the appropriate college or school faculty share responsibility for recommending faculty appointments to the Regents. Full and discriminating consideration by that faculty of the scholarly and professional character and qualifications of a proposed appointee is essential in an effective appointment procedure.

B. The appropriate faculty, therefore, shall carefully judge the scholarly and professional character and qualifications of a prospective appointee, shall determine from all available evidence his or her suitability for employment, and shall provide the Regents, through the President, with the information needed for a wise decision.

Section 13–31, April 16, 1956; S–A 83, April 30, 1991: both with Presidential approval.

Section 24–52   Procedure for New Appointments

A. Faculty recommendations of appointments are ordinarily rendered through committees, and the procedure depends upon the level of appointment.

   1. For recommendation of a departmental appointment other than that of chair, the department members act as an advisory appointment committee. A department may delegate this responsibility to a departmental committee.
B. The duty of an appointment committee is to search for suitable candidates, to study and determine their qualifications (Sections 24–32 to 24–36), and to obtain and evaluate all data related to the problem of appointment. When, after such a study, the committee finds a candidate or candidates who appear to be qualified it shall transmit its information and recommendation to:

1. The department chair, if the appointment is to be a departmental one other than that of chair, or

C. In making new appointments administrative officers shall act in the manner prescribed below.

1. If the appointment is to be a departmental one other than that of chair, the chair shall submit all available information concerning candidates suggested by the department, the chair, or the dean to the voting members of the department faculty. The voting faculty of an academic unit may, by majority vote, delegate authority to recommend the appointment of affiliate or clinical faculty, research associates, or annual or quarterly part-time lecturers to an elected committee of its voting faculty. In an undepartmentalized college or school, this delegation may be made to an elected committee of its voting faculty. The delegation shall expire one calendar year after it is made.

Recommendations in favor of appointment, based on a majority vote of the voting members of the faculty or of the elected committee with delegated authority, shall be sent with pertinent information to the appropriate dean. If the chair concurs in the department recommendation, the dean shall make a decision concerning the appointment and, if it is favorable, shall transmit it together with the vote of the department and the recommendation of the chair to the President. In the unusual case where the chair does not concur in the department recommendation, he or she may communicate objections to the dean and may also submit a separate recommendation to the dean from among the candidates who have been considered by the department. If the dean concurs in the chair's recommendation, or has additional information
which raises doubts concerning the department's recommendation, or finds that the President has such information, the dean shall refer the matter again to the department along with an explanation and comments. After considering the evidence, the department may then either reaffirm its original recommendation, or transmit a new one. After the department's final recommendation has been sent to the dean, the dean shall make a decision concerning the appointment and, if an appointment is to be recommended, shall transmit it together with the final recommendation of the department and the recommendation of the chair to the President.

Section 24–53   Procedure for Renewal of Appointments

When it is time to decide upon renewal of a nontenure appointment to the faculty (Section 24–41), the procedure described below shall be followed.

A. The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank or title to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend renewal or termination of the appointment. Research faculty shall be considered by voting faculty who are superior in rank to the person under consideration, except that the voting faculty at rank of professor shall consider whether to recommend renewal or non-renewal of the appointment of a research professor. Faculty with instructional titles outlined in Section 24–34, Subsection B shall be considered by voting faculty who hold a professorial rank or instructional title superior to the person under consideration. The voting faculty of an academic unit may, by majority vote, delegate authority to recommend the renewal of affiliate or clinical faculty, research associate, or annual or quarterly part-time lecturer appointments to an elected committee of its voting faculty. In an undepartmentalized college or school, this delegation may be made to an elected committee of its voting faculty. The delegation:

1. Does not alter faculty rank requirements for considering appointment renewals, and

2. Shall expire one calendar year after it is made.

B. If this recommendation is a departmental one, the chair shall transmit it to the dean. If the chair does not concur in the recommendation he or she may also submit a separate recommendation.

C. The dean shall decide the matter within the time prescribed in Section 24–41 and inform the faculty member concerned of the decision.
D. If a faculty member requests a written statement of the reasons for the non–
renewal of his or her appointment, the dean shall supply such a written
statement within 30 days.

Section 24–54 Procedure for Promotions

Annually, all eligible members of the faculty shall be informed of the opportunity to
be considered for promotion by their department chair (or chair's designee or the
dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee). At the
request of the faculty member, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, a
promotion review shall be conducted following the procedure below.

A. The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized
college or school) who are superior in academic rank or title to the person
under consideration shall decide whether to recommend the promotion.
Research faculty shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate
department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are superior in
academic rank to the person under consideration. Faculty with instructional
titles outlined in Section 24-34 Subsection B shall be considered by voting
members of the appropriate department or undepartmentalized college or
school who hold an eligible professorial appointment or an instructional title
superior to that of the candidate being considered. In this decision they shall
take into account the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24–32, 24–33, 24–
34, and 24–35 for the various academic ranks and titles. Promotion shall be
based upon the attainment of these qualifications and not upon length of
service. In arriving at recommendations for promotion, faculty, chairs, and
deans shall consider the whole record of candidates' qualifications described in
Section 24–32.

B. The record of the candidate being considered for promotion shall be assembled
following the guidelines of the candidate's college and unit. The candidate is
responsible for assembling the promotion record, which shall include a self–
assessment of the candidate's qualifications for promotion. External letters of
review shall be kept confidential from the candidate.

For departments (or college/school if undepartmentalized) where an initial
report and/or recommendation on the qualifications of the candidate for
promotion is produced by a subcommittee of the faculty senior in rank and title,
the report shall be written. The department chair (or chair's designee or the
dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee) shall
provide the candidate with a written summary of the committee's report and
recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be
omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate's summary. The
candidate may respond in writing within seven calendar days. The chair or dean shall forward the candidate's response, if any, together with the committee's report to the voting faculty.

The voting faculty of the candidate's department (or college/school if undepartmentalized) superior in rank and title to the candidate shall then meet to discuss the candidate's record. A vote on the promotion question shall occur following the discussion.

The department chair (or the chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college or the dean's designee) shall write a formal report of these proceedings for the candidate, summarizing the discussion and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. The candidate may then respond in writing to the department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) within seven calendar days.

If the faculty recommendation is a departmental one, and is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, or if the candidate has written a response to the departmental vote, the chair shall transmit all documents produced in this promotion process to the appropriate dean, with his or her independent analysis and recommendation. The chair may, at his or her discretion, share the chair's recommendations with the candidate.

C. The dean shall be advised by a committee or council of the college or school. This advisory group, elected by the faculty of the college or school, shall consider each case presented to it and submit its recommendations with reasons therefor to the dean. If the recommendation of the committee or council is not favorable, or if it conflicts with the faculty vote, then the council or committee recommendation with reasons therefor shall be provided to the candidate. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. In a departmentalized school or college, when a candidate for promotion is under consideration, any member of the committee or council who is also a member of the candidate's department may be excused.

D. After receiving the recommendation of this committee or council the dean shall decide the matter.

Prior to the issuance of a decision or recommendation by the dean that is not favorable, the dean shall provide the candidate with his or her initial recommendation and reasons therefor. In such cases, the dean or the dean's designee shall then discuss the case with the candidate. The candidate may then respond in writing to the dean within seven calendar days of the
discussion.

If the recommendation of the dean is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, the dean shall transmit his or her recommendation and the candidate's response, if it exists, to the candidate and to the Provost. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the report to the candidate.

If the promotion decision of the dean is not favorable and not mandatory, and the candidate has written a response to the dean, the dean shall transmit his or her decision and the candidate's response to the Provost for information purposes.

E. After the case is decided, the dean shall ensure that the candidate is informed in writing in a timely way of the result of the case and, if the result is not favorable, the reasons therefor.

Section 24–55 Procedure for Salary Increases Based Upon Merit

Faculty at the University of Washington shall be reviewed annually by their colleagues, according to the procedures detailed in this section, to evaluate their merit and to arrive at a recommendation for an appropriate merit salary increase. Such reviews shall consider the faculty member's cumulative record, including contributions to research/scholarship, teaching, and service, and their impact on the department, school/college, University, and appropriate regional, national, and international communities.

The evaluation of a faculty member's merit and salary shall be arrived at after review of the individual's performance in relation to that of their colleagues and by comparison of individuals' present salaries to those of their peers. In evaluating a faculty member's eligibility for merit–based salary increases (Section 24–70, Subsections B.1 and B.4; Section 24–71, Subsections A.1 and B.1) and for "market gap" salary increases (Section 24–71, Subsection B.2), the following procedure shall be followed.

A. In arriving at their recommendations for salary decisions the appropriate faculty, department (unit) chairs, and deans shall each consider the following:

1. The cumulative record of the candidate, taking into account the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24–32, 24–33, 24–34, and 24–35 for the various academic ranks and titles;

2. The candidate's current salary;
3. Documentation of the review conference required by Section 24–57, Subsection D; and

4. Any documents produced under Subsection H of this section.

Salary recommendations shall seek to minimize salary inequities. Salary compression and other inequities, including those resulting from variations in the level of merit funds available over time, may be considered in making merit salary recommendations.

B. The merit and salary of each faculty member below the rank and title of professor shall be considered by the voting members of the department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are his or her superiors in academic rank and title, and they shall recommend any salary increase which they deem merited.

C. The chair of a department, or the dean of an undepartmentalized school/college, shall consider the merit and salary of each full professor in his or her unit. Before forwarding his or her recommendations the chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school/college) shall seek the advice of the full professors according to a procedure approved by the voting members of the unit.

D. If the recommendation is a departmental one, the chair shall transmit it to the dean with any supporting data the dean may request. If the chair does not concur in the recommendations he or she may also submit a separate recommendation.

E. The dean shall review the department's recommendation and forward his or her recommendation regarding faculty merit and salary to the President.

F. The dean of each college/school shall review the record and salary of the chair of each department and shall recommend an appropriate salary increase to the President.

G. The President shall authorize the salary increases of the faculty, and of each dean.

H. At the option of the faculty member affected, and mandatorily in the event of two consecutive annual ratings of no merit (as a result of reviews under this section), the chair of the faculty member's department (or dean of an undepartmentalized school or college) shall, after consultation with the faculty member, appoint an ad hoc committee of department (or school/college) faculty superior (or, in the case of full professors, equal) in rank or title to the
faculty member. This committee shall meet at its earliest convenience with the faculty member and review more fully the record and merit of that faculty member.

The committee shall, upon completion of its review, report in writing the results to the faculty member and to his or her department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school/college) and the committee shall advise them what actions, if any, should be undertaken to enhance the contributions and improve the merit ranking of this colleague, or to rectify existing misjudgments of his or her merit and make adjustments to correct any salary inequity. The faculty member may respond in writing to this report and advice within 21 calendar days to the department chair (or dean) and committee (unless upon the faculty member's request and for good cause the response period is extended by the chair or dean). The committee's report and advice, the faculty member's written response (if any), the response by the chair, and any agreement reached by the faculty member and the chair shall be incorporated into a written report.

Section 24–57  Procedural Safeguards for Promotion, Merit–Based Salary, and Tenure Considerations

All procedures regarding promotion, merit–based salary, and tenure considerations outlined in the relevant sections of the Faculty Code must be followed. Open communication among faculty, and between faculty and administration, must be maintained in order to insure informed decision making, to protect the rights of the individual and to aid the faculty in the development of their professional and scholarly careers.

Each faculty member must be allowed to pursue those areas of inquiry which are of personal scholarly interest; at the same time, however, each faculty member must be informed of the expectations a department holds for him or her and of the manner in which his or her activities contribute to the current and future goals of the department, school, college, and University. In order to enable the faculty member to establish priorities in the overall effort of professional career development and to fulfill the University's obligations of fair appraisal and continual monitoring of faculty development, the following procedural safeguards shall be adopted in each department, school, or college.

A.  Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

To implement the provision stipulated in Section 24–32, Subsection C, the standardized student assessment of teaching procedure which the University makes available may be used for obtaining student evaluation of teaching
effectiveness, unless the college, school, or department has adopted an alternate procedure for student evaluation, in which case the latter may be used. Each faculty member shall have at least one course evaluated by students in any academic year during which that member teaches one or more courses. The teaching effectiveness of each faculty member also shall be evaluated by colleagues using procedures adopted within the appropriate department, school, or college.

The collegial evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted prior to recommending any renewal of appointment or promotion of a faculty member. In addition, for faculty at the rank of assistant professor, or associate professor or professor "without tenure" under Chapter 25, Section 25-32, Subsection D, or with the instructional title of lecturer the collegial evaluation shall be conducted every year. For other faculty at the rank of associate professor or professor or with the instructional title of senior lecturer or principal lecturer the collegial evaluation shall be conducted at least every three years. A written report of this evaluation shall be maintained and shared with the faculty member.

B. Yearly Activity Report

Each department (or undepartmentalized college) shall adopt a suggested format by which each faculty member will have the opportunity to provide information on professional activities carried out during the prior year. These reports shall be prepared in writing by each faculty member and submitted to the chair (or dean) in a timely fashion each year, and shall be used as reference and as a source of information for consideration of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. These forms shall be used as evidence for recommendations of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. Such information may be updated by a faculty member at any time during the academic year.

C. Regular Conference with Faculty

Each year the chair, or where appropriate the dean, or his or her designee, shall confer individually with all full-time lecturers, assistant professors, and associate professors and professors "without tenure" appointed under Chapter 25, Section 25-32, Subsection D. The chair (or dean or his or her designee) shall confer individually with the other associate professors and senior lecturers at least every two years, and with the other professors and principal lecturers at least every three years. The purpose of the regular conference is to help individual faculty members plan and document their career goals. While the documentation of those goals will be part of the faculty member's record for subsequent determinations of merit, the regular conference should be distinct from the merit review pursuant to Section 24–55.
At each such conference, the chair, dean, or his or her designee, and the faculty members shall discuss:

1. The department's present needs and goals with respect to the department's mission statement and the faculty member's present teaching, scholarly and service responsibilities and accomplishments;

2. Shared goals for the faculty member's teaching, scholarship and service in the forthcoming year (or years, as appropriate) in keeping with the department's needs and goals for the same period; and

3. A shared strategy for achieving those goals.

The chair, dean, or his or her designee and the faculty member shall discuss and identify any specific duties and responsibilities expected of, and resources available to, the faculty member during the coming year(s), taking into account the academic functions described in Section 24–32. The chair, dean or his or her designee should make specific suggestions, as necessary, to improve or aid the faculty member's work.

D. Documentation

The chair, dean, or his or her designee, shall, in a timely manner, document in writing, with a copy to the faculty member, that such conferences occurred, and shall list the subject matter discussed.

This conference document shall also articulate in sufficient detail the discussed commitments and responsibilities of the faculty member for the coming year(s) and how these commitments and responsibilities are consistent with institutional standards for promotion and tenure as defined in Chapter 24.

Should the faculty member not agree with the summary or statements in this conference document, he or she shall indicate so in writing. The failure of a faculty member to object in writing to the chair's (or dean's) conference document within ten days of receiving it (unless upon the faculty member's request and for good cause the period is extended by the chair or dean) shall constitute his or her official acceptance of its terms and conditions.

If the faculty member disagrees with the conference document, the chair (or dean) shall either withdraw it and issue a revised one to which both parties can agree, or reaffirm the accuracy of the original conference document.

In the event the faculty member disagrees with the resulting conference
document, the chair of the faculty member's department (or dean of an un–
departmentalized school or college) shall appoint an ad hoc committee
comprised of three department (or school/college) faculty superior (or in the
case of full professors, equal) in rank or title to the faculty member, or faculty
members from the Conciliation Board, and selected in the following manner.
The faculty member and the chair, or dean, shall each select one member of
the ad hoc committee and those two members shall select the third member. At
its earliest convenience, the ad hoc committee shall review fully the records
relating to the conference, meet with the faculty member, and meet with the
chair, dean, or his or her designee.

The chair, dean, or his or her designee, and the faculty member shall then
meet with the ad hoc committee to discuss the issues, with the purpose of
achieving a resolution. In the event resolution is not achieved, the committee
shall, in a timely manner, report in writing the results of its review to the
faculty member, to his or her department chair or dean, and to the designee, if
any. The committee's report and advice, if any; the faculty member's written
response, if any; the response by the chair, dean, or his or her designee, if
any; and any agreement between the faculty member and chair, dean, or his or
her designee shall be incorporated into a written report that shall be placed in
the faculty member's personnel file.

A faculty member's record upon the stated duties and responsibilities in the
conference document will be assessed in accordance with Section 24–55.
Nothing in this section is intended to alter the institutional standards for
promotion and tenure as defined in Chapter 24.

For complete policy see
http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html#Sec2453
University of Washington Bothell
PROMOTION & TENURE TIMELINE
2013-2014

Complete recommendations due to AHR by February 1.

NON-MANDATORY REVIEW: Associate Professor to Professor, Lecturer Full-Time
(competitive recruitment) to Senior Lecturer, Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer,
Awards of Tenure.

EARLY REVIEW (prior to mandatory review year): Assistant Professor to Associate
Professor with Tenure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ACTION/PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter Quarter</td>
<td>Notification from Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) to all faculty regarding mandatory and non-mandatory promotion review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter 2013</td>
<td>Faculty member notifies the school/program dean/director of desire to be considered for promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 29</td>
<td>School/Program dean/director and candidate meet to discuss process and procedures including potential committee membership. Candidate provides program director with a list of three to five qualified external reviewers (faculty from outside the University of Washington campus system) who may be selected to referee their materials and write letters to the review committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>School/Program dean/director selects review committee of senior faculty, informs candidate of committee member’s names and schedules the first meeting. Initial draft of promotion portfolio is completed and sent to committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3</td>
<td>First meeting of the review committee is held. The candidate may join the committee for a portion of the meeting to receive feedback regarding the portfolio. The overall review process is discussed and workload and timelines established. External reviewers are identified and a list of five individuals is sent to the program director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 17</td>
<td>School/Program dean/director solicits participation of external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31</td>
<td>Letters and review materials sent to external reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Quarter 2013</td>
<td>External reviews are completed and returned to the school/program dean/director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16</td>
<td>Candidate’s portfolio is finalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7</td>
<td>All final materials including the external review letters are sent to the candidate’s review committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 14</td>
<td>The committee’s review is completed and the committee chair writes a report of the review to the school/program dean/director. A written</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
summary of the report and the committee’s recommendation is provided by the school/program dean/director or designee to the candidate without names of external reviewers and vote counts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 28</td>
<td>The candidate acknowledges in writing within seven calendar days receipt of the report and may choose at that time to provide a written response to the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4</td>
<td>A copy of the candidate’s acknowledgement and/or response is included with the candidate’s portfolio for review by program faculty senior in rank and eligible to vote before the program discussion and promotion vote occurs. The eligible faculty meet to consider the candidate’s review committee’s recommendation and to vote. Following the program discussion and vote, the school/program dean/director or designee prepares a summary of the discussion and recommendation and provides this summary to the candidate without names and vote counts. <strong>Special Note:</strong> For programs lacking a sufficient number of full professors (a minimum of three) to conduct a review of an application for promotion to Full Professor, the UW Bothell Committee of the Full Professors is used. This committee is advisory to the program director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>The candidate acknowledges in writing within seven calendar days receipt of the reports and may choose at that time to provide a written response to the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2</td>
<td>The school/program dean/director writes a letter and an independent recommendation to the VCAA. The portfolio containing originals of all required elements is forwarded to the VCAA. The school/program dean/director provides the VCAA with access to the candidate’s electronic file and in turn the VCAA provides access to the Campus Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Winter Quarter 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 6</td>
<td>The Campus Council reviews the materials and submits a written review and recommendation to the VCAA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 13</td>
<td>The VCAA reviews the materials and consults with the Chancellor to determine a recommendation to the Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3</td>
<td>The original plus one copy of the portfolio is forwarded to the Provost’s Office. <strong>DUE DATE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provost Review/President’s Letter**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter Quarter</td>
<td>The Provost completes a review and forwards the final recommendation to the Board of Regents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter</td>
<td>Letter from the President confirming promotion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Salary and Title Adjustments for 2014-2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>Salary and title adjustments made effective for 12-month faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16</td>
<td>Salary and title adjustments made effective for 9-month faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Provost’s Guidelines for the Appointment of Full-time Lecturers

Provost’s Guidelines for the Appointment of Full-time Lecturers

Effective September 1, 2013

Revised on September 4, 2013

Recruitment and Selection

- New Hires are selected using a competitive recruitment process appropriate for the position.

The benefits of this recruitment and selection process are the option for multiple year appointments and opportunity for promotion. Limited exceptions to these guidelines for new hires are permitted in circumstances of short-term instructional needs and unanticipated, short-notice instructional needs. Hires under this limited exception are restricted to annual appointments for up to three consecutive years, with continued appointment beyond this period requiring submission of a request, with position justification, and approval from the Office of the Provost.

Appointment Term

- Appointment terms for competitively recruited full-time lecturers are annual or multiple year
- Positions appointed on an annual basis should be reviewed for the potential of multiple year appointments after three years.

- Best practice would generally include an appointment strategy that provides for a “terminal year” of appointment in the event of non-renewal. For example, a two year term with the renewal decision at the end of year one. This allows for planning by both the appointee and the appointing unit.

- At a minimum, the Faculty Code (Section 24-41 B) requires that there be a renewal decision at least six month (or three months in the case of an initial annual appointment) before the expiration date of an appointment.

**Promotion Consideration**

- Promotion criteria should be developed for competitively recruited lecturers.

- Discussion of promotion plans and progress should be held during regular conferences pursuant to the Faculty Code (Section 24-57 C).

**Annual Budget Meeting**

- Report on recruitment and appointment of lecturers.

Appendix D: Annual Evaluation Template

University of Washington Bothell
Business School Lecturer-Track Faculty
Annual Evaluation Template

Name

Teaching

Instructions: Please summarize your teaching activity and performance. Please include one sample syllabus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses Taught</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>Average of First Four Items From Teaching Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: BBUS 695</td>
<td>Winter 2013</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-Assessment Comments: (Include information about innovations, remarks about student ratings, student comments, and other responses, activities for self-improvement, etc. Attach brief supplementary materials, as needed, to illustrate any of your comments.)

Examples:
* Implemented web-based narrated lecture supplements in the winter quarter and these were well-received.
* Attended Harvard workshop on case teaching and have applied lessons learned there.

Scholarship

Instructions: To use this form, clear out examples and enter your own data within the table cells. Evaluations for 2013 will be based on your history of scholarly activities and outcomes from 2011, 2012 and 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Project/Paper</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>Activity in 2011</th>
<th>Activity in 2012</th>
<th>Activity in 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designed and organized UW Bothell Business</td>
<td>UWB hosted the First Annual Accounting Ethics Conference on November 15,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial planning of conference. Conducted</td>
<td>Responsible for all elements of conference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Accounting Ethics Conference

2013. The conference was attended by over 180 people needs surveys of several groups including faculty, students, and targeted attendees. including speaker acquisition, coordination of Beta Alpha Psi, faculty and administrators, advertising, and facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Development Instructor</th>
<th>Vertafore Technical Leadership Development Program</th>
<th>Instructor for 8-hour module on Operations and Software Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Note:** Items indicating scholarship include professional contributions and validating experiences for maintenance of PQ status. See Lecturer Appointment, Review, and Promotion Criteria for further details.

**Self-Assessment Comments About Scholarship:** (Include remarks, if needed, related to long- and short-term strategies and continuous improvement activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Name of Activity (ies)</th>
<th>Brief Description of Your Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to the Profession (include activities with professional organizations, talks to local organizations, etc..)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Benefiting UWB and/or the Business School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEFINITIONS Academically Qualified Faculty

A faculty member is deemed to be academically qualified if one or more items below are satisfied in the past five years unless otherwise specified:

1. Has received a PhD, DBA or equivalent from an accredited university or equivalent degree-granting institution. Has attained ABD status in the past three years. “Individuals with a graduate degree in law will be considered academically qualified to teach business law and legal environment of business.” (pg. 44, AACSB standards)

2. Publication output and validating experiences
   b. Has published three papers in peer-reviewed journals and has one validating experience.
   c. Has published two papers in peer-reviewed journals and two validating experiences.
   d. Has published one paper in peer-reviewed journal and three validating experiences.

3. Has served as editor-in-chief of a top-tier peer-reviewed journal.

4. Has published a textbook supporting a regular course in our curriculum.

Validating experience list-
   b. Presented peer-reviewed paper at an academic conference.
   c. Served as formal discussant as part of a paper session or symposia at a major academic conference (e.g., American Marketing Association, AoM).
   d. Served as editor of a peer-reviewed journal issue.
   e. Served as an associate editor or editorial board member of a peer-reviewed journal.
   f. Served as reviewer for a peer-reviewed journal.
   g. Served as program chair for a major national conference.
   h. Taught doctoral seminars.
   i. Served as a member or chair of a UW dissertation committee.
   j. Participated in specialized pedagogical workshops.
AQ ADMINISTRATION

Associate/Full Professor Teaching Load Policy This policy will go into effect right away and is forward-looking.

It is the expectation of the UW Bothell School of Business that every Associate and Full Professor shall be Academically Qualified. If an Associate/Full Professor does not meet the criteria for AQ that is a serious matter that requires immediate attention from an accreditation standpoint.

The senior personnel committee will be required to rule on who is AQ and who is not. This determination is made in Spring quarter. The performance in the last year is considered. Publications are considered over a three-year window.

If a faculty member loses his/her AQ status in the spring quarter of AY 0, teaching load is unchanged for the next AY and one more year. In year 3, it goes up to six courses and stays there for three more years. Year 6 onwards, the load goes to seven and stays there forever. This table depicts this-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring, Year 0</th>
<th>AQ determined to be lost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 1/2</td>
<td>Five courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 3/4/5</td>
<td>Six courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 6+</td>
<td>Seven courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year 0 is set as 2012 for implementation. If a faculty person gets his/her AQ status renewed in AY 0 (on the research front, acceptance of paper is sufficient), that is reflected in the Spring term in the senior personnel committee report. The faculty person gets back to a five course teaching load the next AY (i.e., AY 1).

Senior faculty participating in Dean, Assistant/Associate Vice Chancellor, Vice Chancellor or Chancellor roles receive a three year window where course-load will not go up.

Non-AQ faculty will not be eligible for summer research support.

If a senior faculty member loses AQ status, s/he must prepare a plan to regain this status and meet with the Dean or designee by June 1 of that year. This plan must include tangible plans for publication in peer-reviewed journals.

Assistant Professors Assistant Professors fresh out of Ph.D. programs are guaranteed AQ status for five years. Senior Assistant Professors are expected to be research-productive and hence, AQ.

Lecturers Some full-time lecturers may be AQ. Teaching load adjustments for these faculty members are under discussion at a tri-campus level.

DEFINITIONS Professionally Qualified Faculty
A faculty member is considered professionally qualified if he or she holds a master’s degree or doctorate in a field related to teaching responsibilities and has either a) been employed full-time or part-time within the past five years in a professional capacity (including consulting) that relates to teaching responsibilities, OR b) engaged in significant professional development efforts such as attainment of professional certifications and attendance at conferences, workshops, or training sessions on an ongoing basis.

A faculty member who does not hold an advanced degree can, in exceptional circumstances, be considered professionally qualified if he or she has extensive professional experience at an executive level.

Faculty members who have full-time administrative assignments such as Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, or School Dean are considered professionally qualified if they engage in professional development activities related to their administrative responsibilities on an ongoing basis.

Participating Faculty
Participating faculty members engage in activities beyond the classroom. These might include participation in faculty meetings, service on committees, working with students in ways that are independent of the teaching assignment, and research. Participating faculty members can be either full-time or part-time.

PQ ADMINISTRATION
PQ faculty members are expected to make professional contributions or validating experiences.

The school supports PQ faculty in their efforts to maintain their status (e.g., attending conferences to maintain CPE hours). Professional contributions include but are not limited to the following:
- Consulting
- Teaching an executive education class
- Serving on a board of directors
- Serving as an expert witness
- Publication of trade journal article
- Publication of a textbook
- Publication of a popular press book
- Publication of a teaching case
Validating experiences may include:
  Presentation at professional conference
  Active professional certification
  Session chair, panel member or discussant at a professional conference
Appendix F: AACSB Standard 10
From Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation
(January 31, 2012 Revision)

Standard 10: The faculty of the school has, and maintains, expertise to accomplish the mission, and to ensure this occurs, the school has clearly defined processes to evaluate individual faculty members’ contributions to the school’s mission. The school specifies, for both academically qualified and professionally qualified faculty, the required initial qualifications of faculty (original academic preparation and/or professional experience), as well as requirements for maintaining faculty competence (intellectual contributions, professional development, or practice). [FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS]

Basis for Judgment:
At least 90 percent of faculty resources are either academically or professionally qualified.
Faculty resources are counted as appropriate to their contributions to the school, i.e., some faculty members may have full-time assignments with the school while others may have part-time assignments. The aggregate, or total, faculty resources is the sum of all full and part-time (based on a measure of percent-of-time devoted to the school’s mission) assignments. For example, if a school has 12 full-time faculty members and seven faculty members who are only half-time assignments, the total faculty resources would equal 15.5.
At least 50 percent of faculty resources are academically qualified.
In the aggregate, the portfolio of current capabilities for all faculty members is sufficient to support high quality performance of all activities in support of the school’s mission.
Qualified faculty resources are distributed across programs, disciplines, and locations consistent with the school’s mission. Variations from the overall percentages may be justified at the program, discipline, and location level. The burden of proof is on the school to demonstrate the delivery of overall high quality in such cases.
In cases where a substantial proportion of a business school’s faculty resources hold primary faculty appointments with other institutions, the school must provide documentation of how this faculty model supports mission achievement, overall high quality, and continuous improvement and is consistent with the spirit and intent of this standard.
If the school deploys a faculty model that relies on different levels of support for classroom instruction (e.g., senior faculty teaching large classes supported by a cadre of —teaching assistants) , the school must document how the model supports high quality academic programs and supports mission achievement.
Maintenance of knowledge and expertise supports faculty performance through an appropriate balance, given the school’s mission, through contributions over the past five years in all of the following areas:
- Learning and pedagogical research
- Contributions to practice
- Discipline-based scholarship
The school has a clearly defined process by which it evaluates how faculty members contribute to the mission and maintain their qualifications.
A school must develop appropriate criteria consistent with its mission for the classification of faculty as academically or professionally qualified. The interpretive material in the standard provides guidance only and each school should adapt this guidance to its particular situation and mission by developing and implementing criteria that indicate how the school is meeting the spirit and intent of the standard. Specific
The policies detail criteria by which academically and professionally qualified status is granted and maintained. The criteria must address:
- The academic preparation and/or professional experience required to attain each status.
- Consistent with the stated mission, the types of development activities that are required to maintain academic or professional qualifications on an ongoing, sustained basis.
- The priority and value of different development activities reflecting the mission and strategic management processes.
- Quality standards required for the various, specified development activities and how quality is assured.
- The quantity and frequency of development activities and outcomes expected within the typical five-year AACSB review cycle to maintain each status.

The criteria for granting and for maintaining academic or professional qualifications for those individuals holding faculty status and also holding significant administrative appointments (e.g., deans, associate deans, department head/chairs, center directors, etc.) may reflect these important administrative roles.

The policies should delineate, where appropriate, how criteria for granting and maintaining status varies with the development of individual faculty members across programs and levels (e.g., the experience of a professionally qualified faculty member who is assigned to teach introductory classes may be different than the professional experience expected of a PQ faculty member assigned to teach a capstone course). The criteria must be periodically reviewed and reflect a focus on continuous improvement over time.

Qualified faculty are generally be distributed equitably across each discipline, academic program, and location consistent with the school’s mission and student needs. Distance delivered programs are considered to be a unique location.

**Guidance for Documentation:**

The school must provide information on academic and/or professional qualifications for each faculty member. This should be provided in the form of an academic vitae that reflects or highlights, at least, the most recent five year period concluding with the end of the most recently completed, normal academic year prior to the year of the accreditation review. The academic vitae must provide sufficient detail as to educational background, intellectual contributions, primary teaching areas, and other faculty development activities supporting currency and relevancy in the field of teaching.

Documentation must clearly identify which of the three areas of contributions is represented in each faculty member’s development activities.

Tables 10-1 and 10-2 must be completed to document the deployment of qualified faculty for the most recently completed, normal academic year. Peer review teams may request documentation for additional years, individual terms as well as by program.
location, and/or discipline. Schools must explain or define their normal academic year format/schedule.

The delivery of high quality management education programs, scholarly activity and other mission components relies on the deployment of a cadre of qualified faculty members who demonstrate currency and relevance in their field or discipline. Faculty qualifications are a function of (1) original academic preparation and (2) subsequent, on-going development activities that maintain currency in the field of teaching and scholarship, supporting each faculty member’s contribution to the business school’s overall mission. Faculty members may be academically qualified, professionally qualified, or neither. Regardless of the category, all faculty members must demonstrate they are current in their field of teaching supported by appropriate, ongoing development activities and academic preparation.

**Academically Qualified Faculty Members**

Academic qualification requires a combination of original academic preparation (degree completion) augmented by subsequent activities that maintain or establish preparation for current teaching responsibilities. The following descriptions are not meant to be exhaustive, but indicative, of the meaning of academic qualification.

1. A doctoral degree in the area in which the individual teaches.
   For purposes of these standards the term —doctoral degree— means completion of a degree program intended to produce scholars capable of creating original scholarly contributions through advances in research or theory. In some cases programs with the word —doctorate (or equivalent) in the title do not have the aim to produce scholars who make original intellectual contributions. Those would not be deemed to be —doctoral degrees in the sense required in the accreditation review process. Such non-research —doctorates might be deemed academically qualified per category six below. Individuals with a graduate degree in law will be considered academically qualified to teach business law and legal environment of business.

2. A doctoral degree in a business field, but primary teaching responsibility in a business field that is not the area of academic preparation.
   Normally, persons meeting this condition are considered to be academically qualified, if they maintain active involvement in the areas of teaching responsibility through writing, participation in professional meetings, or related activities. Those with doctoral degrees in areas related to the field in which they teach are translating their expertise in ways relevant to business. Since many business theories and practices derive from related business fields, these business doctorates can be important faculty resources. The greater the disparity between the field of academic preparation and the area of teaching, the greater the need for supplemental preparation in the form of professional development linked to the area of teaching.

3. A doctoral degree outside of business, but primary teaching responsibilities that incorporate the area of academic preparation.
   Those with doctoral degrees in areas related to the field in which they teach are translating their expertise in ways relevant to business. Since many business theories and practices derive from basic disciplines outside of business, these individuals can be important faculty resources. Normally, faculty meeting this condition are to be considered academically qualified, provided
they maintain active involvement in areas of teaching responsibility as outlined above. The
greater the disparity between the field of academic preparation and the area of teaching, the
greater the need for supplemental preparation in the form of professional development linked
to the area of teaching.
4. A doctoral degree outside of business and primary teaching responsibilities that do not
incorporate the area of academic preparation.
Those meeting this condition would not be considered academically qualified without
additional preparation. To be considered academically qualified, an individual meeting this
condition must have completed additional coursework or personal study sufficient to provide
a base for participation in the mix of teaching, intellectual contribution, and service sought by
the school. The burden of justification in these cases rests with the school under review.
5. A specialized graduate degree in taxation.
Individuals with a graduate degree in taxation or a combination of graduate degrees in law
and accounting are considered academically qualified to teach taxation.
6. Substantial specialized coursework and/or demonstrated research competence in the
primary field of teaching responsibilities, but no research doctoral degree.
Individuals meeting this condition may constitute specialized instructional resources for the
school. Such a faculty member can have a specialized master’s degree in a business-related
field and have completed some coursework in a business doctoral program, or currently may
be a student in a business doctoral program. As noted in category one above, non-research
—doctorates—may also fit into this category. These individuals are to be considered
academically qualified but their number must be limited in each discipline and they are
subject to a 10 percent limit of total faculty resources. An exception to the 10 percent limit is
granted for graduate business students in research doctoral programs who have completed all
but the dissertation in their program. For graduate students in research doctoral programs
who have completed all but the dissertation in their program of study or met other program
requirements that put the students into the final stages of the dissertation (e.g., dissertation
proposal is formally accepted by the student’s faculty committee), academically qualified
status applies for no more than three years beyond the most recently completed graduate
comprehensive examination or other milestone that puts the student into the dissertation
stage. Such graduate students in research doctoral programs at this stage who have teaching
responsibilities, however, are not subject to the 10 percent of total faculty resources as
defined for this category of faculty. Since academic qualifications are often based on research
competence in the primary field of teaching, the existence of a substantive, sustained, and
current record of research in the teaching field will be accepted as prima facie evidence of
academic qualifications.

**Professionally Qualified Faculty Members**
Professionally qualified faculty can be an important component of the total faculty resources
deployed by the business school. Professionally qualified faculty members can be key to
ensuring that students have learning experiences that reflect current business practice and
understand the link to research and theory. The deployment of professionally qualified
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within the context of these standards must be viewed as an appropriate strategic decision that is consistent with supporting high quality academic programs and the mission of the business school.

Both relevant academic preparation and relevant professional experience is required to establish a faculty member as professionally qualified. Normally, the academic preparation is a master’s degree in a field related to the area of teaching assignment. Normally, the professional experience must be relevant to the faculty member’s teaching assignment, significant in duration and level of responsibility, and current at the time of hiring. The burden of justification regarding professionally qualified faculty rests with the school under review.

**Expectations of the Standard Regarding Qualifications**

Normally, to satisfy this standard:

The academically qualified portion of the faculty (as defined in the interpretative material above) should not fall below 50 percent of the total faculty resources for schools with undergraduate programs only. The percentage required varies for schools with different missions. The percentage of academically qualified faculty resources required for a school with graduate degree programs should exceed the percentage required for schools with no graduate programs. For example, a school with a doctoral program and an emphasis on discipline-based scholarship might require faculty resources consisting predominantly of individuals with academic qualifications as defined above.

The total faculty resources that either are academically qualified or professionally qualified (or both) must constitute at least 90 percent of the total faculty resources.

Academically and professionally qualified faculty resources are distributed across programs, disciplines, and locations consistent with the school’s mission and the students’ needs.

Classification as academically or professionally qualified will be lost if there is inadequate evidence of development activities within the past five years that demonstrate currency and relevancy in the field of teaching.

Normally, the proportion of faculty resources defined by description six in the —Academically Qualified Faculty Members— section above should not exceed 10 percent of the total faculty resources. An exception would be made for graduate business students in a research doctoral program who have completed all but the dissertation in their program of study or met other program requirements that put the student into the final stages of the dissertation (e.g., dissertation proposal is formally accepted by the student’s faculty committee). The use of such doctoral students as faculty for teaching purposes is treated similar to the use of academically qualified faculty. For such graduate students, this status applies for no more than three years beyond their most recently completed graduate comprehensive examination or other milestone that puts the student in the dissertation stage. The burden of proof is on the school to document when the three-year period begins and that the student is officially in the dissertation stage.
Reviewers must consider all faculty members in determining the currency and relevance of information brought to teaching and learning responsibilities. This includes all faculty members who are a part of the teaching faculty at the term reported in the Self-Evaluation Report or the Maintenance of Accreditation Report. Regardless of the contractual arrangement of a teaching faculty member with the school, each is included--full-time, part-time, visiting, clinical, etc. All faculty members are expected to demonstrate activities that maintain the currency and relevance of their instruction. Faculty members can maintain qualifications through a variety of efforts including production of intellectual contributions, professional development, and current professional experience. The choice of activities to maintain currency and relevance may change at different times during a faculty member’s career. For example, a new Ph.D. may engage in generating a series of related research papers to establish a presence in his or her discipline. A more established scholar may synthesize previous work into a research monograph. A classically trained economist who wants to become current in behavior economics may participate in psychology courses and combine with a colleague in organizational behavior to do a joint research project. An accounting professor may attend a continuing education certificate program to master recent changes in tax law. A faculty member in information management may spend two months in an internship with a manufacturing company studying its integrated management system. A finance professor may serve as editor of a discipline journal.

Faculty members who are selected to the faculty because of their professional qualifications may engage in different activities to maintain currency and relevance than academically qualified faculty members. Since the professionally qualified members have been appointed to bring in a different set of qualifications, it is reasonable to expect that those qualifications can be maintained differently. For example, a former CEO who is teaching planning and strategy may sit on two corporate boards of directors and lead an executive education planning seminar intended for corporate planning officers. A former marketing director who teaches market analysis may engage in consulting and enroll in a graduate course in data mining. A consultant who teaches one human resource management course each term may maintain currency and relevance by attending workshops at professional association meetings.

These examples for academically qualified and professionally qualified faculty members show only a few of the ways faculty members can maintain their qualifications. Most faculty members will have multiple activities.

There is no intent in these standards to describe a fixed pattern of activities faculty members must follow to maintain their qualifications. Expectations of the school, as well as individual characteristics and circumstances, guide the choice of maintenance efforts. Likewise, there is no intent to categorize certain endeavors as appropriate to maintain academic qualifications and others appropriate to professional qualifications. Persons with either initial qualifications can broaden their perspectives by engaging in professional development activities unlike their previous experience; i.e., a professionally qualified faculty member may get involved in basic research, or an academically qualified faculty member may use a sabbatical leave to gain practical experience on the staff of a firm. Faculty members who at one time in their careers were considered academically qualified, but who choose not to maintain this qualification, may be considered professionally qualified if they meet the professional qualifications criteria. 48
Likewise, professionally qualified faculty members may be (or become) academically qualified if they meet the academic qualifications criteria. Faculty development activities that support maintenance of academic and professional qualifications must be substantive and sustained at levels that support currency and relevance for teaching and other mission related professional responsibilities. The following is a non-exhaustive list of possible activities that faculty may undertake to support the maintenance of academic or professional qualifications:

- Intellectual contributions as detailed in Standard 2
- Relevant journal and/or other business publication editorships and/or editorial board/committee service
- Consulting activities that are material in terms of time and substance
- Faculty internships
- Sustained professional work supporting qualified status
- Leadership positions in recognized professional/academic societies
- Advanced academic coursework
- Relevant, active service on boards of directors
- Documented continuing professional education experiences
- Significant participation in professional and/or academic conferences

It is not AACSB’s intent to limit the range of developmental activities that may be undertaken. School criteria govern and may be narrowly defined or broadly defined in accordance with the school’s mission and programs offered. In summary, while entry qualifications (academic or professional) are important, the world of business changes very rapidly and faculty members must be involved in continuous development throughout their careers to stay current. Regardless of their specialty, work experience, or graduate preparation, the standard requires that faculty members maintain their competence through efforts to learn about their specialty and how it is applied in practice. Likewise, faculty members must engage in constant learning activity to maintain currency with their fields’ developing research and theory.

Business schools must support faculty development activities that link business practice to the educational experience. The intent is that all students at all levels, in all programs, across all disciplines, and in all locations are exposed to faculty members who are well versed in the current practice of business as well as current research and theory. Faculty development activities have value through contributions to the mission. When faculty members are current with the applicability and relevance of ideas and concepts in their field, instruction, practice, and inquiry benefit. The critical factor in determining whether faculty members bring current and relevant information is the impact of faculty member’s development activities on the mission of the school.

**Intellectual Contributions and Faculty Qualifications**

Standard 10 recognizes that there are many activities that faculty members may undertake to demonstrate that they are maintaining their disciplinary currency and relevance. However, 49
Standard 2 states that the portfolio of intellectual contributions should emanate from a substantial cross-section of faculty in each discipline, and the school must have established clear expectations for the intellectual contributions responsibility of individual faculty members. Therefore, a substantial cross-section of the faculty may demonstrate the currency of their qualifications as outlined in Standard 2 and in accordance with the policies of the school under review. Other faculty members may sustain their qualifications through other means including consulting, faculty internships, other professional experiences, and/or professional development activities. The school must make the case for the qualifications of each faculty member.

Summary
The mission will guide the Peer Review Team in its assessment of the adequacy and appropriateness of faculty professional development activities. The faculty, as a whole, must demonstrate that it is maintaining disciplinary currency through its efforts. Faculty resources of the school must be summarized in tables Table 10-1 and 10-2.