



Roles, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures
of the
Jake Jabs College of Business and Entrepreneurship
(Name of Department/School/College)

Effective Date: July 1, 2023

APPROVALS	SIGNATURE	DATE
<u>Laura Black</u> Department Faculty	DocuSigned by: <i>Laura Black</i> 43D8FF1952D2445	7/19/2023 4:11 PM MDT
	Chair, Primary Review Committee	
<u>Dan Miller</u> Primary Administrative Reviewer	DocuSigned by: <i>Daniel Miller</i> 3E80D720BDF5457...	7/19/2023 4:11 PM MDT
	Department Head/Director	
Intermediate Review Committee	Chair, Intermediate Review Committee	
Intermediate Administrative Reviewer	College Dean	
College Review Committee	Chair, College Review Committee	
<u>Durward Sobek</u> University Retention, Tenure and Promotion	DocuSigned by: <i>Durward K. Sobek II</i> 012C669E1D9E4AD	7/19/2023 4:11 PM MDT
	Chair, University Retention, Tenure and Promotion	
<u>Robert Mokwa</u> Provost	DocuSigned by: <i>Robert Mokwa</i> 212A28411AC04BD...	7/19/2023 4:11 PM MDT

Role and Scope Document

Jake Jabs College of Business & Entrepreneurship

July 2023

Article I. Role and Scope of Unit

Montana State University, the State's land-grant institution, educates students, creates knowledge and art, and serves communities, by integrating learning, discovery, and engagement.

The faculty, staff, and administrators in the Jake Jabs College of Business & Entrepreneurship (JJCBE) support the fulfillment of the University's teaching, scholarship, and service mission through the JJCBE mission to inspire creativity, innovation, and growth.

Article II. Appointment and Advancement of Research Faculty

Not applicable

Article III. Annual Review Process

The faculty member and Associate Dean meet annually to review the faculty member's performance relative to the faculty member's role statement and responsibilities. Evaluations are expected to recognize the requirements and expectations of the position based upon the faculty member's letter of hire, assigned percentages of effort, annual assignments, annual productivity report, and evaluations of teaching. The following procedures should be used in conducting annual reviews:

- (a) The faculty member records relevant professional activities and provides a description of those activities in the relevant systems and manner as prescribed each year (e.g., Faculty Success).
- (b) The Associate Dean, with review by the Dean, rates the performance of each faculty member using the information provided by the faculty member and other relevant information.
- (c) After reading the review, the faculty member must acknowledge having received the annual review. Faculty acknowledgement does not indicate concurrence with the rating; it signifies that they have seen the rating. If the faculty member refuses to acknowledge the review, the document will be forwarded with the notation that the faculty member refused to sign it.
- (d) Copies of all annual reviews and the performance ratings of each faculty member will be maintained in electronic files of the College and University. These files will be kept confidential and maintained as outlined in the Faculty Personnel Files policy of the University Faculty Handbook.

Article IV. Primary Review Committee and Administrator

Section 4.01 Primary Review Committee-Composition and Appointment

(a) The JJCBE Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Committee will be composed of five tenured faculty members. Two members are appointed by the Dean of the JJCBE, and three members are elected by the tenured and tenurable faculty. The Dean will appoint members following the election of members. No faculty member may serve on any review committee during the year their Dossier is reviewed.

(i) Appointed Members

- a. Each appointed member serves for a term of one year. If an appointed member is unable to complete their term, the Dean should appoint a replacement member within 30 days of the position becoming vacant to complete the unexpired portion of the term.
- b. The Dean will not appoint a faculty member who has already served four consecutive years on the JJCBE RTP Committee to a fifth consecutive year unless doing so is necessary to fill both seats on the Committee reserved for appointed members.
- c. In appointing members, the Dean will be attentive to the composition of the JJCBE RTP Committee, including option, rank, and diversity of members. Normally, at least one-half of the members will have attained the rank of professor.

(ii) Elected Members

- a. Each elected member serves for one term of three years. Upon completion of a member's three-year term, the member may not be re-elected to the Committee for at least one year.
- b. The Associate Dean will conduct elections in the spring semester each academic year to select the new members needed to fill vacancies in the ensuing year. Elected members of the Committee will be elected for staggered three-year terms. Elected candidates will be the candidates receiving the most votes. In the event of a tie, the Associate Dean will decide, and the other faculty member will serve as alternate when possible. After an election, the ballots will be available for inspection by any tenured or tenurable faculty member.
- c. If an elected member is unable to complete their three-year term, the Committee will conduct a special election within 30 days of the position becoming vacant to elect a replacement faculty member to complete the unexpired portion of the term.

(b) Term Limits

- (i) Faculty members normally will not serve for more than four consecutive years on the Committee.
- (ii) If an appointed member serves for two or more consecutive one-year appointed terms on the Committee, that member will not be eligible for election to the Committee for one year after the expiration of the last of the member's two or more consecutive terms.

- (iii) The Dean may appoint an individual completing their three-year elected term to serve a subsequent one-year term as an appointed member but only with the consent of the member. Upon the completion of such member's one-year appointed term, the member may not be elected to the JJCBE RTP Committee for at least one year.
- (iv) In the event the existing RTP Committee determines that there are only as many eligible faculty members to stand for election to the Committee as there are seats up for election, the term limits described above can temporarily be suspended for the duration of the shortage of eligible faculty members.

Section 4.02 Primary Review Administrator

Dean of the JJCBE

Section 4.03 Identification of Responsible Entities

- (a) Establish the Primary Review Committee either by facilitating the election or appointment of the members as described. *Dean of the JJCBE*
- (b) Select external reviewers and solicit review letters. *JJCBE RTP Committee*
- (c) Select internal peer reviewers and solicit review letters. *JJCBE RTP Committee*
- (d) Assuring the following materials are included in the dossier:
 - (i) Internal and external reviewer letters of solicitation, letters from the reviewers and, in the case of external reviewers, a short bio-sketch of each reviewer. *JJCBE RTP Committee*
 - (ii) Applicable Role and Scope Document. *JJCBE RTP Committee*
 - (iii) Letter of hire, any Percentages of Effort changes, all annual reviews, and all Evaluation Letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU. *JJCBE RTP Committee*
 - (iv) Candidate's teaching evaluations from the review period. If the evaluations are not in electronic format, the unit will provide evaluation summaries. Upon request by review committees and review administrators, the unit will provide access to the original evaluations to review committees and administrators during the review. *JJCBE RTP Committee*
 - (v) Maintaining copies of all review committee evaluation letters and external review letters after the review. *JJCBE Dean's Office Staff*
 - (vi)

Section 4.04 Next Review Level

University Retention, Tenure and Promotion (URTP) Committee

- (a) Elected representative and alternate
 - (i) The Associate Dean will conduct elections in the spring semester when the term of the current committee member is expiring.
 - (ii) Tenured and tenurable faculty will vote on the JJCBE representative to the URTP Committee.
 - (iii) Only tenured faculty who have previously served on the JJCBE RTP Committee are eligible to serve on the URTP Committee. Faculty cannot serve on the URTP

Committee and the JJCBE RTP Committee at the same time. No candidate under review may serve on the URTP Committee during that review cycle.

- (iv) The elected candidate will be the candidate receiving the most votes, and the alternate will be the candidate receiving the second most votes. If the elected faculty member is unable to serve, the alternate will serve instead. After an election, the ballots will be available for inspection by any tenured or tenurable faculty member.

(b) Term Limits

- (i) A faculty member will serve one three-year term on the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion (URTP) Committee. That faculty member will not be eligible for election to the URTP Committee for one year after the expiration of the member's term on URTP Committee.
- (ii) If the elected faculty member cannot serve out a full three-year term, the alternate will serve out the remainder of the term. If there are two or more years left in the term, the alternate will not be eligible for election to the URTP Committee for one year after the expiration of the member's term on URTP Committee.

Article V. Intermediate Review Committee and Administrator

Section 5.01 Intermediate Review Committee - Composition and Appointment

Not applicable

Section 5.02 Intermediate Review Administrator

Not applicable

Section 5.03 Level of Review following Intermediate Review Administrator

Not applicable

Article VI. Review Materials

Section 6.01 Materials Submitted by Candidate

Materials submitted in the dossier by the candidate must include:

- (a) The cover sheet obtained from the Provost's Office.
- (b) A comprehensive curriculum vitae (CV) with education and certifications attained and scholarship, teaching, service, and integration activities of the candidate.
- (c) A personal statement (maximum 2,500 words) that summarizes the candidate's case for retention, promotion, or tenure.
- (d) Separate self-evaluations of scholarship (maximum 1,000 words), teaching (maximum 1,000 words plus 500 words per course preparation during the review period), service (bulleted list showing activities and dates, organized by College, University, Professional, and Community), and integration (bulleted, dated list of activities labeled by type of integration demonstrated, with narrative maximum

500 words) summarizing the evidence demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards for the attainment of retention, tenure, or promotion, as applicable. Each self-evaluation will include a summary of activities, selected products or accomplishments, and evidence of recognition over the relevant review period, as described in Articles VIII-XI, and directly address how the candidate meets each of the standards for review.

- (e) Selected articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period that, in the candidate's judgment, best represents the candidate's scholarship.
- (f) Teaching materials as described in Article IX, Section 9.03(a).

Dossier materials provided to external reviewers by the Promotion & Tenure Committee will include:

- (a) The relevant MSU and JJCBE promotion and tenure standards and candidate's percentages of effort.
- (b) A comprehensive curriculum vitae (CV) with education and certifications attained and scholarship, teaching, service, and integration activities of the candidate.
- (c) The candidate's statement on scholarship.
- (d) Selected articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period that, in the candidate's judgment, best represents the candidate's scholarship. In accordance with University policy, if a candidate for retention, tenure, or promotion is suspected of academic misconduct, the JJCBE RTP Committee will suspend its review and refer the case to the Provost's Office.

Section 6.02 Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions

In the scholarship section of the dossier, candidates should explain their contribution to any collaborative works (e.g., publications, grants, conference presentations, etc.). A candidate must document each listed collaborator's contributions to the scholarship. For example, scholarly contribution for a study might be documented as: "J. Diaz, K. Li, and S. Johnson designed the studies. Diaz conducted the experiments. Diaz and Johnson analyzed the data. All authors participated equally in writing the manuscript."

Section 6.03 Peer Review Solicitation Procedure

In review of a candidate's dossier, the JJCBE RTP Committee will use qualified individuals from inside MSU to evaluate each candidate's performance on teaching for all retention, tenure, and promotion reviews and qualified individuals from outside the JJCBE to evaluate scholarship in all tenure reviews and reviews for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor.

- (a) Two internal reviews are required. Candidates will be asked to submit the names of three MSU faculty members. It is required that these faculty be tenured or tenure-track faculty who have conducted one or more peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching, consulted with the candidate on their teaching, are otherwise knowledgeable of the candidate's teaching, or affiliated with the MSU Center for Faculty Excellence. The JJCBE RTP Committee will select one faculty member from the candidate's list. A second internal review letter will be provided by the candidate's option coordinator, if possible, or by a tenured JJCBE faculty member

selected by the JJCBE RTP Committee. All selected internal reviewers will be asked to comment, within the context of the criteria and standards described in Articles VIII-XI, on the candidate's teaching. Internal reviewers will be expected to address directly the relevant teaching standards, and to base their evaluations on peer review conducted by themselves, any teaching mentorship interactions they have had with the candidate, or other relevant knowledge of the candidate's teaching. Issues of confidentiality, conflicts of interest, and the candidate's rights to respond will be the same as with external reviews (see Section 6.03 (b)(iii)-(vi).

- (b) MSU policy requires external reviews from at least four (4) respected authorities appropriate to the candidate's area of scholarship to provide an independent and objective evaluation of the candidate's scholarship for all tenure reviews and reviews for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor; at least one half of the external reviewers should be persons other than the reviewers recommended by the candidate.
- (i) The candidate will submit to the JJCBE RTP Committee three names of potential external reviewers, along with a description of their qualifications and their relationship, if any, to the candidate. These potential external reviewers should normally come from institutions with research expectations similar to those of the JJCBE, although candidates may include one or more potential reviewers from institutions with higher research expectations than the JJCBE.
 - (ii) The JJCBE RTP Committee will develop its own list of potential external reviewers. These reviewers will normally come from institutions with research expectations similar to those of the JJCBE.
 - (iii) The JJCBE RTP Committee will select at least one of the reviewers on the candidate's list and two or three other reviewers for a total of four reviewers. All reviewers must meet the following criteria:
 - a. No more than two external reviewers can come from the candidate's list.
 - b. All external reviewers should be from different institutions.
 - c. The selection of external reviewers must comply with the MSU Conflict of Interest policy.
 - i. No faculty member may serve on any review committee during the year their dossier is reviewed.
 - ii. No person shall participate in the review of any other faculty member related by blood or marriage or similar personal relationship.
 - iii. No person may participate in the review of any person with whom they have a personal, business, or professional relationship that could be perceived to preclude objective application of professional judgment. A conflict of interest occurs when the evaluating party could realize personal, financial, professional, or other gain or loss as a result of the outcome of the review process, or when the objectivity of the evaluating party could be impaired by virtue of the relationship. Examples of persons who may be excluded by professional relationship include undergraduate and/or graduate mentors, postdoctoral mentors, collaborators who are co-investigators on grants and/or co-authors on a significant portion of scholarly products completed during the review

period, colleagues who depend on instrumentation controlled or operated by the candidate, and/or co-inventor of a patent.

- iv. If a reviewer has a relationship with a candidate under consideration that may result in a conflict of interest, they must declare the nature of the conflict of interest before any deliberation occurs.
- d. All external reviewers must be at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. For promotion to Professor, reviewers should be at the rank of Professor whenever possible.
- e. External reviewers must be scholars published in the candidate's field but not necessarily leaders in the candidate's research area. For a candidate seeking promotion to Professor, at least one reviewer must be published in the candidate's area of expertise.
- f. Each reviewer will supply a curriculum vitae along with their external review.
- (iv) The identities of all external reviewers will be kept confidential to the limits allowed by law from anyone not directly involved in the review process.
- (v) Reviewers will not be informed of the JJCBE RTP Committee's evaluation or final recommendation.
- (vi) Information from the external letters crucial to the committee's evaluation or recommendation may be incorporated in the evaluation letter.
- (vii) The JJCBE RTP Committee may seek additional letters from external reviewers who meet the criteria in Section 6.03(b). The Committee will notify the candidate in a timely manner of its decision to seek additional external reviews and will request from the candidate a list of three additional reviewers. If the Committee seeks two or more additional reviews, at least one reviewer should come from the candidate's initial list of external reviewers or the candidate's list of additional reviewers.

If any RTP Committee member or reviewing administrator believes there is a conflict of interest that could preclude an objective application of professional judgment, the committee member or reviewing administrator will notify the provost within ten (10) days of the date the conflict became apparent either through the publication of committee rosters or the later discovery of the conflict which was not immediately apparent. Upon report of a perceived conflict of interest, the provost will determine if a conflict of interest exists that would preclude the objective application of professional judgment and take necessary measures to address the conflict. Failure of the candidate to raise a timely notification of a potential conflict of interest will preclude the candidate from raising an objection based on conflict of interest in subsequent grievances and appeals.

Article VII. Applicable Role and Scope Documents

Section 7.01 Retention Review

Candidates for retention are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position.

Section 7.02 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review

Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee.

Section 7.03 Promotion to Professor Review

The faculty member will be reviewed using standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect two (2) years prior to the deadline for notification of intent to apply for promotion.

Article VIII. Retention Reviews

Section 8.01 Timing of Retention Review

Faculty are reviewed for retention in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 8.02 University Standard

The standards for the retention of probationary faculty members are:

- (a) effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period, and
- (b) integration of no less than two of the following during the review period:
teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- (c) satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

Section 8.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

- (a) Teaching: The required indicators for teaching for retention are course syllabi and assignments and rubrics used to assess assignments; evidence of advising and mentoring activities; results of required student evaluations of teaching; summaries of grade distributions. See Article IX, Section 9.03(a).
- (b) Service: Performance indicators and weighting for retention review are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Article IX, Section 9.03(b).
- (c) Integration: Performance indicators and weighting for retention review are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Article IX, Section 9.03(c).
- (d) Scholarship: Performance indicators and weighting for retention review are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Article IX, Section 9.03(d).

Section 8.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

- (a) Teaching: Quantitative and qualitative expectations for retention are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Article IX, Section 9.04(a).
- (b) Service: Quantitative and qualitative expectations for retention are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Article IX, Section 9.04(b).
- (c) Integration: Quantitative and qualitative expectations for retention are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Article IX, Section 9.04(c).
- (d) Scholarship
- (i) Qualitative considerations: Discipline-based scholarship, pedagogical research, and contributions to practice are all valued. Activities subject to a rigorous review process, typically blind peer reviewed, are essential. Articles published in journals that do not follow a rigorous review process will not be considered as indicators of scholarship by the JJCBE RTP Committee. Non-peer-reviewed research activities are viewed as scholarly activities, but a record consisting solely of non-peer-reviewed activity is not sufficient for tenure. Scholarship will be evaluated based on both the influence and impact of individual works and the venues through which they are disseminated. If there is any question about whether certain research is of acceptable quality, the College encourages scholars to discuss potential projects, anticipated work products, and target publication/dissemination outlets with colleagues before investing substantial time and effort in the work. The College values substantive contributions to collaborative and cross-disciplinary work as well as solo-authored work. Candidates are responsible for providing evidence regarding the quality and impact of their scholarship.
- (ii) Quantitative Considerations: The candidate must demonstrate satisfactory progress toward meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year, which must include a pipeline of research projects underway. (For example, these could be a combination of research projects in preparation for publication and/or conference submission, such as 1 intellectual contribution and 1 peer-reviewed journal publication and 1 working paper; or 2 intellectual contributions and 1 or more papers nearing publication in a peer-reviewed journal; or 2 or more papers nearing publication in a peer-reviewed journal.) If a candidate has a published journal article or identifies journals as targets for future submission, the peer-reviewed journals must appear in a reputable journal ranking index (e.g., Cabell's, Australian Business Deans Council, SCImago, Financial Times 50, etc.) and provide review feedback to the author(s). Valued intellectual contributions in addition to peer-reviewed journal publications may include (but are not limited to)
- peer-reviewed conference papers / presentations / proceedings,
 - peer-reviewed books or peer-reviewed book chapters,
 - textbooks or textbook chapters,
 - book reviews in academic journals,
 - externally funded grants,
 - alternative forms of research presentation for academic, pedagogical, or practice audience (e.g., video, podcast).

Section 8.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Candidates for retention will submit a dossier that provides indicators of performance that meet the standards for retention. The standards for the award of retention are effectiveness in scholarship, teaching, and service during the review period, and integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service. Materials submitted in the dossier by the candidate must include:

- The signed cover sheet obtained from the Provost's Office.
- A comprehensive curriculum vitae (CV) with education and certifications attained and scholarship, teaching, service, and integration activities of the candidate.
- A personal statement (maximum 2,500 words) that summarizes the candidate's case for retention.

In addition to those materials, this section details specific materials that should be provided as evidence that the candidate meets performance standards.

- (a) Evidence of Effectiveness in Teaching: To meet the effectiveness standard, candidates should provide a statement (maximum 1,000 words plus 500 words for each course preparation during the review period) that summarizes evidence demonstrating effectiveness in course design, teaching practices, and learning outcomes. See Article IX, Section 9.03(a) and Section 9.05(a) for example indicators.
- (i) Demonstration of effective course design may include evidence that each course taught is well-planned; is organized to achieve course and College learning goals; is based on current and relevant course content; is appropriately challenging; employs instructional modalities appropriate for the content. Evidence could include course syllabi and assignments; outcomes of peer teaching reviews (if applicable); description of interdisciplinary courses or team-teaching approaches developed; description of new courses created or current courses revised; development of new programs; or other indicators proposed by the candidate.
- (ii) Demonstration of effective teaching practices may include evidence that teaching is well-structured; creates high-quality learning experiences; is innovative and/or experiential; is inclusive. Demonstration of effective teaching practices may include evidence that the instructor is approachable and accessible to students; has undertaken efforts to improve teaching; engages in advising and mentoring activities. Evidence could also include teaching awards; summaries of advising or mentoring relationships with students; outcomes of peer teaching reviews (if applicable); or other indicators proposed by the candidate. As advising is part of teaching responsibilities, effective teaching practices could also include demonstration of effective advising activities.
- (iii) Demonstration of effective learning outcomes may include evidence of clear criteria for assessing student work; evidence that student learning and outcomes were used to inform teaching; examples of efforts made to support learning in all students by examining possible inequities in performance across groups and making adjustments as necessary. Evidence could include rubrics used to assess

- assignments; student performance in class over time; student preparation for subsequent courses; summaries of grade distributions; required student evaluations of instruction and tables summarizing means and medians of student evaluation scores; or other indicators proposed by the candidate.
- (b) Evidence of Effectiveness in Service: To meet the effectiveness standard for retention, candidates should show a record of service consistent with their status as junior faculty members. As evidence of effectiveness, candidates must provide a bulleted list of service activities with dates, organized by and clearly labeled with the type of service (i.e., College, University, Professional, and Community) for each activity. See Article IX, Section 9.03(b) for example indicators of service.
- (c) Evidence of Integration: Candidates should provide a bulleted, dated list of integration activities (see Article IX, Section 9.03(c)) and clearly label the type of integration demonstrated through each activity [i.e., (a) teaching and scholarship, (b) scholarship and service, (c) teaching and service, and/or (d) teaching, scholarship, and service]. Candidates may also provide a brief narrative (maximum of 500 words) providing further explanation/justification of integration activities. See Article IX, Section 9.03(c) for example indicators of integration.
- (d) Evidence of Effectiveness in Scholarship: To meet the effectiveness standard for retention, candidates should have work published or nearing publication in a peer-reviewed journal and a pipeline of research projects at various stages. Scholarly products that have been submitted or accepted within the review period will be considered. To provide evidence of effectiveness in scholarship, candidates must provide:
- (i) A research statement (maximum of 1,000 words) that situates the candidate's research for the review committees. This research statement should explain the candidate's research, focus on its impact in the field of expertise, and be understandable to colleagues who are not in that field.
 - (ii) A numbered table of all articles appearing in peer-reviewed publications during the review period (see Appendix A for a template).
 1. This table must be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list describing the candidate's specific contribution(s) to each collaborative work listed (up to 50 words for each entry). For example: "J. Diaz, K. Li, and S. Johnson designed the studies. Diaz conducted the experiments. Diaz and Johnson analyzed the data. All authors participated equally in writing the manuscript."
 2. If applicable, this table may be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list (up to 100 words for each entry) that provides additional support for nontraditional/non-business peer-reviewed publications listed in the table (e.g., alternative impact factors, acceptance rates, inclusion in textbook or course pack at another university, internal or extramural funding, reputation of published conference proceedings, competitive review, etc.).
 - (iii) Evidence (see Appendix A for a template) of multiple activities in a pipeline of scholarship, which might include:
 1. A table of manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals or peer-reviewed conferences and/or conference presentations during the review

period: This table must be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list describing the candidate's specific contribution(s) to each collaborative work listed (up to 50 words for each entry). See Section 8.05(d)(ii)1 for an example of how to document collaboration.

2. A table of grants awarded during the review period: This table must be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list describing the candidate's specific contribution(s) to each collaborative work listed (up to 50 words for each entry). See Section 8.05(d)(ii)1 for an example of how to document collaboration.
 3. A table of other research output or works-in-progress (see Article IX, Section 9.03d for other potential indicators): This table must be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list describing the candidate's specific contribution(s) to each collaborative work listed (up to 50 words for each entry). See Section 8.05d(ii)1 for an example of how to document collaboration.
- (iv) Candidates shall include up to five selected scholarly products (copies or URLs where they may be readily accessed) that best represent their scholarship during the review period. These products could include full-text articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence. According to University requirements, candidates must include any scholarly products that have been accepted for publication but are not yet published or scholarly products published in a journal not readily available through University databases. In addition, instructions for accessing nontraditional scholarly products (e.g., documentary films) from the review period must be included.

Section 8.06 Status of Scholarly Products

For the retention review, all scholarship submitted during the review period will be considered as evidence of scholarship and a pipeline.

Article IX. Tenure Review

Section 9.01 Timing of Tenure Review

Faculty are normally reviewed for tenure in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 9.02 University Standard

The University standards for the award of tenure are:

- (a) sustained effectiveness in teaching and service ;
 - (b) sustained integration of no less than two of teaching, scholarship, and service, and
 - (c) accomplishment in scholarship
- as demonstrated by the candidate's performance during the review period.

Candidates for tenure are reviewed under the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee.

Section 9.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

Under the definitions in the Faculty Handbook, performance indicators are the categories of products and activities used to evaluate performance of the faculty undergoing review. This section identifies potential forms of evidence (i.e., indicators) that candidates may provide to support their case. Each list is neither exhaustive nor entirely mandatory; candidates may provide some of these forms of evidence and/or additional indicators of their performance. *Required indicators are identified in Section 9.05.* This section serves as guide for candidates to understand the types of performance indicators that they might use to support their case and the weight (i.e., value) the JJCBE RTP Committee places on various indicators. Some indicators may be given more weight; for example, awards can serve as performance indicators, but a prestigious national award may be given more weight than an award from an academic unit or the university.

(a) Teaching

- (i) The criteria for effective teaching are: course design, teaching practices, and learning outcomes. Indicators that demonstrate actual course practices and tie them concretely to course and College learning goals are most highly valued by the JJCBE RTP Committee.
 - a. Demonstration of effective course design may include evidence that each course taught is well-planned; is organized to achieve course and College learning goals; is based on current and relevant course content; is appropriately challenging; employs instructional modalities appropriate for the content. Evidence could include course syllabi and assignments; outcomes of peer teaching reviews (if applicable); description of interdisciplinary courses or team-teaching approaches developed; description of new courses created or current courses revised; development of new programs; or other indicators proposed by the candidate.
 - b. Demonstration of effective teaching practices may include evidence that teaching is well-structured; creates high-quality learning experiences; is innovative and/or experiential; is inclusive. Demonstration of effective teaching practices may include evidence that the instructor is approachable and accessible to students; has undertaken efforts to improve teaching; engages in advising and mentoring activities. Evidence could also include teaching awards; summaries of advising or mentoring relationships with students; outcomes of peer teaching reviews (if applicable); or other indicators proposed by the candidate. As advising is part of teaching responsibilities, effective teaching practices could also include demonstration of effective advising activities.
 - c. Demonstration of effective learning outcomes may include evidence of clear criteria for assessing student work; evidence that student learning and outcomes were used to inform teaching; examples of efforts made to support learning in all students by examining possible inequities in performance

across groups and making adjustments as necessary. Evidence could include rubrics used to assess assignments; student performance in class over time; student preparation for subsequent courses; summaries of grade distributions; required student evaluations of instruction and tables summarizing means and medians of student evaluation scores; or other indicators proposed by the candidate.

Research documents that student evaluations are vulnerable to various forms of bias (e.g., evaluations may be based on criteria other than quality of instruction). Therefore, evaluation scores and averages will be applied with caution as a measure of teaching effectiveness and must be supplemented by other evidence. In particular, written student comments may be viewed as formative feedback to be used for instructor improvement but are not considered a form of evaluation. In addition to the candidate's statement, the Committee will examine course materials and other evidence provided by the candidate to evaluate sustained effectiveness in teaching. Indicators that have the potential for selection bias or are not directly related to the criteria will not be given weight in the process. For example, candidate-selected individual student comments, thank you notes, and self-designed and administered evaluations of teaching will not be considered.

(b) Service

- a. Indicators for service include: participation in the governance of the University at the College or University levels; contributing to College or University projects and programs; mentoring faculty colleagues; serving in leadership roles in professional organizations; serving as journal editor or referee of scholarly papers or proposals; applying professional expertise in public service activities; other indicators proposed by the candidate.
- b. All indicators of service are equally weighted and valued by the College.

(c) Integration

(i) Indicators of integration include:

- a. Integration of scholarship and teaching: inclusion of research/creative products in other instructors' pedagogical tools (e.g., a supplement for a textbook, an article included in another instructor's syllabus); using data gathered or results of teaching methods in a published research paper or poster presentation; using personal research to inform a module, topic or other specific content of courses; presentations of research in other professors' classrooms; presentation of teaching innovations at academic conferences; using student research assistants on personal research projects; supervising student research projects, including presentation of their work at conferences (e.g., MSU Undergraduate Research Celebration; co-authored work at national conference); other indicators proposed by the candidate.
- b. Integration of scholarship and service: using knowledge learned or data gathered from service activities in a research paper or conference presentation or poster; using personal research to provide community or University service (for example, using results of research on the differential effects of certain marketing techniques on gender to inform the marketing strategies of a service organization or University committee); use of service learning in a course that will result in research activities; serving as a mentor

in the Blackstone/406 Labs incubator; providing editor or reviewer expertise to a journal or conference; other indicators proposed by the candidate.

- c. Integration of teaching and service: incorporating knowledge learned from writing questions for or grading professional exams (CPA, CFA, CMA, etc.) in specific areas of course; using teaching innovations or methods or content to inform service commitments, such as presenting class content to a professional organization as part of a training session; using teaching activities to benefit a service such as VITA; using teaching activities to analyze, support, and provide student consulting to businesses and organizations; other indicators proposed by the candidate .
- d. Integration of teaching, scholarship, and service: preparing teaching activities that are informed by research activity and used in service such as teaching tax, researching the effects of VITA on tax students, and participating in VITA; providing research supervision for student programs, e.g., the McNair Scholars program, which has both academic and social objectives; other indicators proposed by the candidate.

(ii) All indicators of integration are equally weighted and valued by the College.

(d) Scholarship

- (i) Indicators of scholarship include: publications in peer-reviewed journals; academic book publications; awards of extramural funding; conference proceedings; competitively submitted conference presentations; creation of impactful knowledge that serves local, national or international audiences; other indicators proposed by the candidate.

(ii) Peer-reviewed journal articles are required for tenure and promotion.

However, in keeping with its mission, the JJCBE values many forms of research activity. Research activities consist of contributions to discipline-based scholarship, pedagogical research, and contributions to practice. Discipline-based scholarship adds to the theory or knowledge base in the faculty member's area of expertise and includes basic research and applied scholarship that extends existing knowledge to practice areas. Pedagogical research contributes to the academic community's understanding and application of teaching and learning theories and techniques. Contributions to practice interpret existing knowledge for a practitioner audience. Activities subject to a rigorous review process, typically blind peer reviewed, are essential. Articles published in journals that do not follow a rigorous review process or provide detailed reviews to authors will not be considered as indicators of scholarship by the JJCBE RTP Committee. Non-peer-reviewed scholarly activities are also viewed as research activities, but a record consisting solely of non-peer-reviewed activity is not sufficient for tenure or promotion. Scholarship indicators that have been subjected to peer review processes are valued most highly by the College.

Section 9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

The Committee will consider the circumstances particular to each candidate and academic discipline. Ultimately, each activity will be judged by its quality and impact.

(a) Teaching

(i) Qualitative considerations: In the JJCBE, we have established and continue to cultivate a culture of high-quality teaching. Quality teaching is a key component of the mission of the JJCBE. Effective instructors:

- a. Create effective course designs;
- b. Implement effective teaching practices;
- c. Show effective course learning outcomes.

These qualitative criteria are intended to provide guidance so that the candidate and reviewers can focus on measures that indicate effective teaching and deemphasize criteria that have the potential for selection bias or are not responsive to the criteria for effective teaching. See Section 9.03 for detailed suggestions about possible evidence for each criterion.

(ii) Quantitative considerations: Due to varied needs across the College, there are not specific quantitative expectations related to teaching assignments. Consistently teaching the same course might be associated with different outcomes than teaching assignments with variation. Quantitative indicators may provide insight into the quality of teaching, though the JJCBE recognizes the forms of bias consistently documented in student evaluations of instruction. Course evaluations serve to provide a measure of student satisfaction. The College expectation is that, normally, for each course taught, the overall mean score from the required student evaluation instrument is not less than "Average" on the evaluation instrument scale. It is expected that any overall mean score below "Average" will be addressed by the candidate. While the results of standardized course evaluations are required materials, the Committee will view evaluation scores and averages with caution as an indicator of teaching effectiveness.

(b) Service

(i) Qualitative considerations: In keeping with the University's mission as a land grant institution, the College values outreach and public service activities that serve the needs and interests of the JJCBE, University, city, state, national, and global communities. College faculty could serve in professional organizations, community groups, and College and University committees.

(ii) Quantitative considerations: Candidates applying for tenure should show a record of service consistent with their status as junior faculty members. It is expected that candidates for tenure will have served on at least one substantive College or University committee.

(c) Integration

(i) Qualitative considerations: Candidates can demonstrate integration through the combination of (a) teaching and scholarship, (b) scholarship and service, (c) teaching and service, and/or (d) teaching, scholarship, and service. All forms of integration are equally valued.

(ii) Quantitative considerations: Candidates need provide evidence of only one type of integration to meet the requirements.

(d) Scholarship

(i) Qualitative considerations: Discipline-based scholarship, pedagogical research, and contributions to practice are all valued. Activities subject to a rigorous

review process, typically blind peer reviewed, are essential. Articles published in journals that do not follow a rigorous review process will not be considered as indicators of scholarship by the JJCBE RTP Committee. Non-peer-reviewed research activities are viewed as scholarly activities, but a record consisting solely of non-peer-reviewed activity is not sufficient for tenure. Scholarship will be evaluated based on both the influence and impact of individual works and the venues through which they are disseminated. If there is any question about whether certain research is of acceptable quality, the College encourages scholars to discuss potential projects, anticipated work product, and target publication/dissemination outlets with colleagues before investing substantial time and effort in the work. The College values substantive contributions to collaborative and cross-disciplinary work as well as solo-authored work. Candidates are responsible for providing evidence regarding the quality and impact of their scholarship.

(ii) Quantitative Considerations: Six intellectual contributions are required. Of the six intellectual contributions, four must be publications in peer-reviewed journals, with at least one in a high-quality journal. Peer-reviewed journals must appear in a reputable journal ranking index (e.g., Cabell's, Australian Business Deans Council, SCImago, Financial Times 50, etc.) and provide review feedback to the author(s). A high-quality journal is defined as highly ranked in the journal ranking index the candidate provides (e.g., 25% acceptance rate in Cabell's, A or higher on Australian Business Deans Council, Q1 in SCImago, etc.) or demonstrated as high quality by candidate-provided evidence such as impact score, field ranking, number of citations or equivalent indicators. Valued intellectual contributions in addition to peer-reviewed journal publications may include (but are not limited to)

- peer-reviewed conference papers / presentations / proceedings,
- peer-reviewed books or peer-reviewed book chapters,
- textbooks or textbook chapters,
- book reviews in academic journals,
- externally funded grants,
- alternative form of research presentation for academic, pedagogical, or practice audience (e.g., video, podcast).

Quantitative indicators can provide insight into the quality of scholarship. A record of scholarship without quantitative indicators of quality is unacceptable for tenure. The candidate has the burden of proving that at least one publication meets the requirements for a high-quality publication.

Section 9.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Candidates for tenure will submit a dossier that provides indicators of performance that meet the standards for tenure. The standards for the award of tenure are sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period; integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service; and accomplishment in scholarship. As noted in Article VI, Section 6.01, materials submitted in the dossier by the candidate must include:

- The signed cover sheet obtained from the Provost's Office.

- A comprehensive curriculum vitae (CV) with education and certifications attained and teaching, scholarship, service, and integration activities of the candidate.
- A personal statement (maximum of 2,500 words) that summarizes the candidate's case for tenure.
- Separate self-evaluations for teaching (maximum 1,000 words plus 500 words per course preparation during the review period), scholarship (maximum 1,000 words), service (bulleted list showing activities and dates, organized by College, University, Professional, and Community), and integration (bulleted, dated list of activities labeled by type of integration demonstrated, with narrative maximum 500 words) that summarize the evidence demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards for tenure. Each self-evaluation will include a summary of activities, selected products or accomplishments, and evidence of recognition over the relevant review period and directly address how the candidate meets each of the standards for tenure (effectiveness in teaching and service, integration of activities, and accomplishment in scholarship).

This section details the specific materials that should be provided as evidence that the candidate meets performance standards.

(a) Evidence of sustained effectiveness in teaching: To meet the sustained effectiveness standard, candidates should demonstrate that they consistently design effective courses, implement effective teaching practices, and create effective course learning outcomes. The case for effective teaching will be made through a narrative of no more than 1,000 words plus 500 words for each course preparation during the review period that indicates how those three criteria are met. The candidate must demonstrate sustained effectiveness with breadth and depth of evidence using multiple indicators. See Table 1 for required and possible evidence for each criterion. Candidates may also choose to provide context regarding their number of course preparations, course levels, required versus elective courses, and student composition of course (e.g., option, College, University). Candidates should not include indicators such as thank you notes from students or self-administered surveys.

Table 1: Performance Indicator and Evidence

<i>Performance Indicator</i>	<i>Evidence</i>
Effective course design: Courses are well-planned, organized to achieve course and college learning goals, based on current and relevant course content, appropriately challenging; use instructional modalities appropriate for the content	<p><u>Required evidence:</u> Course syllabi and assignments; outcomes of peer teaching reviews (if applicable).</p> <p>Other examples of effective course design include development of interdisciplinary courses, team-teaching; creating new courses, revising current courses, or developing new programs; or other indicators proposed by the candidate.</p>

<p>Effective teaching practices: Teaching is well-structured; creates high-quality learning experiences; is innovative and/or experiential; is inclusive. As advising is part of teaching responsibilities, effective teaching practices could also include demonstration of effective advising activities.</p>	<p><u>Required evidence:</u> Evidence that the candidate is approachable and accessible to students; evidence of efforts to improve teaching (if applicable); outcomes of peer teaching reviews (if applicable); evidence of advising and mentoring activities.</p> <p>Other examples of effective teaching practices include Teaching awards; application of pedagogical materials from participating in workshops, conferences, or trainings; using Open Educational Resources; or other indicators proposed by the candidate.</p>
<p>Effective learning outcomes: Clear criteria for assessing student work; evidence that student learning and outcomes was used to inform teaching; examples of efforts made to support learning in all students by examining possible inequities in performance across groups and making adjustments as necessary.</p>	<p><u>Required evidence:</u> Rubrics used on assignments; tables summarizing grade distributions by course; university-required student evaluations of teaching; table summarizing mean and median student evaluation scores by course (see Section 9.04(a)(ii)-Quantitative Considerations).</p> <p>Other examples of effective learning outcomes include student performance in class over time; student preparation for subsequent courses; broad description of changes made in response to student feedback (if applicable); or other indicators proposed by the candidate.</p>

- (b) Evidence of sustained effectiveness in service: To meet the sustained effectiveness standard for tenure, candidates should show a record of service consistent with their status as junior faculty members. As evidence of sustained effectiveness, candidates should provide a bulleted list of service activities with dates and organized by and clearly labeled with the type of service (i.e., College, University, Professional, and Community) for each activity and brief explanation of how they individually and/or collectively demonstrate effectiveness. See Section 9.03(b) for example indicators of service.
- (c) Evidence of integration: Candidates should provide a bulleted list of integration activities (see Section 9.03(c)) undertaken during the review period and clearly label the type of integration demonstrated through each activity [i.e., (a) teaching and scholarship, (b) scholarship and service, (c) teaching and service, and/or (d) teaching, scholarship, and service] and a brief narrative (maximum of 500 words) providing further explanation/justification of integration activities.
- (d) Evidence of accomplishment in scholarship: To meet the accomplishment standard, candidates should normally have a minimum of four peer-reviewed journal publications, with at least one in a high-quality journal, and a total of six or more intellectual contributions. Per University policy, only scholarly products that have been published or accepted for publication within the review period will be

considered as publications and counted toward the tenure requirement. In cases of tenure and promotion, works or products that have been submitted but not accepted at that the start of the review process may not be considered as publications. As evidence of accomplishment in scholarship, candidates must provide:

- (i) A research statement (maximum of 1,000 words) that situates the candidate's research for the review committees. This research statement should explain the candidate's research, focus on its impact in the field of expertise, and be understandable to colleagues who are not in that field.
- (ii) A numbered table of all articles appearing in peer-reviewed publications during the review period (see Appendix A for a possible template).
 - a. This table must be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list describing the candidate's specific contribution(s) to each collaborative work listed (up to 50 words for each entry). For example: "J. Diaz, K. Li, and S. Johnson designed the studies. Diaz conducted the experiments. Diaz and Johnson analyzed the data. All authors participated equally in writing the manuscript."
 - b. If applicable, this table may also be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list (up to 100 words for each entry) that provides additional support for nontraditional/non-business peer-reviewed publications listed in the table (e.g., alternative impact factors, acceptance rates, inclusion in textbook or course pack at another university, internal or extramural funding, reputation of published conference proceedings, competitive review, etc.).
- (iii) Evidence of intellectual contributions that are not peer-reviewed journal publications might include:
 - a. A table of conference presentations during the review period: This table must be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list describing the candidate's specific contribution(s) to each collaborative work listed (up to 50 words for each entry). See Section 9.05(d)(ii)1 for an example of how to document collaboration.
 - b. A table of grants awarded during the review period: This table must be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list describing the candidate's specific contribution(s) to each collaborative work listed (up to 50 words for each entry). See Section 9.05(d)(ii)1 for an example of how to document collaboration.
 - c. A table of other research output (see Section 9.03(d) for other potential indicators): This table must be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list describing the candidate's specific contribution(s) to each collaborative work listed (up to 50 words for each entry). See Section 9.05(d)(ii)1 for an example of how to document collaboration.
- (iv) Candidates shall include up to five selected scholarly products (copies or URLs that easily allow access) that best represent their scholarship. These products could include full-text articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence. According to University requirements, candidates must include copies of any scholarly products that have been accepted for publication but

not yet published or scholarly products published in a journal not readily available through University databases. In addition, instructions for accessing nontraditional scholarly products (e.g., documentary films) from the review period must be included.

Article X. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

Section 10.01 University Standards

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are the standards for the award of tenure. Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor does not demonstrate, in and of itself, that standards for tenure have been met.

Article XI. Promotion to Rank of Professor

Section 11.01 Timing of Review

Normally, faculty are reviewed for promotion after the completion of five (5) years of service in the current rank. However, faculty may seek promotion earlier if they can establish that they meet the same standards of effectiveness and excellence used in evaluating candidates after five (5) years in rank.

Section 11.02 University Standard

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Professor are:

- (a) sustained effectiveness in teaching and service;
 - (b) sustained integration of no less than two of teaching, scholarship, and service, and
 - (c) excellence in scholarship
- as demonstrated by the candidate's performance during the review period.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor will be reviewed using standards and indicators in effect two (2) years prior to the deadline for notification of intent to apply for promotion. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee.

Faculty members seeking promotion to Professor must notify the primary reviewing administrator of their intent by the deadline established by the provost. Only tenured Associate Professors may be promoted to the rank of Professor. Unsuccessful candidates may reapply.

Section 11.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

- (a) Teaching: Performance indicators and weighting for promotion are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Article IX, Section 9.03(a).
- (b) Service: Performance indicators and weighting for promotion are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Article IX, Section 9.03(b).

- (c) Integration: Performance indicators and weighting for promotion are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Article IX, Section 9.03(c).
- (d) Scholarship: Performance indicators and weighting for promotion are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Article IX, Section 9.03(d).

Section 11.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

- (a) Teaching: Quantitative and qualitative expectations for promotion are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Article IX, Section 9.04(a). Regardless of time since tenure, teaching materials and the candidate's self-evaluation teaching statement should focus on teaching during five years of the review period immediately preceding application for promotion to full.
- (b) Service
 - (i) Qualitative considerations: In keeping with the University's mission as a land grant institution, the College values outreach and public service activities that serve the needs and interests of the JJCBE, University, city, state, nation, and world communities. For promotion to full professor, demonstrated impact from service to professional organizations, community groups, or College and University committees is required.
 - (ii) Quantitative considerations: Candidates applying for promotion should show a record of service consistent with their status as tenured faculty members. Normally, since tenure, candidates will demonstrate membership and active participation in at least two College committees or task forces and at least one substantive University committee or task force, as well as providing service to the academy, community, or professional association, assuming leadership roles in service activities when appropriate.
- (c) Integration
 - (i) Qualitative considerations: Candidates can demonstrate integration through the combination of (a) teaching and scholarship, (b) scholarship and service, (c) teaching and service, and/or (d) teaching, scholarship, and service. All forms of integration are equally valued.
 - (ii) Quantitative considerations: Candidates need only provide evidence of one type of integration to meet the requirements.
- (d) Scholarship
 - (i) Qualitative considerations: Discipline-based scholarship, pedagogical research, and contributions to practice are all valued. Activities subject to a rigorous review process, typically blind peer reviewed, are essential. Articles published in journals that do not follow a rigorous review process will not be considered as indicators of scholarship by the JJCBE RTP Committee. Non-peer-reviewed research activities are viewed as scholarly activities, but a record consisting solely of non-peer-reviewed activity is not sufficient for promotion. Scholarship will be evaluated based on both the influence and impact of individual works and the venues through which they are disseminated. If there is any question about whether certain research is of acceptable quality, the College encourages scholars to discuss potential projects, anticipated work product, and target publication/dissemination outlets with colleagues before

investing substantial time and effort in the work. The College values substantive contributions to collaborative and cross-disciplinary work as well as solo-authored work. Candidates are responsible for providing evidence regarding the quality and impact of their scholarship.

(ii) Quantitative Considerations: Six intellectual contributions since tenure are required. Of the six intellectual contributions since tenure, four must be publications in peer-reviewed journals, with at least two in a high-quality journal. Peer-reviewed journals must appear in a reputable journal ranking index (e.g., Cabell's, Australian Business Deans Council, SCImago, Financial Times 50, etc.) and provide review feedback to the author(s). A high-quality journal is defined as highly ranked in the journal ranking index the candidate provides (e.g., 25% acceptance rate in Cabell's, A or higher on Australian Business Deans Council, Q1 in SCImago, etc.) or demonstrated as high quality by candidate-provided evidence such as impact score, field ranking, number of citations or equivalent indicators. Valued intellectual contributions in addition to peer-reviewed journal publications may include (but are not limited to)

- peer-reviewed conference papers / presentations / proceedings,
- peer-reviewed books or peer-reviewed book chapters,
- textbooks or textbook chapters,
- book reviews in academic journals,
- externally funded grants,
- alternative form of research presentation for academic, pedagogical, or practice audience (e.g., video, podcast).

Quantitative indicators can provide insight into the quality of scholarship. A record of scholarship without quantitative indicators of quality is unacceptable for promotion to full professor. The candidate has the burden of proving that at least two publications meet the requirements for high-quality publications.

Section 11.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

The evidence required to support the case for promotion matches the evidence required for tenure but is limited to the review period (since tenure). See Article IX, Section 9.05 for details about required dossier materials.

Article XII. Procedures for Update and Revision of the Unit Role and Scope Document

By the end of each Academic Year, members of the JJCBE RTP Committee shall review the Role and Scope document with the purpose of identifying needed changes to standards and procedures. A full review of the Role and Scope document will take place no less than every three years. JJCBE faculty members or administrators may also propose changes to Role and Scope Documents of the College. JJCBE RTP Committee members, faculty, or administrators who identify a need for improvement, clarification, or other revision to the JJCBE Role and Scope Document may submit the request for changes to the Dean and Associate Dean of the College or to the Chair of URTP

Committee, who will forward the recommendations to the academic unit for consideration in accordance with Article XIII. The Dean and Associate Dean will review with the JJCBE RTP Committee any recommended changes, who will then bring them to the JJCBE tenurable faculty for their consideration, discussion, and vote. Changes approved by vote of tenurable faculty will result in an update to the Role and Scope Document. Change submissions should occur only after the review committee and the Dean complete all reviews for the year.

Article XIII. Approval Process

Section 13.01 Primary Academic Unit Role and Scope Document

- (a) tenured and tenurable faculty of JJCBE;
- (b) JJCBE RTP Committee and Dean;
- (c) University Retention, Tenure and Promotion (URTP) Committee; and
- (d) Provost.

Section 13.02 Intermediate Academic Unit Role and Scope Document

Not applicable.