



Unit Standards Approval Worksheet

Department: **Accounting and Finance**

Year: **2020**

The Unit Standards Committee (USC)

The objective of the USC is to look at the standards from an outsider's point of view and from the perspective of a newly hired faculty member (.5 FTE and above). It evaluates the clarity of the Unit Standards in relation to the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and makes recommendations based on elements that are unclear or do not reflect changes to the CBA that may have occurred since the Units' standards were last evaluated.

The USC's goal is to help Units refine standards that accurately reflect what the Unit values across rank and across the areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service.

The USC reviews the standards to ensure they:

- X Are consistent with University Standards (CBA)
- X Address the general activities
- X Address participation in general education activities
- X Address all academic appointments to the unit covered under the CBA
- X Specify, where appropriate, special standards and special procedures for the evaluation of individuals on grants, contracts, or other work assignments outside the normal academic activities of the unit, including but not limited to adjunct research faculty
- X Guarantee peer review
- X Ensure consultation between faculty members and chairpersons or deans before each individual recommendation is made final

The USC's generalized feedback is summarized below. Please see the standards document for specific revisions.

These revised standards address all of the concerns the Unit Standards Committee sent to the department. The unit added additional language around clarifying normal, above normal and outstanding in each of the three areas for review. Although we believe some clarity could be added, particularly in the area of scholarship and creative activity, the unit standards committee believes the standards are suitable for signoff by the committee.

Once the standards have been revised, please return to:

- the Unit Standards Committee, OR the Office of the Provost

UNIT STANDARDS

DEPARTMENT of ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE

The following document contains the Unit Standards of the Department of Accounting and Finance, College of Business. This document does not stand-alone. It must be read and applied in conjunction with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the University Faculty Association and the Montana University System. These unit standards and procedures are intended to be in addition to and consistent with those provided in the current CBA and in the event of any omissions or inconsistencies, the terms of the CBA shall be applicable and shall prevail.

I. General Statements

- A. Probationary faculty should pay particular attention to the CBA sections that cover rights of probationary appointees and other matters such as rank, appointment, reappointment, non-reappointment and credit for probationary service.
- B. Attention of each faculty member is directed to the CBA sections governing the "Student Evaluation Committee" CBA 10.230.
- C. The Department Chairperson prepares an individual recommendation for each faculty member in the unit per the procedures outlined in CBA 10.250.
- D. Each faculty member shall sign the recommendations of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and the Student Evaluation Committee for Faculty Evaluation and the Department Chairperson to signify that he/she has received and read them. The signature does not signify the faculty member's endorsement of the recommendations. The faculty member may request a meeting with the FEC Chair, the FEC and/or the Department Chairperson for clarification of the recommendations.
- E. A faculty member should consult the CBA for procedures relative to the evaluation process beyond the FEC and to determine the procedural requirements for appeals.

II. Faculty Evaluation Committee

The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) shall be composed of one non-voting student member appointed by the FEC Chair and, to ensure peer review, all tenured or tenure track faculty members within the Department for whom the University Faculty Association is the bargaining representative under the CBA. The minimum acceptable size of the FEC shall consist of at least 3 eligible faculty members. Should an insufficient number of eligible faculty members exist, a committee will be formed with eligible faculty from the College of Business.

Except as follows:

1. No visiting faculty members shall be members of the FEC.
 2. A faculty member shall not be present during deliberations or voting concerning his or her own evaluation.
 3. All tenure track and tenured faculty members are members of the FEC with voting rights except that a faculty member shall be a non-voting member of the FEC during their first semester in the Department.
 4. With respect to promotions, voting FEC members may cast ballots only on faculty who are seeking promotions to the voting member's own rank or to a lower rank (e.g. an associate professor can only vote on requests by other faculty members for promotions from instructor to assistant professor or from assistant professor to associate professor. An associate professor cannot vote on promotion requests from associate professor to professor).
 5. The Department Chair is not a member of the FEC. However, under University faculty evaluation procedures (CBA 10.250) the Department Chair has a separate vote and written evaluation on the performance of each faculty member. The Department Chair does receive copies of all of the written results of the FEC process which they may use in their own evaluation of a faculty member's performance.
- B.** The Department Chair shall call a meeting of Department Faculty early in the fall semester to choose or reaffirm the chair of the FEC. (A FEC chair may be chosen in the spring semester to be reaffirmed at the fall meeting.) The FEC shall select its own chairperson. The FEC chairperson shall be a tenured full professor who is a faculty member of the department and shall be chosen by a majority vote of the FEC eligible committee members unless there is no faculty currently at that rank, in which case the chair will be chosen from the next highest rank. The vote will be by secret ballot and will be counted by the FEC chairperson and Assistant FEC Chair. Those eligible to serve as FEC chairperson must indicate their willingness by a positive affirmation to the FEC. An Assistant FEC Chair will also be appointed. The Assistant FEC Chair is typically, but not necessarily, the most recent prior FEC Chair who is available and is a current FEC member.
- C.** The Committee may receive or seek evidence from any source including tenured and tenure track faculty, non-tenure track faculty and students, that is relevant to the evaluation of any faculty member in the academic unit so long as the evidence is relevant to the approved unit standards, any evidence relied upon for evaluation purposes is incorporated into the record, and the faculty member to whom the evidence pertains is afforded full opportunity to review and respond to the evidence in accordance with the CBA. Unsolicited materials may not be used as part of the evaluation process unless they are signed. Unlike materials solicited by the FEC, unsolicited materials have no expectation of confidentiality of the identify of their

author.

- D.** Upon request of any faculty member being evaluated, the Committee shall afford the faculty member an opportunity to address the Committee personally regarding his or her evaluation.
- E.** The FEC Chair will establish a period for the FEC to vote on faculty requests for promotion, tenure, retention and salary adjustments in accordance with University deadlines. Voting shall occur by written secret ballot. The results of the FEC vote will be forwarded by the FEC Chair to the Department Chair and the FEC as “for” or “against.” A “for” is defined as support for the requested action by more than 50% of the Committee members voting. A quorum for purposes of voting shall consist of at least 60% of eligible faculty members. The FEC Chair and the Assistant FEC Chair shall jointly count the ballots for each action requested by a faculty member and verify the results of the balloting process. The FEC Chair and the Assistant FEC Chair shall keep confidential the names and source of comments of all voting FEC members.

The exact vote tally (i.e., the number of votes “for” and “against”) shall be reported to the Department Chair and the affected faculty member, but otherwise shall not be made public.

- F.** The FEC can vote without a formal meeting by voting unanimously to do so prior to commencement of the voting period in each evaluation year.
- G.** The FEC shall also evaluate the performance of non-tenurable teaching faculty members, such as adjuncts and lecturers. The FEC evaluation is primarily focused on teaching performance. Adjuncts, lecturers and other non-tenurable faculty members are evaluated to ensure that a normal level of teaching performance (and service performance, as discussed below) as defined in this document and the CBA is maintained. The FEC will at a minimum evaluate the SEC report and the student evaluations of these faculty members. The department chair also normally attends part or all of one or more classes per year taught by non-tenurable faculty members that are part of the bargaining unit. The department chair may make a written report of the classroom visit available to the FEC. In select cases, non-tenurable teaching faculty members may be assigned service commitments as part of their work assignment. In these cases, the FEC evaluation will include a report of service performance. The FEC Chair will forward recommendations of retention or non-retention to the Department Chairperson with the FEC report for faculty members in the bargaining unit.
- H.** The FEC Chair has a number of duties.
 - 1. The FEC Chair will manage and oversee the FEC process. The FEC Chair establishes and disseminates a schedule for the evaluation process to assure accordance with the deadlines provided in the current CBA. The FEC Chair will also organize the process, work with appropriate staff, disseminate reminders of important deadlines, run the voting process including counting ballots, distribute the votes as per the unit standards and generate original write-ups on

faculty undergoing evaluation.

2. Faculty members requesting additional information will request such information from the FEC Chair. The FEC Chair will contact the faculty member concerning the request and ensure procedures for requesting additional information are conducted in accordance with the CBA.
 3. The FEC Chair will meet with the new tenure-track faculty members in the department to discuss and answer questions about the unit standards and the evaluation process.
 4. A written evaluation is prepared by the FEC Chair for all other faculty members being evaluated. The evaluation of the FEC Chair will be prepared by the Assistant FEC Chair. The written evaluations for each faculty member also will be reviewed by the Assistant FEC Chair. The Assistant FEC Chair will review the evaluations to assure that the comments of the individual members of the committee are properly synthesized and fairly presented before issuance to the faculty member and the Department Chairperson. The members of the FEC may review the current written evaluations of other faculty members of the department.
 5. The FEC Chair (or the Assistant FEC Chair) will call a meeting of the FEC to conduct an evaluation of the department chairperson regarding his or her duties as chairperson. The results will be forwarded to the department chairperson and the dean by April 15th.
- I. Late balloting is not allowed. If a faculty member will not be present during the voting period, the member should cast their ballot early. Faculty members on leave or otherwise unable to be present should cast their ballot by mail if they so desire. The ballot must be received by the voting deadline.

III. Student Evaluation Committee

- A. The Department Chairperson will appoint at least three (3) students and a maximum of seven (7) students, including at least one student member from each of the emphasis areas (e.g., Accounting & Finance), to the Student Evaluations Committee (SEC). One student will be a MACCT student. The members shall be appointed by September 15th and the committee will select a chair from its voting members.
- B. The committee will include one faculty observer who will be chosen from the tenured or tenurable members of the bargaining unit. The faculty member can be the assistant FEC chair, which has been tradition in the department.
- C. The Chairperson of the department will provide the annual summary evaluation reports of the faculty member's performance for each of the classes taught to the SEC.

- D. The SEC will make its report to the Department Chairperson by the due date for faculty files (October 15th in the current COB). The Department Chairperson and the faculty member being evaluated must sign the SEC report.
- E. Neither error nor omission of student participation in any evaluation may constitute grounds for a grievance. The evaluation procedure may proceed without participation by the SEC.

IV. Documentation

- A. Each faculty member shall document his or her performance as indicated in the CBA. (For more specific statement of evidence which may be used to document teaching, service and scholarship, see Section V of this document). All faculty members are to include a self- assessment summary. This summary shall be no more than two pages in length and should summarize and justify the material provided in the IPR in support of the faculty member's requested action. For instance, a faculty member requesting merit needs to indicate in which area(s)—teaching, research, or service—he or she considers his or her performance above normal or outstanding (see Section VII). The self-assessment and the Individual Performance Record (IPR) submitted as part of the documentation may only include the information pertaining to the timeframe for which the action is requested. For instance, a faculty member requesting merit for the period of 2018-2021 may only list activities for this timeframe.
- B. Each faculty member shall document his or her performance to a degree sufficient to allow the FEC to make a competent judgment of that performance.
- C. Faculty members will be informed in writing if additional documentation is solicited by the FEC. The exact nature of the additional documentation must be specified. The faculty member shall submit any additional documentation he or she desires within 5 working days of receipt of the request.
- D. The FEC Chair shall not accept material after the deadline for submission of the IPR without approval of the FEC.

V. General Criteria

- A. Faculty responsibilities in the areas of teaching, service and scholarship are outlined in the CBA. The following criteria are intended as an elaboration of the CBA
 - 1. Evidence of teaching effectiveness:
 - a) Students' evaluation of the faculty member based on specific questions selected by the department should be provided for every course taught during the academic year (evaluations of summer and winter session courses or any course not part of his/her normal load may be included or excluded at the faculty member's option). At a minimum, the summarized results of these questions shall be included as evidence. The set of specific questions selected by the department shall be in

compliance with the teaching evaluation format adopted by the UFA-Administration Committee although a faculty member may use a different form that is approved by the A&F department.

- b) Student opinion gathered by the faculty member under evaluation from either present or former students. All opinions of teaching effectiveness must be documented and in a format such that the faculty member has a fair opportunity to confirm or refute such opinions.
 - c) Observations of teaching by peers and or the departmental chairperson. The Department Chairperson or a tenured faculty member assigned by the department chairperson, will conduct at least one observation and provide a written evaluation of all untenured faculty members prior to the candidate's application for tenure and promotion to the next level. A faculty member can request additional visits if desired. All formal visits will be scheduled in advance with the faculty member's approval. Evaluations will follow a formal rubric, and the rubric will be shared with faculty prior to classroom visits. Written evaluations will be made available to the FEC.
 - d) Other evidence of teaching effectiveness, which may include student performance on standardized tests, department or university teaching awards and other recognition.
 - e) Evidence of providing the appropriate level of rigor in classes in line with the department's goals of a high-quality education that allows students to successfully compete in the job market upon graduation and subsequently progress in their career.
 - f) Participation in General Education courses as opportunities arise.
 - g) Direction of student research with tangible outcomes such as publications or presentations.
2. Evidence of university, community, or professional service:
- a) Active participation in professional organization(s) including, but not limited to such matters as chairing discussant sessions at meetings, refereeing papers for presentation or publication, and serving as an officer or a committee member of a professional organization.
 - b) Providing continuing education activities, such as extension courses, workshops, and/or seminars for business and government personnel. For example, providing a continuing professional education course for CPAs.

- c) Rendering professional service as a member of private or public boards or committees.
- d) Speaking engagements related to one's professional field.
- e) Receipt of awards in recognition of professional accomplishments.
- f) Active and positive participation in the activities of the department and school, including but not limited to curriculum development and service on school/department committees.
- g) Active and positive participation on campus-wide faculty committees.
- h) Consulting which contributes to professional growth and/or enhancement of the University.
- i) Other significant public, community or university service which contributes to professional growth and/or enhancement of the University whether such activity is for compensation or not.

3. Evidence of scholarship:

- a) Publication of journal articles, books, cases, software, proceedings, articles, or monographs. When appropriate, work should be submitted to a blind, peer reviewed process. All faculty members are expected to have blind, peer reviewed publications. Other evidence of scholarship may include peer reviewed publications that are not blind reviewed and non-refereed publications. A publication can be in any widely available media.
- b) Receipt of grants or contracts for research or other scholarly activity.
- c) Professional research efforts incident to publication.
- d) Presentation of papers at meetings of professional organizations.
- e) Formal working papers reviewed by professionals outside the University.

VI. Definitions

The following are intended as an elaboration of the CBA.

- A. Terminal Degree.** A terminal degree for the Department is defined as an earned research doctorate in the faculty member's area of competence or the Juris Doctor.
- B. Professional Qualification.** Professional qualification is defined as appropriate professional experience. Examples include high-level corporate or government

experience relevant to the position, or unique experience in business or government, which provides the candidate with special qualifications.

Before offering employment to any individual who does not possess the appropriate research doctorate or the JD degree, the Department will determine if the candidate meets the criteria of having appropriate professional experience. This will be done by the department in consultation with the Dean and the Department Chair. Appropriate professional experience cannot be granted or earned while an employee of the University, except by taking leave to pursue such experience.

The concept of appropriate professional experience is not taken lightly by the department. It can only be granted for major and significant experience directly related to the responsibilities of the faculty member. The documentation required to support appropriate professional experience will vary with each individual depending on factors such as the organization in which the experience was acquired, the level of responsibility held in the organization, diversity, or experience and other factors. For this reason, a standard documentation cannot be specified which will fit all cases.

Prior to a consideration of appropriate professional experience, the department, the Department Chair, and the Dean will determine what documentation will be required. A statement specifying the requirements will be communicated to the candidate in writing so that the evidence may be returned prior to any action.

- C. Standards for Performance in Teaching.** Teaching is critical to the mission of the Department of Accounting and Finance. The department values teaching and considers effective teaching to be the primary obligation of all faculty in the department. Requests for promotions, tenure, normal and retention require evidence of effective performance in teaching.

Courses should be designed so that they are rigorous, challenging, and conducive to learning. Courses must also cover content outlined in the course learning outcomes. Interpretation of student evaluation scores should take in consideration mitigating factors such as average GPA for the class, class size, course level, and whether the class is required or optional. For example, a faculty member teaching a new course preparation would not be expected to have student ratings as high as in other circumstances. It is understood that given the same level of teaching effectiveness, evaluations will be poorer in a large lecture class than in a small discussion class, poorer in a required class than in an elective, poorer in a lower division class than in an upper-division class, and poorer in a class where the average grades are lower than in a class where the average grade is higher.

1. Levels of Teaching Activity. The activities below are not ranked within levels. If a faculty member has engaged in other forms of teaching activity, they may include them in their IPR and present an argument regarding the level of these activities. As with other activities, the FEC will review the evidence and assign the work to levels.

a) Level One (Includes, but is not limited to:)

- (1) Teaching a normal load (3:3) unless otherwise assigned by the Dean of the College of Business (course buyouts, medical/family leave reduction, etc.).
- (2) A normal teaching load typically includes 3 annual course preps unless otherwise assigned by the Dean of the College of Business.
- (3) Holding regular office hours (at least one hour per course per week).
- (4) Demonstrated willingness to mentor Accounting or Finance students (giving career advice, writing letters of recommendation, etc.).
- (5) Periodically updating or revising courses (e.g., incorporating new research into lectures, revising readings, developing new activities or assessments, etc.).
- (6) Quantitative student evaluations that are generally at or above the midpoint of the Likert scale. The FEC will pay close attention to student responses to the following statements:
 - (a) The course as a whole or general course quality was...
 - (b) The instructor's contribution to the course was...
 - (c) The instructor's effectiveness was.....
 - (d) The intellectual challenge was.....

b) Level Two (Includes, but is not limited to:)

- (1) Teaching or co-teaching an overload (above 3:3), whether compensated or uncompensated.
- (2) Substantially updating or revising courses (overhauling readings/book, organizational changes, major changes to assessments, etc.)
- (3) Authoring a publication with a current or former UM student.
- (4) Supervising one or more independent studies, or honors thesis.
- (5) Consistently receiving higher than normal teaching evaluations for the courses one teaches.
- (6) Teaching more than normal class preps as defined in level one above.
- (7) Taking on additional teaching tasks, such as new preps.
- (8) Participating in extraordinary professional development related to instruction such as authoring or co-authoring a textbook or similar level of work

c) Level Three (Includes but is not limited to:)

- (1) Receiving uniformly excellent teaching evaluations for the courses one teaches.
- (2) Winning a college-wide, UM, MUS, or scholarly association's teaching award.

(3) Receiving national recognition for teaching.

2. Normal Performance in Teaching. A “normal” ranking requires evidence of **all** teaching activities from Level One (except in exceptional circumstances) during the review period.
3. Above Normal Performance in Teaching. An “above normal” ranking requires evidence of **all** teaching activities from Level One during the review period **and** evidence of at least 1 teaching activity from Level 2 during the review period.
4. Outstanding Performance in Teaching. An “outstanding” ranking requires evidence of **all** teaching activities from Level One **and either** (a) evidence of 3 or more teaching activities from Level 2 **or** (b) evidence of 1 teaching activity from Level 3 during the review period.

D. Standards for Performance in Scholarly Activity. The definition of Normal Scholarship varies with the requested action and level of the faculty member and is outlined in the appropriate parts of Section VII. Any scholarly work that is directly related to the discipline of Business, Accounting, or Finance, can be used to demonstrate scholarly activity. Interdisciplinary work bridging disciplinary boundaries between Business and other academic fields shall be considered as directly related to the discipline of Business. However, since not all scholarly work is of the same quality, the FEC shall place the work in one of three levels listed below based upon the work's scholarly contribution and impact. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence of the scholarly work, to propose a level, and to provide documentation supporting the proposed level. The FEC shall review the evidence provided by the faculty member and use the guidelines below to assign scholarly work to levels.

1. Levels of Scholarly Activity. The activities below are not ranked within levels. Scholarly activity completed and accepted for publication but not yet published can be evaluated as if publication had taken place as long as the faculty member includes documentation of acceptance. It is possible that some scholarly activities may not be included in the items below. If a faculty member has engaged in other forms of scholarly activity, they may include them in their IPR and present an argument regarding the level of the activities. As with other activities, the FEC will review the evidence and assign the work to levels.

a) Level One (Includes, but is not limited to:)

- (1) Evidence of an active research program, including but not limited to advancement of working papers towards publication, distribution of working papers for review, submissions of research for conference presentations, and submissions of research for publication (and not yet accepted for presentation or publication). For non-tenured faculty, this should reflect reasonable progress toward promotion and tenure requirements (as outlined in 7.A-B).
- (2) Public presentation of research, at an external workshop or conference.

- (3) Solo or co-author of a peer reviewed journal publication.
- (4) Solo or co-author of a non-peer reviewed book chapter or article.
- (5) Co-editor of a book with an academic press (and did not contribute a chapter).
- (6) Author of a book review for a scholarly journal.
- (7) Author of a non-peer reviewed publication (for example, consulting and technical reports for local, state, regional commissions, agencies, and nongovernmental organizations).
- (8) Recipient of a College or UM research award.
- (9) Applied for an external grant (not necessarily awarded).

b) Level Two (Includes, but is not limited to:)

- (1) Solo or co-author of a peer reviewed article in a nationally respected journal.
- (2) Solo or co-author of multiple peer-reviewed articles in scholarly journals.
- (3) Publishing more frequently than typical.
- (4) Solo or co-author of a textbook.
- (5) Recipient of an external research award.

c) Level Three includes, but is not limited to:

- (1) Publication in the highest quality journals for one's field of research.
- (2) Publishing at a much higher rate than is typical.
- (3) Recipient of prestigious awards for one's scholarly work(s).
- (4) Recipient of a major competitive external grant (e.g., NSF, NIJ, etc.).

2. Normal Performance in Scholarly Activity. A "normal" ranking requires evidence of 1 scholarly activity from Level One during the review period. In addition, non-tenured faculty, or faculty at the assistant level, should show reasonable progress toward promotion and tenure requirements (as outlined in 7.A-B).
3. Above Normal Performance in Scholarly Activity. An "above normal" ranking requires evidence of 3 scholarly activities from Level One during the review period **or** evidence of 1 scholarly activity from Level Two during the review period.

4. Outstanding Performance in Scholarly Activity. One's scholarship shall be considered Outstanding if one far exceeds normal standards. An "outstanding" ranking requires evidence of 1 scholarly activity from Level Three during the review period **or** evidence of scholarly activities from Level One and Two exceeding normal and above normal activity.

E. Standards for Performance in Service. Each faculty member is expected to share in the load of COB and University service. Service to the profession and the community are also encouraged. The expected level of service varies by rank and requested action and is outlined in the appropriate parts of Section VII. However, since not all service work is the same, the FEC shall place service work in one of the three levels listed below based on its intensity and impact. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence of the service work, to propose a level, and to provide documentation supporting the proposed level. The FEC shall review the evidence provided by the faculty member and use the guidelines below to assign service work to levels.

1. Levels of Service. The activities below are not ranked within levels. If a faculty member has engaged in other forms of service, they may include them in their IPR and present an argument regarding the level of the activities. As with other activities, the FEC will review the evidence and assign the work to levels.

a) Level One includes, but is not limited to:

- (1) Participation in department, and college committees as assigned.
- (2) Participation in University committees commensurate with rank and in support of the department's mission and goals.
- (3) Presenting to local, statewide, or national nongovernmental organizations and governmental agencies.
- (4) Member of a local, statewide, or national nongovernmental organization's voluntary board that meets monthly or less and/or requires minimal workload outside of meetings.
- (5) Discussant for a conference panel or session.
- (6) Organizing a panel or session at a scholarly conference.
- (7) Faculty advisor for UM student group.
- (8) Peer reviewer for journals, textbooks, or book chapters.
- (9) Service in support of the Department's, COB's, and University's student recruitment efforts.

b) Level Two includes but is not limited to:

- (1) Chair departmental initiatives or projects (including chairing search committees).

- (2) Member of a campus-wide committee that meets weekly or biweekly and/or requires a moderate workload outside of meetings (ECOS, UFA, Unit Standards, ASCRC, etc.).
- (3) Member of a campus-wide committee that requires a significant one-time workload (Sabbatical, Fulbright, etc.).
- (4) Member of a local, statewide, or national nongovernmental organization's voluntary board that meets weekly or biweekly and/or requires moderate workload outside of meetings.
- (5) Member of a committee for a regional, national, or international scholarly association.
- (6) Member of editorial board or Associate Editor of a scholarly journal.
- (7) Winning a college-wide, UM, MUS, or scholarly association's service award.
- (8) Chair of departmental committees, as needed (e.g., FEC Chair).

c) Level Three includes, but is not limited to:

- (1) Member of a campus-wide committee that meets weekly or biweekly and/or requires significant workload outside of meetings (President's cabinet, ASCRC, etc.).
- (2) Member of local, statewide, or national nongovernmental organization's voluntary board that meets weekly or biweekly and/or requires significant workload outside of meetings (and the workload is not research).
- (3) Elected officer for regional, national, or international scholarly association.
- (4) Editor-in-Chief of scholarly journal.
- (5) Organizing a multi-day conference.

2. Normal Performance in Service. For tenure-track faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor, a "normal" ranking requires serving on departmental committees as assigned during the review period (VI.E.1.a(1) above). For tenured and tenure tracked faculty at the rank of Associate or Full Professor, a "normal" ranking requires serving on departmental committees during the review period (VI.E.1.a(1) above) **and** evidence of 1 additional service activity from Level One during the review period.
3. Above Normal Performance in Service. An "above normal" ranking requires serving on departmental committees during the review period **and either** additional evidence of service activities from Level One in excess of "normal," **or** evidence of 1 service activity from Level Two during the review period.

4. Outstanding Performance in Service. One's service shall be considered "outstanding" if one's service far exceeds a "normal" ranking as outlined above. An "outstanding" ranking requires serving on departmental committees during the review period **and either** (a) evidence of additional service at Level One and Two which far exceed the level of "normal" **or** (b) evidence of 1 service activity from Level Three during the review period in addition to "normal" department and college service.

VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE

A. Promotion and change in status.

Promotion to any rank will depend upon attainment of the academic qualification and an academic record appropriate to that rank. Promotion is not, in other words, merely a matter of years in rank. It is the faculty member's responsibility to apply for promotion in a timely manner, in accordance with the provisions of the CBA. Promotion to any higher rank or award of tenure requires having demonstrated achievements in accordance with the standards for teaching, scholarship, and service specified in Section VI above. Receiving normal evaluations as per the CBA during the evaluation period is not sufficient evidence to automatically result in a FEC recommendation for promotion to the next level or award of tenure. In addition to the criteria listed in the CBA the following will apply as appropriate:

1. Change of status from Instructor or Visiting to a tenure-track Professor

There are two ways in which a visiting or adjunct instructor may become a tenure-track professor: 1) if the individual is conditionally hired through a national search into a tenure-track assistant professor position after having completed all requirements for the terminal degree except completion of the final document (all but dissertation, A.B.D.) and then receives the terminal degree or 2) if the instructor or visitor is selected for a vacant assistant professor position advertised through a national search. In the first case, the conditions for conversion from instructor to assistant professor are specified in the offer letter.

2. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

Except in unusual circumstances, four (4) or more years of full-time service in rank as assistant professor are required prior to the date of promotion (application may be made during the fourth year in rank) (CBA 10.110.1b). All candidates for promotion to Associate Professor must present evidence of effective teaching, satisfactory performance in scholarship and satisfactory performance in service as outlined by the following criteria:

- a) Teaching: All candidates for promotion to Associate Professor must present evidence of effective performance in teaching as described in VI C. 1. The faculty member should show a teaching record ranked by the

FEC as “above normal” or “outstanding” at least once during the service period.

- b) Scholarly Activity. For promotion to Associate Professor, satisfactory performance in scholarship will generally be evidenced by three or more refereed journal publications while at the assistant rank, related to the candidate’s field of expertise and be evidenced by “other related activity” demonstrating potential for future professional growth. At least one of the three articles must be published in a quality nationally respected journal (a Level Two scholarly contribution – see section VI.D.1.b above). In recognition of the increased time and effort required to publish in premier journals, a publication in a clear A-level journal (A Level Three Scholarly contribution – see section VI.D.1.c above) will count as much as two lower-level, quality nationally respected publications. Evidence for journal quality must be provided by the candidate. Evidence of “other related activity” may include non-refereed publication in journals and conference proceedings, presenting papers at conferences, developing cases or books for publication, and developing software or other innovative materials for publication.
- c) Service. For promotion to Associate Professor, satisfactory performance in service requires active and constructive participation in COB committees as opportunities and needs arise, maintaining at least a “normal” service record (see section VI.E.2) While service on UM level committees and other external service is also appropriate and appreciated, it is not necessary at this level.

3. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor

Except in unusual circumstances, five (5) or more years of full-time service in rank as an associate professor are required prior to the date of promotion (application may be made during the fifth year) CBA 10.110.1c). The character of the service in rank as associate professor shall be such that there is a clear demonstration of professional growth and an increasingly valuable contribution to the University. Receiving normal evaluations as per the CBA during prior evaluation periods is not sufficient evidence to automatically warrant promotion to Full Professor. All candidates for promotion to Associate Professor must present evidence of effective teaching, satisfactory performance in scholarship and satisfactory performance in service as outlined by the following criteria:

- a) Teaching: For promotion to Full Professor, satisfactory performance in the area of teaching shall be defined in terms of increasing value to the University. All candidates for promotion to Associate Professor must present evidence of effective performance in teaching as described in VI.C.1. This will include a record of teaching evaluated at least once by the FEC as “above normal” or “outstanding” for the period of

evaluation.

- b) Scholarly Activity. For promotion to Full Professor, satisfactory performance in scholarship will generally be evidenced by three or more refereed journal publications while at the Associate Professor rank, related to the candidate's field of expertise, or the equivalent in other areas of scholarship) and service. At least one of the three articles must be published in a quality nationally respected journal (a Level Two scholarly contribution – see section VI.D.1.b above). In recognition of the increased time and effort required to publish in premier journals, a publication in a clear A-level journal (A Level Three Scholarly contribution – see section VI.D.1.c above) will count as much as two lower-level, quality nationally respected publications. Evidence for journal quality must be provided by the candidate
- c) Service. For promotion to Full Professor, the character of the service in rank as Associate Professor shall be such that there is a clear demonstration of professional growth and an increasingly valuable contribution to the College and the University. The faculty member should show a service record ranked by the FEC as “above normal” or “outstanding” at least once during the service period.

B. Tenure

Granting of tenure reflects not only past performance, but also potential for significant future growth. The Department does not require an external review for the award of tenure. However, demonstration of efforts to develop a positive reputation beyond the University of Montana is required. Associate Professors must show satisfactory progress and potential for promotion to Full Professor. Full Professors must show continued productivity in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Receiving normal evaluations as per the CBA during prior evaluation periods is not sufficient evidence to automatically warrant tenure. Satisfactory performance in teaching, research and service necessary for tenure requires the applicant to exceed the normal performance level in one or more areas. The applicant may provide evidence of satisfactory performance as allowed by the CBA.

The attention of those faculty members concerned with tenure is directed to the CBA regarding “Eligibility for Tenure Application,”(CBA 9.310) “The Tenure Application,”(CBA 9.320) “Limitations on Tenure Awards,”(CBA 9.330) “Rights of Tenured Appointees,” (CBA 9.300) and “Failure to Attain Tenure,”(CBA 9.340) as well as the sections in the CBA and this document which cover criteria, documentation and procedure. Particular note should be taken of the statement in the CBA, which reads in part, “It shall be the responsibility of the eligible faculty member to initiate the application for tenure... (for example see CBA 9.320 in the 2019 CBA or the appropriate section of an updated contract)”

C. Merit Recognition and Outstanding Performance Award.

Merit recognition is covered in the CBA. To be eligible for merit or and Outstanding Performance Award, a faculty member must have demonstrated “above normal”

performance in at least two (2) of the three (3) areas: teaching, scholarship, or service; or “outstanding performance” or special recognition in at least one (1) of these areas, and at least normal performance in the remaining area or areas of assigned duties. Receipt of a merit award does not provide sufficient evidence that the requirements of promotion and tenure have been met.

D. Normal.

The performance of a majority of faculty members will generally be evaluated as “Normal.” They will be expected to grow in value to the institution through continued satisfactory teaching, scholarship, and service (and will be rewarded with a normal increment to their salary.) (See sections 6.C-E above)

E. Less-Than-Normal Increment.

Less-than-normal increment is covered in the CBA and is recommended for either the absence of any performance or poor performance of assigned responsibilities within the scope of employment. Failure to submit an IPR for evaluation by a faculty member, when required (see CBA 10.210, 10.220), is grounds for a less-than-normal increment.

F. Retention.

The FEC shall make a recommendation concerning retention of non-tenured faculty members that are covered by the CBA. The following statements in this section are intended as amplifications of the CBA language.

The documentation and evidence submitted by the faculty member in conformance with the CBA and this document also will be used by the FEC in consideration of retention and non-reappointment. As indicated in the CBA (for example see CBA 10.230 in the 2012 CBA or the appropriate section of an updated contract.), the FEC may also receive or seek evidence from other sources and may request additional documentation from the faculty member being evaluated.

The procedure used for making a recommendation concerning retention and non-reappointment will be the same as provided in the CBA and this document for making recommendations concerning tenure, salary and promotion. That is, satisfactory performance in the areas of teaching, service and scholarship is required.

The procedure used for making a recommendation concerning retention and non-reappointment of non-tenurable faculty will be the same as provided in the CBA and this document. That is, a normal level of performance in teaching as defined by the CBA and this document is required.

G. Non-reappointment.

Non-reappointment of a probationary faculty member (tenure track or non-tenurable) will be recommended when the FEC makes a judgment that the performance of the faculty member is less than normal with respect to the standards applicable to such

faculty member given his/her rank for example see CBA 10.110.3C in the 2019 CBA or the appropriate section of an updated contract.

- H.** Within three days of knowledge of the vote, a faculty member has the right to change his/her requested action in the event of a negative vote by the FEC, provided a majority of the FEC has supported the alternative action.