SECTION 1
ORGANIZATION

Preamble. The College of Business of Southern Illinois University Carbondale (hereinafter referred to as the “College”) is dedicated to high quality business education serving domestic and international students so they may compete effectively in the global marketplace. The College administers programs of instruction to promote the professional and intellectual development of its faculty and students and support advancement of the University.

Section 1.01. Mission Statement of the College. The College shall maintain a Mission Statement that will be reviewed and revised when necessary under direction of the Dean. Any proposed revisions to the Mission Statement must be approved by a majority of the voting faculty of the College present at the meeting at which the vote occurs.

Section 1.02. Organization. The College consists of the academic departments of Finance, Management, and Marketing, a School of Accountancy, and such research centers or institutes that may be established by, or affiliated with, the College in accordance with the Bylaws and Statutes of the Board of Trustees for Southern Illinois University (hereafter referred to as the “Board”).

Section 1.03. Dean. The chief administrative officer of the College shall be the Dean. The voting faculty of the College, operating through an ad hoc committee in cooperation with the Provost, shall take steps leading to the nomination of a person or persons to fill any vacancy in this office as provided by the resolutions of the University Faculty Senate and the Board.

Section 1.04. Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, and other College-wide Officers. There shall be such Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, or other administrative Officers for the College as may be established from time to time by the Dean in accordance with the Board.

a. Individuals in these positions serve at the pleasure of the Dean. The Dean is responsible for annual performance reviews of these individuals based upon performance of job duties listed in their job descriptions as well as other duties assigned by the Dean.

b. When a vacancy exists in any such office, the voting faculty of the College, operating through an ad hoc committee in cooperation with the Dean, shall take steps leading to the nomination of a person or persons to fill any such vacancy.

Section 1.05. Administrative Officers of Units Ancillary to the College. The faculty shall take steps leading to a recommendation to the Dean of a person(s) to head ancillary units of the College.
a. Individuals serving in these positions serve at the pleasure of the Dean, who shall evaluate their performance annually according to duties described by their job description and other duties the Dean may assign.

b. Each Administrative Officer of a unit ancillary to the College shall organize the office and shall appoint, subject to confirmation by the Dean, such assistants as the Administrative Officer deems proper.

Section 1.06. Department Chairs and Directors. The chief administrative officer of an academic department shall be the chair of that department. The chief administrative officer of the School of Accountancy shall be the Director of that School.

a. The voting faculty of each academic department, or school, operating through an ad hoc committee elected for that purpose, shall take steps leading to a recommendation to the Dean of a person(s) to fill a vacancy in such offices consistent with the Board.

b. Department chairs and directors serve at the pleasure of the Dean. They are reviewed annually by the Dean on the basis of their job descriptions and other duties assigned by the Dean.

Section 1.07. Faculty of the College. The faculty of the College (hereafter called “Faculty”) shall consist of all individuals on appointment at the University holding academic rank as professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, or lecturers in an academic department or the School of Accountancy within the College.

Section 1.08. Chair of the Faculty. The Dean shall be the Chair of the Faculty and act as presiding officer at all meetings, unless a conflict of interest arises.

Section 1.09. Secretary of the College. Each year at a Fall meeting voting Faculty shall elect, from its membership, a Secretary who shall prepare minutes of all meetings of the Faculty, safeguard all records of the Faculty, and perform other duties as indicated in this document or which may be assigned by the Faculty.

Section 1.10. Parliamentarian of the College. Each year at a Fall meeting voting Faculty shall elect, from its membership, a Parliamentarian who shall perform the usual duties of a Parliamentarian and interpret, voluntarily or upon request, the provisions of this document to the Faculty. The Parliamentarian’s interpretations may be overridden by a two-thirds majority of the voting Faculty present at the meeting.

Section 1.11. Business Leadership Council. The BLC has the responsibility to develop and enhance the College through their input and activities. The BLC shall be composed of members appointed or elected by their respective Registered Student Organization (RSO). Each RSO shall be entitled to one seat on the council. The BLC shall meet with the College administrator responsible for student affairs to discuss issues, plan activities, and evaluate progress on initiatives. Meeting frequency shall be determined by majority vote of the BLC. In addition, the BLC shall meet at least annually with the Dean.
SECTION 2
GOVERNANCE

Section 2.01. Responsibilities of Faculty. Faculty shall have direct or shared responsibility in areas including, but not limited to the following:

a. Initiation, formulation, approval, and continuous improvement of all educational policies and procedures involving admissions, retention, academic advisement, and graduation requirements for students of the College.

b. Curriculum requirements and assessment of learning for all degree programs and interdisciplinary programs of the College.

c. Policies involving matters of the academic programs, discipline of students, and recognition of students for academic awards.

d. Continuous review and improvement of academic matters including setting minimum standards for merit, promotion, and tenure.

e. Advising the Dean with regard to College administrative matters, including budget; resource allocation; planning; and administrative personnel.

Section 2.02. Establishing Policies. The Faculty shall formulate rules and procedures in a manner consistent with this document, the Board, and all relevant collective bargaining agreements. Any action duly taken by the Faculty with regard to policies or procedures shall be forwarded to the Dean by the Secretary, and shall become effective unless vetoed by the Dean within two weeks after it shall have been presented to the Dean. Any such veto by the Dean must be made in total and must be accompanied by an explanation from the Dean; it may not involve a partial acceptance or rejection or any change unless permission for such is specified in the original action. In order to override any such veto, it is necessary for the motion to be re-passed without any change by a two-thirds majority of the voting Faculty present at a meeting that has been called for that purpose and presided over by the Secretary.

Section 2.03. Voting Rights of the Faculty. The voting Faculty of the College shall consist of all Faculty on full-time appointment with the University, who hold permanent tenure or continuing appointment in their respective ranks. University faculty members who have voting privileges in any other academic department of the University and Administrative Professionals shall have no voting rights.

Section 2.04. Faculty Voting Rights within Departments. With respect to internal departmental affairs, each academic department of the College shall determine the membership of its own unit, but department members represented at College meetings or meetings of any two or more academic departments shall be consistent with the definition of Faculty established by Section 1.07 above.

Section 2.05. Meetings of College Faculty. Regular meetings of the faculty of the College shall be held at times and locations determined by the Dean, but at least once each Fall term.
a. Written notices of all regular meetings, including copies of all materials to be considered, shall be sent by the Dean or, when appropriate, by the Secretary and distributed to each member of the faculty of the College at least five (5) school days before the date of such meeting. School days are hereinafter defined as any day classes or examinations are conducted during a school term, exclusive of Saturday, Sunday, and inter-session periods.

b. Rules of procedures at all regular meetings shall follow the most recent edition of Robert’s Rules of Order, unless contrary to this document, as interpreted by the Parliamentarian.

c. An attendance greater than 50% of voting Faculty shall constitute a quorum at any regular meetings. Any member of the voting Faculty who is on an approved leave of absence, as that term is defined by the University, and any member who relinquishes the right to vote by means of a written waiver to the Dean or Secretary shall not be counted in determining a quorum at any meetings. In the absence of a quorum, the presiding officer shall adjourn the meeting and may call another meeting, giving notice as provided above.

d. The call for each regular meeting shall carry with it an agenda of business to be transacted. No votes shall be taken on any topic not specifically listed on the agenda, including those designated “new business,” except by consent of a two-thirds majority of the voting faculty present at the meeting.

e. The Dean, in consultation with department chair/director of each of the academic units, shall prepare and distribute to each member of the faculty of the College an official list of all members of the faculty of the College that shall indicate which persons are voting faculty members and the name of the academic department to which each is assigned.

f. Each voting member shall have one vote, and such votes shall not, under any circumstances, be by proxy or by mail ballot. Voting shall be by a show of hands, except in those instances wherein a secret ballot is required for by the Operating Paper, or when a voting member specifically requests a secret ballot.

g. A deferred vote on any matter except a parliamentary interpretation may be taken by a vote if a majority of the voting faculty in attendance agrees thereto. The location of the polling place for a deferred vote shall be the Dean’s office and the conduct of the vote shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary. The vote shall not be held sooner than the fifth school day following the meeting at which the motion was made.

h. All votes involving personnel conducted at Faculty meetings must be made by secret ballot.

i. The Secretary and two voting members of the faculty chosen by the Secretary shall conduct the secret balloting and present the results to the Dean or presiding officer. Before secret balloting is undertaken, the Secretary or the Secretary’s designated representatives shall announce the number of qualified voters. If, under any circumstances, the presiding officer is unable to verify the results based on the procedures prescribed above, the Dean or presiding officer shall declare the vote invalid and call for
a re-vote. The Dean or presiding officer shall vote only in the event of a tie on any matter, including a deferred vote.

Section 2.06. Special Meetings. Special meetings may be called by the Dean or the Secretary at any time at the discretion of either officer. Upon petition of at least 20% of the voting faculty, special meetings must be called by the Secretary of the faculty and the Secretary shall be the presiding officer at such meetings.

Section 2.07. Standing Committees of the Faculty of the College. The faculty of the College shall maintain the standing committees described in Sections 2.08 through 2.15 below. Unless otherwise specified, each standing committee shall be composed of one member elected from and by each of the academic departments of the College and the School of Accountancy. Eligibility for election is limited to faculty holding the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor, and having at least one academic year’s service at SIU prior to joining the committee.

a. Terms of office of each member of a standing committee shall be three (3) years, with terms staggered, and members may succeed themselves.

b. Committee members who are unable to attend meetings may send a designee with full power to represent the absent committee member in all matters.

c. In the event a committee member’s service should be terminated, the member’s Department shall immediately elect a new member to complete the unexpired term.

d. Unless otherwise specified, a Chairperson and a Secretary shall be chosen from membership of the committee by a majority vote of the committee, and those officers shall serve in that capacity for one year.

Section 2.08. Undergraduate Programs Committee. The UPC represents Faculty interests with regard to undergraduate student affairs. This committee has primary oversight responsibility for (a) development and delivery of the undergraduate degree programs offered by the College, (b) establishing assurance of learning procedures and metrics for undergraduate courses offered by the College, (c) monitoring the effectiveness of information technology platforms used for undergraduate courses, and (d) establishing criteria for and determining recipients of undergraduate program teaching awards.

In addition to elected faculty, the UPC shall also include two undergraduate student members, who have the same voting rights as faculty members. Student members of the UPC shall be selected by a majority vote of the Business Leadership Council (see Section 1.11). Student members of the UPC must be enrolled in the College, have second semester junior year standing, and have a cumulative grade point average of at least 2.5 for all coursework in the College. The Dean may also appoint additional Faculty and Administrative Professionals as ex-officio, non-voting members of the UPC.
Section 2.09. Masters Programs Committee. The MPC represents Faculty interests with regard to Masters student affairs. This committee has primary oversight responsibility for (a) development and delivery of Masters degree programs offered by the College, (b) establishing assurance of learning procedures and metrics for Masters courses offered by the College, (c) monitoring the effectiveness of information technology platforms used for Masters courses, and (d) establishing criteria for and determining recipients of Masters program teaching awards.

a. The Dean will appoint a director of Masters Programs who will serve as an ex-officio, non-voting member of the MPC.

b. The Director of the School of Accountancy will appoint a director of Masters Programs in Accounting who will serve as an ex-officio, non-voting member of the MPC.

c. Faculty members of the MPC must meet the criteria for voting Faculty.

d. The MPC shall also include two graduate student members, who have the same voting rights as Faculty members. One student member of the MPC shall be appointed annually by the director of the Masters program, and the other student member shall be appointed annually by the director of the Masters programs in Accounting.

e. The Dean may also appoint additional Faculty and Administrative Professionals as ex-officio, non-voting members of the MPC.

f. If twenty percent of voting Faculty object in writing to any decisions made by the MPC within one month after the circulation of the minutes of the meeting at which that decision was made (except when such decision was made within the last month of the Spring semester or within the Summer session, in which case the period of objection shall be within one month after the beginning of Fall semester), the MPC Chair shall submit the issue to the voting Faculty for a vote by means of a written ballot. Such ballot shall be conducted no sooner than two weeks, and no later than three weeks after receiving the objection. If a majority of the voting Faculty vote against the decision made by the MPC, the decision shall be rescinded.

g. The Faculty is entitled to receive minutes of all MPC meetings, as well as information regarding agenda items for future meetings.

Section 2.10. Doctoral Programs Committee. The DPC represents Faculty interests with regard to Ph.D. student affairs. This committee has primary oversight responsibility for (a) development and delivery of the doctoral degree programs offered by the College, (b) establishing assurance of learning procedures and metrics for doctoral courses offered by the College, (c) monitoring the effectiveness of information technology platforms used by doctoral students, and (d) establishing criteria for and determining recipients of all doctoral student awards.

a. The Dean will appoint a director of Doctoral Programs who will serve as an ex-officio, non-voting member of the DPC.
b. Voting members of the DPC include the doctoral program coordinators for Finance, Management, Marketing, and the School of Accountancy, and a doctoral student who is currently eligible to be funded by the College.

c. The student member of the DPC shall be selected annually by majority vote of all Ph.D. students who are currently eligible to be funded by the College.

d. The Dean may also appoint additional Faculty and Administrative Professionals as ex-officio, non-voting members of the DPC.

e. If twenty percent of voting Faculty object in writing to any decisions made by the DPC within one month after the circulation of the minutes of the meeting at which that decision was made (except when such decision was made within the last month of the Spring semester or within the Summer session, in which case the period of objection shall be within one month after the beginning of Fall semester), the DPC Chair shall submit the issue to the voting Faculty for a vote by means of a written ballot. Such ballot shall be conducted no sooner than two weeks, and no later than three weeks after receiving the objection. If a majority of the voting Faculty vote against the decision made by the DPC, the decision shall be rescinded.

f. The Faculty is entitled to receive minutes of all DPC meetings, as well as information regarding agenda items for future meetings.

Section 2.11. Faculty Policy Committee. The FPC provides an organized voice for Faculty in advising the Faculty and the Dean on questions of policies and their application. The Committee is responsible for presenting motions to the faculty to amend the College Operating Paper. The Committee shall entertain recommendations for amendment from individual faculty members, other College Standing Committees, and the Dean. The Faculty Policy Committee will review changes to policies and procedures recommended by the Dean and the Executive Committee prior to their implementation. As such, the Faculty Policy Committee also serves as advisory to the Dean on such matters. Items will be placed on the Committee agenda by the committee Chair, in consultation with the Dean. Any member of the Committee may petition the committee Chair to place an item on the agenda. The committee Chair will provide a period report at least once per year of any requests for items to be placed on the agenda in which the committee Chair did not concur. In addition to faculty members, the Dean or Dean’s designee serves as an ex officio, non-voting member of the Committee.

Section 2.12. Promotion and Tenure Committee. The PTC advises the Dean with regard to Faculty being considered for promotion and/or tenure. Eligibility for election to the PTC shall be limited to faculty holding tenure and rank of Professor. Should an academic department have no member at rank of Professor, faculty holding rank of Associate Professor shall be eligible for election. Members of the PTC may not appoint a designee to attend in their absence.

Section 2.13. Differential Tuition Committee. The DTC advises the Dean on issues relating to the use of funds generated by differential tuition in the College. Specifically, the Differential Tuition Committee is charged to assess and evaluate the needs specific to students of the College, consistent with the mission and program goals of the College and University. Members
of the DTC shall be appointed by the Dean or his/her designee. The DTC shall be composed of at least one faculty member, at least three undergraduate students, at least one MBA student, and at least one MAcc student. One of the undergraduate students should be a student in the Undergraduate Online Degree Completion Program, if one is available to serve. The Dean may also appoint other individuals as ex-officio, non-voting members of the DTC.

Section 2.14. Faculty Research Committee. The FRC establishes criteria for and oversees selection of recipients of (a) awards for Faculty research productivity, (b) research grants to Faculty, and (c) financial research support for Faculty. This committee also establishes, monitors, and maintains academic journal rankings used to evaluate the research productivity of Faculty when awarding merit raises, promotion and tenure, research awards, or financial research support.

Section 2.15. Assessment of Learning Committee. The ALC oversees the collection of metrics for assessment of learning that have been established by the UPC, MPC, and DPC. This committee has primary oversight responsibility for (a) reporting results of assessments to the Faculty, (b) monitoring Faculty response to learning deficiencies illuminated by those assessments, (c) evaluating the effectiveness of changes made by Faculty to improve learning, and (d) ensuring that assessment processes in the College comply with requirements of organizations that provide accreditation for the College.

Section 2.16. Other Ad Hoc Committees. The Faculty may establish any other ad hoc committees it deems appropriate. Ad hoc committees of the Faculty shall be established by a majority vote of the Faculty. Each ad hoc committee, except as otherwise specified in the motion establishing the committee, shall be composed of one member selected from and by the Department of Finance, Department of Management, Department of Marketing, and the School of Accountancy. In consultation with the Faculty Policy Committee, the Dean may appoint ad hoc advisory committees who serve at the pleasure of the Dean.

Section 2.17. Executive Committee. The EC advises the Dean on strategic and administrative issues. The Dean shall serve as Chair of the EC. Members include chairpersons from Finance, Management, and Marketing departments, the Director of the School of Accountancy, and others designated by the Dean.
SECTION 3
ADMINISTRATION

Section 3.01. Appointments, Promotions, and Conferring of Tenure. The department chair/director, after such formal balloting as the department may deem appropriate, shall make recommendations to the Dean with respect to appointments, promotions, and conferring of tenure. The department chair/director shall present the results of the balloting to the department and to the Dean at the time of the recommendation. Criteria for evaluation of Faculty for promotion and tenure are contained in Addendum B Minimum Standards and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure.

Section 3.02. Faculty Workload. Faculty workload assignments shall consist of teaching, research/creative activity, and service as defined by Collective Bargaining Agreements with the SIUC Faculty Association and the SIUC Non-tenure Track Faculty Association that have been approved by the Board and are currently in force. Workload assignments shall be based upon a workload equivalent of twenty-four (24) credit hours of teaching per academic year, excluding office hours and course assignments compensated as an overload.

a. Faculty in the Finance, Management, and Marketing departments, and the School of Accountancy shall meet with their chair/director to negotiate workload assignments as specified in Addendum A Section 2: Negotiating Faculty Roles.

b. Changes in a final workload assignment can be made only for a subsequent change in circumstances, including death or disability of a Faculty member, employment of new Faculty, the closing of previously scheduled courses, level of external funding from grants, increase or decrease in enrollment of assigned courses, and reduction in total revenue, among others.

Section 3.03. Evaluation of faculty for merit salary increases. Criteria for the evaluation of Faculty for merit salary increases are contained in Addendum A Merit Salary System.

Section 3.04. Performance Review and Evaluation of the Dean. The performance of the Dean is to be reviewed and evaluated formally every five years, except that one informal, internal review will be conducted after the first three years. These reviews are conducted under the direction of the Secretary of the faculty of the College according to established College and University procedures.

a. The Dean is evaluated according to the job description under which he or she was originally hired.

b. The Secretary shall devise an evaluation form that includes at least one global, unambiguous measurement of the Dean’s performance, such as “acceptable/unacceptable.”

c. The Secretary shall provide the Faculty with the outcome of the review in a formal report distributed no later than April 15 of the academic year in which the review takes place. The faculty shall meet between April 25 and May 10 to discuss the Dean’s performance.
The Secretary shall call and preside over the faculty meeting, and the Secretary shall have sole responsibility for any vote.

d. The outcome of any vote shall be reported to the Faculty and forwarded to the Provost.

e. The Faculty may petition the Provost for a special review. A vote representing two-thirds (2/3) of the faculty is required to support any such petition.

Section 3.05. Interim or Acting Dean. When the Provost determines that the Dean’s position will become vacant, the Provost shall direct the Faculty to conduct an internal search for either an acting or interim dean. The term “acting” is appropriate when an administrator steps down for a period of time with the intention of returning to the position. The title “interim” is appropriate when the College is between permanent administrators. The Associate Dean will form an ad hoc search committee of Faculty and Administrative Professionals containing equal representation from each academic department in the College. Any tenured faculty member with rank of at least Associate Professor may be nominated by written notice to the search committee. The search committee shall review the nominations and make a recommendation for an interim/acting dean to the Provost, who then makes the appointment.

Section 3.06. Interim or Acting Department Chair or Director. Should circumstances necessitate the appointment of an acting, or temporary, academic department chair, such temporary appointment shall follow the same procedures as in the nomination of a department chair/director. However, these provisions are not intended to preclude the informal designation by a chair of a person as “acting chair”/director to perform the duties of the chair during the chair’s absence.

a. The department chair/director may designate an “acting chair/director” for a period of less than one week (five school days).

b. The department chair/director may designate an “acting chair/director” for a period of more than five school days, but no more than 30 days. However, such appointment is subject to approval by the Dean.

c. If a chair/director is absent for more than 30 days, then an acting chair/director must be elected by majority vote of Faculty in the department. However, such appointment is subject to approval by the Dean.

Section 3.07. Departmental Operating Papers. Departments of Finance, Management, Marketing, and the School of Accountancy have the right to develop their own operating papers. Operating papers of individual departments must be consistent with the College operating paper and the Board.

Section 3.08. Effective Date. This document shall become effective on the date of its passage by a majority of the voting Faculty.

a. When adopted, this document supersedes any and all constitutions, rules, regulations, working papers and bylaws previously adopted for the College.
b. Any proposed amendment to the operating paper must be presented for discussion at a special or regular meeting of the faculty of the College, provided it has been stated in full in the written notice of the meeting. The vote on any amendment shall be by secret ballot. Amendments shall become effective upon the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the voting Faculty present at the meeting at which the vote occurs and approval by the Dean and the Chancellor or the Chancellor’s designee. Disputes over amendments shall be processed according to provisions as set forth in the applicable collective bargaining agreement.

As amended by the faculty April 26, 2012
41 faculty members were eligible to vote.
The following votes were cast: 36 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstain.

Amended December 15, 1998
Amended: May 5, 2000
Amended: April 11, 2001
ADDENDUM A
MERIT SALARY SYSTEM

The College of Business (hereafter referred to as the College) is committed to excellence in teaching, research and service. This document is a description of a merit system designed to encourage faculty to achieve high standards of performance in these areas, to recognize accomplishment in achieving these standards and to foster the professional development of the College’s faculty.

Since the College, as a whole, is committed to excellence in teaching, research and service, and since faculty differ in terms of their specific strengths and interests, it is recognized that the overall mission of the college will be fulfilled by allowing individual faculty members to negotiate roles which will differ depending upon individual strengths, interests, and development needs. The merit system, therefore, is designed so as to maximize the human resource talents of the faculty, collectively, in order to achieve both personal and organizational goals.

While recognizing the concept of differential contributions by faculty, the interrelated nature of teaching, research and service should be noted. This relationship implies that, for the most part, all faculty would participate in, and contribute to, all three areas -- albeit in different proportions. A certain minimum accomplishment should be expected in each of the areas, but the merit evaluation system shall have sufficient flexibility to accommodate those instances where outstanding performance in one or two areas can offset a lesser contribution to the other(s).
ADDENDUM A SECTION 1
MERIT SYSTEM COMPONENTS

Section A.01.01. Areas of Responsibility. In order to actualize the merit system of evaluation and rewards, it is necessary to identify those primary areas in which performance will be evaluated and to describe distinct merit categories.

The purpose of this section is to articulate the three major components (teaching, research, and service) of the professional position. Each is described in terms of the types of activities which they constitute. The activities listed should be considered representative, not exhaustive. Further, they are not listed to imply that all faculty must engage in all activities within each category.

Section A.01.02. Teaching Contribution. To contribute to the College’s classroom instruction program, a faculty member must be proficient in communicating ideas. The components of the instructional role include such activities as: (1) classroom instruction; (2) curriculum development; (3) coordinating multi-section courses; (4) counseling with students outside the classroom and involvement with student organizations; (5) serving as chairperson or member of doctoral dissertation committees and guiding independent research; (6) preparation of course materials including textbooks, case books, technical notes and computer exercises; and, (7) preparation and submission of teaching-related grant applications, even in cases where the grant is not awarded but the activity involved a substantial commitment of time and effort on the part of the faculty member.

Section A.01.03. Research Contributions. The College accepts a broad interpretation of research to include basic and applied, theoretical and empirical, and qualitative as well as quantitative methods or approaches. National recognition for research contributions, regardless of individual research method, is a desirable goal. Indeed, examples of desirable results of that research would include: (1) publication, i.e., disseminating research contributions in scholarly journals, books, monographs, and special reports (in evaluating research, the quantity and quality of publications as well as the author’s role should be taken into consideration); (2) presentation of papers and reports of research to regional, national, and international professional groups; (3) preparation and submission of research-related grant applications, even in cases where the grant is not awarded but the activity involved a substantial commitment of time and effort on the part of the faculty member; (4) participation in special research projects, e.g., grants or other funded research; and (5) leadership in the development of cooperative research programs involving other faculty members or graduate students.

Other types of activities which demonstrate active involvement in the research process might include the preparation of working papers; presentations at research seminars with doctoral students, faculty and others; and offering special courses designed to stimulate research efforts. Such activities, while not necessarily leading to publication, are important to the research environment within the College and the University.

Section A.01.04. Service Activities. Service involves the faculty member’s contribution to the well-being of the College, the University, his/her profession, and the community. Service to the College and University includes participation in College programs, student activities, alumni activities, committee work, and the preparation and submission of service-related grant
applications when such activity involves a substantial commitment of time on the part of the faculty member. Service in one’s profession can be demonstrated by contribution to, and leadership of, professional organizations. Community service encompasses those activities which make a contribution to the public interest, e.g., Small Business Development Center projects, BRMSI activities, CMED seminars, and involvement in civic work.

Whether consulting engagements and participation in educational programs will be recognized for merit salary purposes depends on the contributions these activities make to the faculty member’s effectiveness in teaching, research, and the college’s mission. Care must be taken that such activities do not diminish a faculty member’s basic obligations to teaching and research. University guidelines on extra compensation activities must be observed.

Section A.01.05. Merit Categories. The merit evaluation system involves four levels of performance. These are described as follows:

a. Exceptional Performance – This category is for those who present compelling evidence of excellence in the performance of their assigned duties and responsibilities. This category is reserved for performance readily documented as being truly outstanding and, therefore, is not often attained.

b. Good Performance – This category, while not reflecting exceptional performance, clearly involves a high quality of contribution. It is reserved for those whose performance has been sufficient to distinguish it from what is an expected level of quality in meeting assigned responsibilities.

c. Acceptable Performance – This category reflects a performance level that would by the minimum expectation for faculty in the College. It describes an acceptable execution of assigned duties and responsibilities.

d. Unacceptable Performance – Those performing at this level have demonstrated a serious shortcoming in fulfilling the requirements in assigned duties and responsibilities. This category is for those failing to provide evidence of at least acceptable performance. Faculty who receive this evaluation should be aware of a deficiency in their performance. Careful attention to the specific indicators which lead to an evaluation is crucial. It is recognized, however, that differences might exist across disciplines and/or departments. While such differences should be recognized, consistency in administering the merit system is necessary. In order to promote this consistency, the Dean’s Office will insure that standards are uniformly interpreted and that meaningful differences are recognized when appropriate. The Dean’s Office will make every effort to insure that gross inequities do not occur, thus preserving the integrity of the merit evaluation system.
ADDENDUM A SECTION 2
NEGOTIATING FACULTY ROLES

A faculty member should have a voice in the determination of those goals and activities on which his or her merit evaluation is to be based. Accordingly, each faculty member in the College shall negotiate a faculty role with his/her chair. This negotiation shall occur in the late fall of each year and shall be applicable to the following calendar year. A written statement of the negotiated role shall be prepared, signed by both the faculty member and the chair, approved by the Dean and placed in the faculty member’s personnel file. This statement should, insofar as possible, reflect the kind of documentation which will be provided by the faculty member to demonstrate accomplishment in each portion of the negotiated role.

An important component in this negotiation process is one of fostering the professional development of the faculty member. In consultation with the chair, the faculty member should outline a multi-year development direction for his/her professional career.

It is important to appreciate that the degree of commitment in terms of particular goals and activities can vary not only from faculty member to faculty member but also from year to year for the same faculty member. Likewise, it would be expected that different roles would be negotiated for tenured and nontenured faculty members. Furthermore, normally as faculty members move through the ranks and achieve greater seniority their contributions should evolve toward a greater leadership role rather than solely a participant role. A major consideration is that the negotiated role for a particular faculty member should reflect one’s strengths and the needs and opportunities at that particular point in the individual’s professional development. The negotiated role, however, must be consistent with the missions and goals of the department, the College, and the University. The negotiation process should result in a successful reconciliation of individual and organizational priorities.

Occasionally there may be a need to renegotiate a faculty role as a result of unexpected events requiring a change in assignment. However, under no circumstances may a faculty role be renegotiated after the fact, e.g., after the year has ended.

It must be emphasized that a faculty role which allows for merit salary increases may not necessarily lead to a favorable tenure or promotion decision. It is incumbent upon the chair to provide direction and counsel, particularly in the case of a nontenured assistant professor, to insure that the faculty member fully understands the tenure and promotion implications of the assignment negotiated.

The role of each faculty member shall be negotiated within the following guidelines, expressed as the percent of effort to be negotiated in the teaching (indirect and direct), research, and service areas. Normally, a 50% teaching assignment represents 6 hours per semester, while a 75% assignment represents 9 hours per semester. However, it should be recognized that deviations from these weights may be warranted. Factors such as teaching innovation, indirect teaching assignments, the nature of the assigned courses and student enrollment may be used to justify weights which are different from the norm. For a definition of research and service roles, see Appendices B and C.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-tenured</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDENDUM A SECTION 3
MERIT SYSTEM PROCEDURES

Section A.03.01. General Procedures. The following procedures are designed to standardize annual faculty evaluation and merit salary distribution. Implementation of these procedures is the responsibility of the chair. New faculty members are to be evaluated based on the period of their association with the College. Therefore, their first evaluation may be for a period of less than one year.

a. The annual review period will be January 1 to December 31. Individual performance evaluation will occur early in the following calendar year, and the determination of salary increases (see below) will occur once the College is informed of its salary increase pool. Salary increases will become effective in the subsequent fiscal year.

b. The review will take place every year, regardless of the availability of merit pay monies.

c. Each faculty member will receive formal, written evaluation from the chair.

d. The evaluation will focus on the faculty role negotiated with the chair for the review period. The negotiated role should not only reflect differential emphasis on the teaching, research, and service areas, but additionally, should describe the information to be collected in order to assess accomplishments in these areas. A written record of the negotiated role shall be prepared by the chair and signed by both faculty member and chair and approved by the Dean.

e. Faculty will be responsible for submitting an annual report by February 1 of each year. This document will be used as appropriate for departmental and College summary reports in addition to its use for the merit review decision, and may be appended with additional information as determined by the faculty member. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to complete this document in a timely manner.

f. It is the chair’s responsibility to gather additional information pertinent to the evaluation of teaching, research and service.

g. The chair is responsible for evaluating each faculty member. An evaluation will be made in each major area (teaching, research and service) and a composite evaluation will be calculated. Individual feedback sessions will be held with each faculty member to discuss these evaluations, and to reassess the multi-year professional development direction of the faculty member.

h. Records must be kept and shall include (a) a written statement of the negotiated role for each faculty member, signed by both the faculty member and chair; (b) the completed annual review document, including all appended information; (c) the chair’s evaluation, composite evaluation and comments; and (d) pertinent comments from the feedback session. These records will be retained as part of the faculty member’s departmental personnel file.
i. Faculty members who disagree with their evaluation may appeal it in accord with established grievance procedures.

Section A.03.02. Indicators of Effectiveness. Each faculty member has the responsibility to provide information regarding effectiveness in the teaching, research, and service areas. In preparing this information, faculty members shall:

a. Complete the Faculty Annual Report, emphasizing those specific areas pertinent to the negotiated role;

b. Make sure that copies of the completed “Teaching and Course Evaluation” form for every course assignment during the review period are attached (the TCE form is shown in Appendix D); and

c. Attach copies of all other material pertinent to the evaluation.
Section A.04.01. Procedures.

a. Evaluations of teaching, research, and service will be made on a seven-point rating scale, with verbal anchors at four points. The verbal anchors will correspond to Exceptional, Good, Acceptable and Unacceptable performance (see IIB. Merit Categories). Thus, the rating scale would look as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, if a faculty member’s teaching can best be described as Good, a rating of 4 would be given. Persons whose performance is not precisely described by one of the verbal anchors would receive a rating corresponding to the numerical value that falls between the most appropriate performance categories. Thus, if a faculty member’s teaching is less than Good, but better than Acceptable, a rating of 3 would be given.

Furthermore, it is not expected that faculty performance will be evaluated on a relative basis, but rather according to the standards and implementation guidelines established by each department. Therefore, if two or more faculty members within in a department are judged to have met the “exceptional performance” standards in one area, they should each receive a rating of six (6) in this particular part of their assignment. An extraordinary performance among equally rated members should further be given special consideration in the distribution of the Dean’s portion of the merit salary pool (see VB4).

b. Weights for the teaching, research and service areas will be based on the percent of effort negotiated for each of these areas for this evaluation period. Weights will be decimal numbers and must add up to 1.00. Thus, if the negotiated role for a particular faculty member were Teaching =40%, Research=40% and Service=20%, the corresponding weights would be .40, .40, and .20.

c. A Merit Point Index will be computed for each faculty member by multiplying the evaluation rating for each area by their corresponding weights and summing over all three areas. For example, evaluation ratings of Teaching =5, Research=2, Service=5 would result in different Merit Point Indices depending upon one’s negotiated role. If a person had negotiated a role of Teaching=.40, Research=.50, and Service=.10, the Merit Point Index would be 3.50. On the other hand, if a person had negotiated a role of Teaching=.40, Research=.30, and Service=.30, the Merit Point Index would be 4.10.

d. The next step in this plan is to determine the value of one Merit Point for salary increase purposes. This will be accomplished, within each department, by calculating the total number of Merit Points and dividing this sum into the total number of dollars made available for merit pay distribution. For example, assume that a total of $20,000 were
available for merit pay distribution among 10 faculty members in one department. The distribution of Merit Points earned by faculty members in this department is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Merit Points</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D, E, F</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, H</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of Merit Points would be 43.00. The dollar value of one Merit Point would be $20,000/43 = $465.12.

e. Merit pay increases for individual faculty members would be determined by multiplying the dollar value of one Merit Point by the number of Merit Points each faculty member has earned. Thus, in the example described above, $465.12 would be multiplied by each faculty member’s Merit Point Index as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Merit Points</th>
<th>Merit Raise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>$2,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>2,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>2,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>2,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>2,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>2,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1,256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 43.0 $20,000

f. A faculty member who receives a rating of 0 in any area (i.e., teaching, research, or service) has demonstrated a serious shortcoming in fulfilling assigned duties and responsibilities in that area. Such deficiencies must be noted and reported back to the faculty member along with a statement that continued poor performance is unacceptable and that corrective action is expected. The faculty member shall work with the chair to develop appropriate strategies for removing this deficiency.

Section A.04.02. Other Considerations.

a. In order to provide for a College-wide merit salary program, a share of available merit salary dollars should be retained in the Office of the Dean. In any given year up to 20 percent of the available dollars may be retained in the Dean’s Office.
generated by term positions and not used for merit salary increases for term faculty will be added to the dollar pool available for continuing faculty merit salary increases. The share of this total pool to be retained in the Dean’s Office will be determined, with the remainder allocated to the departments according to their respective proportion of the College’s continuing faculty salary base.

b. If in any given year(s) there is no merit money, or only an insignificant amount of merit money is available, the merit salary increases for the next year in which there is significant merit money allocation should take into consideration the faculty member’s performance in the preceding year(s).

c. Consistent with the University policy the chair shall recommend to the Dean merit salary increases for individual faculty members based on the negotiated roles and the performance evaluations in each of these roles.

d. The portion of the merit salary pool retained by the Dean will then be allocated to faculty according to specific guidelines. These may include, but are not limited to, the following: (a) Departmental adjustments to account for situations where the departmental portion may be insufficient to reward an unusually productive departmental faculty member; (b) Individual adjustments to reflect major contributions outside the previously negotiated role of a faculty member.

Each year the Dean will disseminate information to the faculty on the distribution of his/her portion of the merit salary pool.

e. This merit salary system shall be evaluated every three years after adoption.

f. This document applies only to members of the bargaining unit.

Effective April 1985
Revised February 1990
Amended December 1998
ADDENDUM B
PROMOTION AND TENURE

Section B.01. The Promotion decision process. The College of Business faculty is committed to excellence in teaching, research, and service. Academic promotion is awarded to those faculty making continuing contributions in these areas. The preservation of quality requires that all persons recommended for promotion clearly satisfy the general criteria presented herein. Fairness requires that these criteria be applied as uniformly as possible. A basic format for promotion dossiers is available for distribution to faculty members through departmental chairs. A common format for presenting the supporting information will help assure fairness in the decision-making process. As promotion requires that a person’s entire professional contribution be reviewed, the format calls for information on educational background, previous academic and professional experience, teaching and advising activities, scholarly contributions, and service activities. A faculty member will be evaluated for promotion in any year at his/her request. A faculty member below the rank of Professor, including non-tenure accruing ranks, must have his/her dossier submitted for review by the department at least every five years unless the faculty member requests in writing not to be reviewed. In addition, the department chair is required to provide the faculty member with a written evaluation of his/her progress toward promotion at two-year intervals commencing two years after initial employment. This evaluation shall be conducted in consultation with the departmental faculty who are eligible to vote in each particular case.

The faculty member will prepare a promotion dossier in close coordination with the chair. The faculty member will be allowed to submit relevant information and material in addition to specific information and material required by the University, College, or departmental policies.

Section B.02. General Criteria for Teaching. The first step in promotion is an evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Only after an affirmative judgment as to teaching effectiveness has been made can serious consideration be given to an evaluation of scholarship and professional service activities. Unless a determination is made that the candidate is an effective teacher promotion will not be granted. Teaching includes an up-to-date knowledge of one’s discipline. In some instances teaching may be indirect, primarily in support of student teaming activities. Faculty members also influence teaching by designing courses and curricula. Textbooks and instructional materials may also be considered contributions to teaching. In addition, faculty members influence teaching in less tangible, but no less decisive, ways through such activities as counseling students and conversations with colleagues. Detailed evidence of effective teaching shall be included in the dossiers of faculty members being recommended for promotion. Evidence should include peer evaluations and student evaluations conducted over a reasonable period of time. Faculty colleagues should be asked to evaluate the objectives, methods and materials of courses designed and/or taught by the individual. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness should also be drawn from faculty who have taught with the individual or have frequently observed classes taught by the individual. Furthermore, evidence of teaching effectiveness shall include the results of COBA’s “Teaching and Course Evaluation” instrument for every course assignment during the review period, effective Fall semester 1985. Whenever possible, evaluation should also include evidence concerning the faculty member’s contribution to the career accomplishments of former students.
Section B.03. General Criteria for Research. Research activities are those activities which serve to advance the discipline or the state of the art, evidence of which may include journal articles, presentations, scholarly books, funded grants, textbooks, innovative instructional materials, cases and the like.

In general, the minimum expectation is an average of one quality refereed journal article per year in rank. Exceptions can occur only in instances in which a candidate has demonstrated and documented exceptional contributions to the discipline. Meeting this minimum expectation of an average of one publication per year, however, does not in any way guarantee that the candidate is qualified for promotion. In all instances the quality of the contribution as opposed to the quantity will be the determining factor. Furthermore, a candidate must demonstrate independent research capability to be considered for promotion. In evaluating independent research capability, the quantity and quality of publications as well as the author’s role should be taken into consideration.

For promotion to the rank of Professor, evidence of national visibility is required. Furthermore, evidence should be present that the faculty being considered serves as a resource person, facilitator, and source of encouragement with regard to the research and scholarship activities of other faculty members.

In addition to the basic standards noted above, the documentation of excellence in research performance can be shown by many different types of activities. These include, but are not limited to, exceeding the minimum standard stated above; preparation and presentation of research proposals to outside funding organizations; direction and other involvement with research projects funded by the College, University or outside agencies; direction and other involvement in non-funded research projects; presentation of research papers at professional meetings; and publication of papers in proceedings of professional meetings.

The dossier of an individual should provide substantiating evidence submitted by qualified observers from within and outside the University. If the candidate’s field is one in which no colleague has expertise, it is essential that extensive outside review of the candidate’s scholarly activities be sought.

Section B.04. General Criteria for Service: Faculty members are expected to make professional contributions through service to the department, the College, the University community and the discipline at large. The last item includes discipline-related community service. Paid consulting engagements and participation in professional educational programs will be recognized for promotion purposes only to the extent that these activities contribute to the faculty member’s effectiveness in teaching, research, and the College’s mission. Administrative and professional work on behalf of the department or the University, for which there is no specific compensation or assignment, may be regarded as service.

The documentation of service can be shown by such activities as involvement with, and creative contributions in, administrative areas; College and University committee work; University governance; faculty development; and fund raising and other development activities for the College and University. It is required that an evaluation by qualified individuals indicating the
quality of the substantial service/professional contribution rendered be submitted with the promotion dossier.

Section B.05. University Minimum Standards for Academic Ranks. The minimum University requirements for each academic rank are given below for information purposes.

a. Assistant Professor: Promotion from the rank of Instructor to Assistant Professor requires an ability to teach effectively and the academic degree defined by the academic unit for the position held by the candidate. Those tenured in the rank of Instructor as of July 1, 1978, may meet the minimum University criteria through: 1) demonstration of effective teaching; 2) successful completion of scholarly/creative activity which contributes to the discipline or field of study and offers promise for future achievement (e.g., completion of the required academic degree) or peer-reviewed publications; and 3) demonstrated participation in service activities appropriate to the discipline and the academic unit.

b. Associate Professor: Promotion from the rank of Assistant Professor to the rank of Associate Professor requires: 1) a demonstrated record of effectiveness as a teacher; 2) a record of peer-reviewed publication which has contributed to the discipline or field of study, to the candidate’s intellectual development, and to the quality of the academic unit; 3) a record of professional service appropriate to the discipline, the academic unit, and where possible, the College and/or the University; and 4) promise of growth in teaching and research activity.

c. Professor: For promotion to the highest academic rank, the candidate’s academic achievements and professional reputation should be superior. This rank can be earned only by the faculty member who has demonstrated continued growth in, and has a cumulative record of, teaching effectiveness, substantial peer-reviewed publication and professional contributions and service.

Section B.06. The Tenure decision process. The criteria to be considered in the tenure decision process are teaching, research, and service. These criteria are the same and are to be evaluated in the same general manner as for promotion, described above.

a. Information Regarding Criteria, Standards, and Guidelines: It is the responsibility of the College Dean to insure that all newly-appointed faculty are explicitly apprised of the criteria, standards, and guidelines of the University, College, and department in which they have been appointed.

b. Annual Performance Evaluation: All non-tenured faculty in tenurable ranks must be evaluated annually and informed regarding their professional performance by May 1 of each year. This evaluation shall be the responsibility of the chair and Dean, and it shall be made with regard to the criteria above. In addition, this evaluation shall include a statement of the programmatic needs of the College and department relative to the faculty member under review.
Section B.07. Documentation. Documentation for the promotion and tenure decision-making process shall follow the University guidelines. Furthermore, additional requirements by the College, as stated in this document, must be observed.
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