

Heider College of Business
Criteria for Granting Tenure and Awarding Promotion
Adopted by the Faculty April 6, 2006

Policy of the College of Business Administration regarding Tenure and Promotion

Faculty are an essential part of the College, and a fully-engaged, continuously developing faculty is essential to a vibrant, successful educational enterprise. The College has a responsibility to create an environment in which faculty can and have the incentive to fully develop their academic abilities. The faculty, in turn, have the responsibility to discharge to the best of their ability their responsibilities in the three traditional core areas of faculty activity. Faculty members should strive for balance across all three areas of responsibility and ideally would be progressing toward full professor status over the course of their careers.

Criteria for Granting Tenure

The University Criteria for Granting Tenure (from the 2006-2007 Handbook for Faculty) are as follows:

“ Tenure is awarded on the basis of:

- i. successful performance of the terms of the faculty member’s job description as stated in the initial contract or subsequently amended by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the university;
- ii. a record of achievement at Creighton University;
- iii. a record of achievement at previous institutions, provided the record of achievement has continued while at Creighton University;
- iv. an expectation that the record of achievement will be maintained or expanded in the future; and
- v. the determination that the granting of tenure fits into the Mission, needs, plans and goals of the Department, the College or School, and the University.”

The College of Business Administration interprets these standards to mean:

To be awarded tenure,

1. A candidate must satisfactorily perform the duties that were outlined in his or her initial or amended contract.
2. A candidate’s:
 - a. Teaching performance must be characterized generally by students, peers, and the annual reviews of teaching as being “very good” or higher as defined by the college’s performance standards during his or her probationary period.

- b. Scholarship performance must be characterized generally by peers and annual reviews of scholarship as being “good” or higher as defined by the college’s performance standards during his or her probationary period.
 - c. Service performance must be characterized generally by peers and annual reviews of service as being “good” or higher as defined by the college’s performance standards during his or her probationary period.
3. A candidate seeking to be awarded tenure based on performance at a previous institution must show evidence that this performance meets a level characterized as very good or higher in teaching, good or higher in scholarship, and good or higher in service as defined by COBA’s performance standards.
 4. A candidate’s record merits a conclusion that the record of achievement is not transitory or episodic but holds promise of continued success.
 5. A candidate’s performance “fits with mission” such that the candidate demonstrates professional and personal abilities and dispositions to furthering the academic and Jesuit mission of the Department, College and University.

Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

The University Criteria for Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor (from the 2006-2007 Handbook for Faculty) are as follows:

“Promotion to the rank of associate professor is awarded on the basis of:

- i. demonstrated consistent effectiveness in teaching;
- ii. an emerging record of recognized scholarly achievement that contributes to one’s discipline(s);
- iii. evidence of active service consistent with the Mission of Creighton University; and
- iv. an emerging record of regionally recognized clinical activity consistent with the Mission of Creighton University, if appropriate to the candidate’s position.”

The College of Business Administration interprets these standards to mean:

To be promoted to Associate Professor,

1. A candidate’s teaching performance must be characterized generally by students, peers, and the annual reviews of teaching during the measurement period as being “very good” or higher, on average, as defined by the college’s performance standards.
 - a. Teaching performance means educational activities, which includes not only classroom teaching but also other activities that enhance student learning.

- b. A candidate's record of teaching performance merits a conclusion that the record of achievement is not transitory or episodic but holds promise of continued success.
2. A candidate's scholarship performance must be characterized generally by peers and the annual reviews of scholarship during the measurement period as being "very good" or higher, on average, as defined by the college's performance standards.
 - a. The scholarship performance merits the conclusion that it contributes to the advancement of basic, applied or pedagogical knowledge in the candidate's discipline or in related and emerging areas that are logical extensions of that specialization.
 - b. The scholarship performance should emphasize publication in peer-reviewed, academic journals, but may also include other outlets, such as practitioner and professional publications.
 - c. A candidate's record of scholarship performance merits a conclusion that the record of achievement is not transitory or episodic but holds promise of continued success.
3. A candidate's service performance must be characterized generally by peers and the annual reviews of service during the measurement period as being "very good" or higher, on average, as defined by the college's performance standards.
 - a. The service performance merits the conclusion that the candidate has made significant contributions to the work of department, college, and/or university standing, ad hoc, advisory, or other committees.
 - b. The service performance shows evidence of significant contributions to professional and/or community organizations that further the academic, community and/or Jesuit Mission of Creighton University.
 - c. A candidate's record of service performance merits a conclusion that the record of achievement is not transitory or episodic but holds promise of continued success.
4. The College of Business Administration does not at this time engage in clinical activities, and therefore no interpretation is made of the fourth criterion. Should that situation change, the College would provide appropriate guidance on this specific criterion.

Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor

The University Criteria for Promotion to the rank of Professor (from the 2006-2007 Handbook for Faculty) are as follows:

- "Promotion to the rank of professor is awarded on the basis of:
- i. a consistent record of distinguished teaching;

- ii. an established record of nationally recognized scholarly achievement that contributes to one's discipline(s);
- iii. evidence of recognized leadership in service, consistent with the Mission of Creighton University; and
- iv. a record of nationally recognized clinical activity consistent with the Mission of Creighton University, if appropriate to the candidate's position."

The College of Business Administration interprets these standards to mean:

To be promoted to Professor,

1. A candidate's teaching performance must be characterized generally by students, peers, and the annual reviews of teaching during the measurement period as being "very good to outstanding," on average, as defined by the college's performance standards.
 - a. Teaching performance means educational activities, which includes not only classroom teaching but also other activities that enhance student learning.
 - b. A candidate's record of teaching performance merits a conclusion that the record of achievement is not transitory or episodic but holds promise of continued success.
2. A candidate's scholarship performance must be characterized generally by peers and the annual reviews of scholarship during the measurement period as being "very good to outstanding," on average, as defined by the college's performance standards.
 - a. The scholarship performance merits the conclusion that it contributes to the advancement of basic, applied or pedagogical knowledge in the candidate's discipline or in related and emerging areas that are logical extensions of that specialization.
 - b. The scholarship performance merits the conclusion that it is published or discussed in national outlets or fora and that it is known and respected by peers outside the university.
 - c. The scholarship performance should include publication in peer-reviewed, academic journals, but may also include other outlets, such as practitioner and professional publications.
 - d. A candidate's record of scholarship performance merits a conclusion that the record of achievement is not transitory or episodic but holds promise of continued success.
3. A candidate's service performance must be characterized generally by peers and the annual reviews of service during the measurement period as being "very good to outstanding," on average, as defined by the college's performance standards.

- a. The service performance merits the conclusion that it represents leadership in service in a variety of contexts that contribute to the Mission of the Department, College, and University.
 - b. The service performance shows evidence of formal leadership roles on Department, College, and/or University committees, professional, and/or community organizations.
 - c. A candidate's record of service performance merits a conclusion that the record of achievement is not transitory or episodic but holds promise of continued success.
4. The College of Business Administration does not at this time engage in clinical activities, and therefore no interpretation is made of the fourth criterion. Should that situation change, the College would provide appropriate guidance on this specific criterion.

The following table summarizes a non-exclusive list of the minimum evidence candidates should provide in each of the three dimensions of faculty performance. The level of evidence depends on the criteria being considered; i.e., the evidence supporting educational activities for granting tenure is different than for promotion, and thus the evidence presented of, e.g. teaching effectiveness, must support the candidate's assertion that the minimum expected level of performance has been met.

Educational Activities	Scholarship Activities	Service Activities
1. Annual performance evaluations	1. Annual performance evaluations	1. Annual performance evaluations
2. Classroom teaching effectiveness	2. Copies of published outputs (articles, books, chapters, proceedings, etc.)	2. Candidate statement of connection of service to Mission of University
3. Innovative educational processes, tools and other activities, including service learning and experience with developing and offering new courses	3. Copies of working papers, chapters, monographs, etc.	3. Innovative service programs developed, including service learning
4. Level of courses taught (e.g. required v. elective, undergraduate and graduate)	4. Internal and external research grants received	4. Leadership positions and accomplishments (both internal to university and in external and professional communities)
5. Formal and informal non-curricular courses, seminars and other educational programs	5. Collaborative activities, including editorships, program chairs, etc.	5. Service to the professoriate, including mentoring, editorships, program chairs, etc
6. Awards and other recognitions	6. Awards and other recognitions	6. Awards and other recognitions
7. Current and recent student	7. Peer letters	7. Letters from internal and

Educational Activities	Scholarship Activities	Service Activities
and alumni letters	8. Evidence of local, regional, and/or national impact (citation counts, reprints, etc.)	external committee chairs, outside agencies, students, clients and other service recipients, etc. explaining significance of service