

Emporia State University
Policies and Procedures for Faculty Review

School of Business and Technology

History and Revisions:
Adopted April 2026

Table of Contents

Values Statement:	3
Academic Appointments.....	3
Faculty Recognition Committee	3
Annual Faculty Evaluation	4
Evidence and Criteria for Annual Faculty Review.....	5
Teaching	5
Scholarship/Creativity	6
Service	6
Faculty Recognition Matters	7
Performance-Based Salary Increases and Adjustments.....	7
Retention.....	7
Renewal.....	8
Tenure	9
Promotion	10
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	11
PROFESSOR	11
Sabbatical	12
Post-tenure Review	14
Appendices.....	15
A. Relevant University-wide policies	15
B. Sabbatical Application Forms & Rubrics	15
C. Timelines	15
ACADEMIC YEAR ACTIONS & DECISIONS CALENDAR	15
TIMELINES BY APPOINTMENT TYPE	19
TIMELINES BY REVIEWER TYPE	22
D. Evaluation Rubrics.....	25
FACULTY RECOGNITION DOCUMENT COMMON RUBRICS	26
Teaching Evaluation Rubrics	27
Scholarship/Creativity Evaluation Rubrics	36
Service Evaluation Rubrics	41

Values Statement:

Faculty evaluation must be consistent with the values of Emporia State University therefore, the criteria and processes for retention, tenure, promotion, merit raises, sabbaticals, and post-tenure review recognize that:

- 1) We are a teaching-focused institution.
- 2) We highly value teaching, scholarship/creativity, and service activities that result in student learning and the meaningful engagement, retention, and success of students.

Academic Appointments

Guiding Policy **UPM 3.04 Academic Appointments**

The policies and procedures described herein apply to all faculty positions and appointments, both full-time and part-time, regardless of rank, position, or assignments. These include continuous non-tenure track, contracted faculty, tenure track ("probationary"), and tenured faculty. Exceptions include faculty members whose intention to resign or retire has been formally executed. Employment in academic temporary positions are considered at-will and may be terminated at any time, without cause, prior to the end date specified in the notice of appointment.

Faculty Recognition Committee

Under direction of their Dean, the faculty of each School or College will participate in such faculty matters as annual review, sabbatical review, post-tenure review, and promotion/tenure decisions.

- Each college/school shall elect 5-9 members to serve on the Faculty Recognition Committee depending on the size of the school and variation of programs within the school.
 - The Faculty Recognition Committee provides school or college level review.
 - The purpose of review by the FRC is to provide peer feedback and recommendations to the Dean. Not all reviews involve voting.
 - As its review is not discipline specific, the FRC need not represent every program in a unit, but its membership should encompass representation from a breadth of program areas within the school or college.
 - The Faculty Recognition Committee should include representation of all ranks and faculty positions including instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, and multi-year contract faculty.
 - Representation areas will be determined by the faculty of the college/school.
- From the elected FRC committee members, each Dean will assign specific responsibilities according to appointment types and elements of performance. For example, all teaching faculty can assess teaching. Faculty whose appointment types include scholarship/creativity might be assigned to assess performance in the area of scholarship/creativity.

School of Business & Technology Faculty Recognition Committee (FRC):

The FRC is responsible for making recommendations for promotion and tenure, with the option of merit, retention, sabbatical leaves, and post tenure review. The membership of the FRC will be determined on an annual basis. The SB&T FRC is comprised of three representatives from the SB&T. One representative will come from Business Administration and Finance (BUA), one will come from Accounting and Information Systems (AIS), and the remaining one can come from either area. The committee will elect its own Chair. All members of the committee must hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. If the SB&T does not have at least three associate or full professors, an alternate at the rank of associate or full professor from another university unit will be identified and voted in as a committee member. If a representative is under active review for any items for which the FRC makes a recommendation, for example, tenure and promotion, that representative must exclude themselves from any discussion/recommendation pertaining to their review. Representatives must be willing to commit to the responsibilities of the committee, including impartial evaluation of nominees. Once a faculty member has agreed to serve on the FRC, they cannot later recuse themselves from the evaluation process or decline to sign a recommendation letter.

Election Procedure:

The Office of the Dean will issue a Call for Committee Nominations in August of each year. Faculty may self-nominate or be nominated by peers, with consent. The Dean may appoint nominees to the FRC as needed. Nominees are reviewed by the Dean's Office to confirm eligibility. Once confirmed, a secret ballot listing all eligible nominees will be distributed to all full-time faculty in the School. Faculty will rank-order the nominees. The nominees with the highest number of votes will be appointed to the committee. In the event of a tie for the final open seat, a runoff election will be held between the tied candidates. If the runoff also results in a tie, the Dean shall determine the nominee to be appointed by a random draw.

Annual Faculty Evaluation

Guiding Policy **UPM 4.03** Faculty Performance, Recognition, and Evaluation

Annual review follows criteria and guidelines stipulated by School/College Faculty Recognition Documents. All faculty receive annual review. Annual reviews are conducted at the end of each academic year for all faculty ranks and positions. These reviews inform goal setting, workload assignments, and ongoing faculty development. Along with evidence of responsiveness to feedback and a demonstrated commitment to professional growth, they form the basis for faculty recognition decisions such as retention, promotion, and tenure.

The annual faculty evaluation will include:

- a statement of the overall level of faculty performance
- a statement of performance in each area of faculty responsibility (i.e., teaching, scholarly activity, and/or service) relative to rank, position and assigned responsibilities.
- a provision for faculty development and/or progress on prior goals.

School of Business & Technology Performance Weighting:

For tenure-track and tenured faculty, the SB&T establishes the following weights for annual evaluation: Teaching 50%, Scholarship 30%, Service 20%. For other appointment types, weights may vary according

to the specific assignment and will be negotiated with the Dean. Faculty with different assigned responsibilities (e.g., heavy administrative load, program coordinator roles) may have adjusted weights as negotiated with the Dean.

Evidence and Criteria for Annual Faculty Review

Guiding Policy **UPM 4.03** Faculty Performance, Recognition, and Evaluation

- All Emporia State University tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to make contributions to teaching, research, and service. The amount and nature of these contributions should reflect the standards of the faculty member's discipline and specific assignment to ESU.
- Teaching faculty members who are not connected with the tenure system may, or may not, have expectations in the areas of research and/or service; if these expectations exist, then these expectations shall be in written form consistent with this policy.
- Expectations for the percentage of faculty's effort and expected activities for the academic year are to be enumerated in the faculty's annual work plan and approved by the unit's Dean and the Provost.

At ESU annual faculty review meets the following objectives:

- To provide a documented record of faculty performance to support personnel decisions such as retention, promotion, tenure, merit raises, sabbatical leave, and chronic low performance provisions.
- To recognize that the education of students is the highest priority of ESU. The education of students occurs in a variety of ways and venues, including the classroom, research experiences, outreach, and community service. Consequently, individual faculty or units may vary their emphasis on instruction, scholarly activity, and service and annual evaluations will reflect individual faculty assignments.
- To recognize the varied responsibilities and expectations of faculty at different ranks, appointments, and assigned responsibilities.
- To involve faculty in the design and evaluation of expectations central to their performance and professional growth.
- To develop strategies to link evaluation and its outcomes to assistance and support for faculty growth and development.
- To recognize unique talents or capabilities that contribute to the success of ESU.

The criteria used for faculty evaluation shall be developed by the faculty of the School or College and be approved by a majority vote followed by consecutive approval of the Dean and the Provost. This "Faculty Recognition Document" (FRD) will explain the specific criteria for faculty review. Moreover, it outlines the procedures and timelines for enacting University policies pertaining to faculty recognition. Changes to the Faculty Recognition Document shall follow the same developmental and approval process.

Teaching

The criteria and evidence used for evaluating faculty efforts in teaching shall be developed by the School or College but must include student ratings of instruction. The anonymous rating by students must occur at least once per semester on an instrument that is norm-referenced, controlled for initial student

bias/motivation, and adjusted for other major research-demonstrated biases. At a minimum, the instrument should solicit students' perspectives on (a) the delivery of instruction, (b) the assessment of learning, (c) the availability of the faculty member to the students, and (d) whether the goals and objectives of the course were met.

School of Business & Technology Teaching Standards:

The School of Business & Technology utilizes the IDEA student evaluation system. An adjusted IDEA summary score averaging 45 or above across all classes evaluated during the review period is presumed evidence of PROFICIENT teaching in Teaching Category 3 (Teaching Practices). Faculty with scores below 45 must provide alternative evidence of teaching effectiveness as outlined in the Teaching rubric criteria. EXPERT-level teaching is evidenced by IDEA scores consistently above institutional averages and/or documented innovation, leadership, or recognized excellence in teaching.

Scholarship/Creativity

The criteria used for evaluating faculty efforts in scholarship/creativity, research, or creative activities shall be developed by the School or College but must include a measure of how such efforts contribute to student learning or the meaningful engagement, retention, and success of students.

School of Business & Technology Scholarship Standards:

Definitions:

- *Peer-reviewed* is defined as being reviewed by at least two independent reviewers before being accepted. Editorial reviews, book reviews, and invited commentaries are excluded from the peer-reviewed article count.
- *High-quality journal* is defined as one which: (a) appears on ABDC (Australian Business Deans Council), Cabells, or SJR (Scimago Journal Rank) list of journals with an acceptance rate of less than 50%, OR (b) has been pre-approved by the Dean or Dean's designee, OR (c) faculty member makes the case to the Dean or Dean's designee for why the peer-reviewed journal should be considered high-quality. The School shall maintain a list of pre-approved journals.

Scholarly activities align with AACSB intellectual contribution categories: Basic/Discovery scholarship, Applied/Integration scholarship, and Teaching/Learning scholarship.

Faculty in the School of Business & Technology must maintain Scholarly Academic (SA) status as defined in the Faculty Qualifications and Engagement Policy to be eligible for tenure and promotion.

Service

The criteria used for evaluating faculty efforts in service and outreach, shall be developed by the School or College in accordance with the FRD, but must include a measure of how such efforts contribute to student learning or the meaningful engagement, retention, and success of students. Faculty service should involve the application of discipline-specific knowledge and skills, align with the university's mission, and contribute to institutional or program priorities.

School of Business & Technology Service Standards:

Service expectations prioritize Category 1 (Student Support and Collaboration) in alignment with the university's student-focused values. Faculty are expected to demonstrate an average of two service

contributions per year, with service in more than one category required for tenure and more than two categories required for promotion to Professor.

Annual reviews will evaluate faculty in all three areas weighted appropriately according to the faculty member's rank and the nature of their assigned duties and responsibilities. Concerns about upcoming personnel decisions will be documented in writing with specific recommendations for ongoing faculty development.

Faculty Recognition Matters

Guiding Policy **UPM 4.03 Faculty Performance, Recognition, and Evaluation**

Faculty recognition includes the granting of tenure, salary increases and adjustments, reappointments, contract renewals, promotions, chronic low performance, and sabbatical leaves. While recognition certainly includes leaves of absence without pay, reduced loads and other modifications in assignment, office and laboratory space assignments, teaching assignments, and honors accorded, these types of recognition are not within the scope of this policy. These procedures apply to all unclassified employees who are eligible for the types of recognition described herein.

Decisions and recommendations regarding these personnel decisions shall be based on annual faculty reviews and evidence of achievement.

Performance-Based Salary Increases and Adjustments

Eligibility for salary increases shall be merit-based and recognize the "top performers" who model highly impactful contributions to teaching, scholarship/creativity and/or service relative to their rank and assignment. To be considered for merit pay or performance-based bonuses or increases, faculty must have adhered to policies established in the University Policy Manual as well as priorities established by the Provost, and must be recommended by their Dean.

School of Business & Technology Merit Eligibility:

To be eligible for merit consideration, faculty must: (1) meet all benchmarks for their current rank, (2) demonstrate EXPERT performance in at least one area (teaching, scholarship, or service), (3) maintain SA status as defined in the Faculty Qualifications and Engagement Policy, (4) achieve IDEA scores above institutional averages, and (5) have at least one peer-reviewed publication in the evaluation year. Faculty with any performance deficiencies identified in their annual evaluation are ineligible for merit consideration that year.

Retention

The decision to retain a faculty member in a tenure-track, probationary appointment shall be based on the cumulative record of Annual Reviews indicating the faculty member is meeting expectations relative to their rank and assigned duties, is effectively addressing areas for improvement identified by the annual review, and is successfully progressing toward a positive tenure decision.

At minimum, Tenure-Track Faculty who are seeking retention to the second or third year will achieve a rating of PROFICIENT in the following areas:

TEACHING

- Demonstrate a rating of PROFICIENT across a breadth of criteria in teaching, meaning demonstrating proficiency in a majority of the criteria in each category of the Teaching rubrics
- Achieve an adjusted IDEA summary score averaging 45 or above

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVITY

- Achieve a rating of PROFICIENT in at least one of the criteria in Category 1 of the Scholarship/Creativity rubrics
- At least one peer-reviewed article published or accepted for publication
- Maintain SA status as defined in the Faculty Qualifications and Engagement Policy

SERVICE

- Demonstrate a rating of PROFICIENT in a majority of the criteria in category 1 of the Service rubrics

At minimum, Tenure-Track faculty who are seeking retention to the fourth year and beyond will demonstrate having achieved the following ratings in the following areas:

TEACHING

- Demonstrate having achieved a rating of PROFICIENT in all of the criteria in each category of the Teaching rubrics
- Achieve an adjusted IDEA summary score averaging 45 or above

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVITY

- Achieve a rating of PROFICIENT in one of the criteria in category 1 of the Scholarship/Creativity rubric
- Demonstrate having achieved a rating of PROFICIENT in criteria in the other categories of the Scholarship/Creativity rubric as enumerated in annual reviews and annual goals
- At least two peer-reviewed articles published or accepted for publication
- Maintain SA status as defined in the Faculty Qualifications and Engagement Policy

SERVICE

- Demonstrate having achieved a rating of PROFICIENT in a majority of the criteria in Category 1 of the Service rubrics
- Demonstrate having achieved a rating of PROFICIENT in one or more of the other categories of the Service rubrics as enumerated in annual reviews and annual goals

Renewal

The decision to renew a contract shall be based on the cumulative record of Annual Reviews indicating the faculty member is meeting expectations relative to their rank and assigned duties and is effectively addressing areas for improvement identified by prior annual reviews.

At minimum, Instructors and faculty in Part-time/Adjunct appointments who are seeking renewal will demonstrate having achieved a rating of:

- PROFICIENT in all categories of the teaching rubric as well as PROFICIENT in any of the criteria in the scholarship/creativity or service criteria that have been identified as applicable to their position
- Achieve an adjusted IDEA summary score averaging 45 or above
- Instructors and adjuncts are evaluated primarily on teaching. Scholarship expectations do not apply unless specified in the appointment. Service requirements are position-specific.

By the end of their contract period, faculty on Non-Tenure-Track appointments who are seeking renewal are expected to demonstrate, at minimum having achieved a rating of PROFICIENT in the following areas:

TEACHING

- As appropriate to the expectations of their contract, Contract Faculty will have identified teaching priorities and expectations with their Dean. By the end of their contract period, contract faculty are expected to be PROFICIENT in all of the criteria in each category of the Teaching rubrics
- Achieve an adjusted IDEA summary score averaging 45 or above

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVITY

- If appropriate to the expectations of their contract, Contract Faculty will have identified scholarship/creativity expectations with their Dean. By the end of their contract period, contract faculty are expected to be PROFICIENT in any of the criteria on the Scholarship/Creativity Rubrics that have been identified as applicable to their position.
- Default expectation: Maintain appropriate AACSB qualification status (SA, PA, SP, or IP) as defined in the Faculty Qualifications and Engagement Policy. Specific requirements may be negotiated with the Dean.

SERVICE

- If appropriate to the expectations of their contract, Contract Faculty will have identified service expectations with their Dean. By the end of their contract period, contract faculty are expected to be PROFICIENT in any of the criteria on the Service Rubrics that have been identified as applicable to their position.
- Default expectation: Average of one service contribution per year across any Service category. Specific requirements may be negotiated with the Dean.

Tenure

Guiding Policy UPM 4.04 Tenure

Tenure shall be awarded to faculty who 1) have a terminal degree or professional certification deemed appropriate by the discipline, 2) have completed the probationary period established at the time of hire or promotion, and 3) have demonstrably achieved improvement and development as evidenced by the cumulative record of Annual Reviews.

Faculty applying for tenure will demonstrate having achieved the following levels of performance in these areas:

TEACHING

- Demonstrate having achieved a rating of PROFICIENT in all of the criteria in each category of the Teaching rubrics
- Demonstrate having achieved a rating of EXPERT in a breadth of criteria as enumerated in annual reviews and annual goals
- Demonstrate a record of self-reflection indicating a commitment to continuous improvement
- Achieve an adjusted IDEA summary score averaging 45 or above across the review period

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVITY

- Achieve a rating of PROFICIENT in one of the criteria in category 1 of the Scholarship/Creativity rubric
- Demonstrate having achieved a rating of PROFICIENT in criteria in a selected breadth of other categories of the Scholarship/Creativity rubric as enumerated in annual reviews and annual goals
- Demonstrate a record of self-reflection indicating a purposeful commitment to selected achievements
- Maintain Scholarly Academic (SA) status as defined in the Faculty Qualifications and Engagement Policy

Publication Requirements by Terminal Degree Alignment:

- Terminal degree in instruction field: 3 peer-reviewed articles + 2 additional scholarly activities
- Business degree, but not instruction area: 4 peer-reviewed articles + 2 additional scholarly activities
- Degree outside business, instruction incorporates degree area: 4 peer-reviewed articles + 2 additional scholarly activities
- Degree outside business, instruction does not incorporate degree area: 5 peer-reviewed articles + 2 additional scholarly activities + 15 graduate hours in instruction area

SERVICE

- Demonstrate having achieved a rating of PROFICIENT in all of the criteria in category 1 of the Service rubrics
- Demonstrate having achieved a rating of PROFICIENT in selected other categories of the Service rubrics as enumerated in annual reviews and annual goals
- Demonstrate a record of self-reflection indicating a commitment to continuous improvement

Promotion

Guiding Policy **UPM 3.04 Academic Appointments**

Promotion in rank is not a matter of routine, seniority, or time in rank. Rather, it is the recognition of the cumulative professional record of a faculty member as well as their potential for continued growth and

contribution as evidenced by the cumulative record of Annual Faculty Reviews. Completion of five (5) years in rank will be regarded as the normal time necessary before a faculty member is eligible to apply for promotion.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The rank of Associate Professor is granted to faculty who are emerging leaders in academia. Their work positively impacts students, colleagues, and the institution. As such, for tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty promotion to this rank carries the minimum expectations of achieving the required levels of development during the requisite time in the probationary period of their appointment. Five (5) years in rank will be regarded as the normal time necessary before an Assistant Professor becomes eligible for promotion to Associate Professor. At the end of five (5) years, or upon application in the sixth year or thereafter, promotion will be recommended only on the basis of documented meritorious performance. The terminal degree/certification deemed appropriate by the discipline is the minimum expectation for this rank.

Faculty applying for promotion to Associate Professor will demonstrate having achieved the following levels of performance in these areas:

TEACHING

- A rating of EXPERT in all of the criteria of at least one category of the Teaching Rubric

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVITY

- A rating of EXPERT across a majority of the criteria in one or more categories of the Scholarship/Creativity rubrics OR a rating of EXPERT in one or more categories of the Service Rubric

SERVICE

- A rating of EXPERT across a majority of the criteria in one or more categories of the Service Rubric OR a rating of EXPERT in one or more categories of the Scholarship/Creativity rubrics

PROFESSOR

The rank of Professor is granted to faculty who embody excellence and leadership across academia. They generously contribute to improving academic culture by exemplifying institutional values. Promotion to Professor implies sustained excellence, institutional leadership, and contributions to others' success, not just personal achievement. As such, for tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty promotion to this rank carries the minimum expectations of achieving the required levels of development during the requisite time in the probationary period of their appointment. Five (5) years in rank will be regarded as the normal time necessary before an Associate Professor becomes eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor. At the end of five (5) years, or upon application in the sixth year or thereafter, promotion will be recommended only on the basis of documented meritorious performance. The terminal degree/certification deemed appropriate by the discipline is the minimum expectation for this rank.

Early promotions, or promotion in the absence of an appropriate terminal degree, will be considered only when there is acceptable evidence of truly exceptional contributions in teaching, scholarly and/or creative achievements, University service, or professional service.

Faculty applying for promotion to Professor will demonstrate having maintained performance levels expected for Associate Professors, and having achieved the following levels of performance in these areas:

TEACHING:

- A rating of EXPERT in majority of the criteria of two or more categories of the Teaching Rubric

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVITY

- A rating of EXPERT across a majority of the criteria in two or more categories of the Scholarship/Creativity rubrics

Publication Requirements by Terminal Degree Alignment:

- Terminal degree in instruction field: 5 peer-reviewed articles + 4 additional scholarly activities (since last promotion)
- Business degree, but not instruction area: 6 peer-reviewed articles + 4 additional scholarly activities
- Degree outside business, instruction incorporates degree area: 6 peer-reviewed articles + 4 additional scholarly activities
- Degree outside business, instruction does not incorporate degree area: 7 peer-reviewed articles + 4 additional scholarly activities + 15 graduate hours in instruction area

OR a rating of EXPERT in two or more categories of the Service Rubric

SERVICE

- A rating of EXPERT across a majority of the criteria in two or more categories of the Service Rubric OR a rating of EXPERT in two or more categories of the Scholarship/Creativity rubrics
- Average of two service contributions per year, with service from more than two categories, and at least two leadership roles or significant contributions

Sabbatical

GUIDANCE:

- Guiding ESU Policy **UPM 4.11 Sabbatical Leave**
- Guiding KBOR Policy:
- KBOR Manual Chapter II Governance, State Universities Section C, Chief Executive Officer, Faculty and Staff: Item 10 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, FACULTY AND STAFF, **Item 10 Leave**
- Guiding Documents **[See Appendix B of FRD on Canvas: Sabbatical Application Forms & Rubrics]**

ELIGIBILITY:

- Eligibility for paid sabbatical leave includes at least 12 consecutive semesters (fall and spring) of full-time service to the University with the rank of instructor or above (ESU UPM). Furthermore, the most recent Annual Review must indicate the faculty is meeting expectations relative to their appointment and rank.
- Only tenured faculty members or administrators are eligible to request sabbatical leave (ESU UPM).

PRIORITIZATION:

The number of faculty members to whom leave of absence with sabbatical pay is granted in any fiscal year shall not exceed four percent of the number of equivalent full time faculty with rank of assistant professor or higher, or equivalent rank for the institution concerned for the fiscal year for which the leave of absence is granted (KBOR PM C-10.3).

- Sabbatical leave with pay is designed to improve the professional competencies of university faculty (ESU UPM).
- All leave requests are judged on the merits of the application, time limitations, and faculty priorities (ESU UPM).
- At all levels of review, sabbatical applications will be prioritized according to their alignment with the core values of Faculty Recognition:
 - We are a teaching-focused institution.
 - We highly value teaching, scholarship/creativity, and service activities that result in student learning and the meaningful engagement, retention, and success of students.
- Priority will be given to proposals that demonstrate Scholarship/Creativity that contributes to the instructional mission of the university and results in student learning and the meaningful engagement, retention, and success of students.

PROCESS:

- Applications for sabbatical leave reflect the specific nature of the proposed leave.
- Sabbatical requests must be made in writing prior to the creation of course schedules for the semester(s) of the requested leave.
- In consultation with an appropriate faculty committee as appropriate, the dean of the School or College shall review the application in terms of staff requirements, budget limitations, the merits of the individual and the nature of the proposed efforts during leave.
- The Dean will recommend an order of priority among the applicants and forward requests to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- The Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President review the applications and recommendations in terms of university-wide staff requirements, budget limitations, and institutional policy.
- The Provost will notify all parties of the final decision.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

The investment in the professional competencies of university faculty is an investment in the university's capacity to serve its students and community.

- No faculty member shall be granted leave of absence with sabbatical pay who does not agree to return to the service of the university granting the sabbatical leave for a period of at least one

year immediately following the expiration of the period of leave. Persons failing to return to the institution granting sabbatical leave shall refund all sabbatical pay. Those who fail to remain for the full year of school service (9 to 12 months depending on annual term of employment) shall refund that portion of their sabbatical pay as represented by the portion of time they fail to serve (KBOR PM C-10.4).

- It is the responsibility of the recipient to inform the Vice President for Academic Affairs of any change in the proposed program or financial support during the period of their sabbatical leave (ESU UPM 4.11)
- When an individual returns from sabbatical leave, they must make a written report to the academic unit's administrative supervisor regarding the nature of the studies, research, or the work undertaken while on leave. The academic unit's administrative supervisor will provide copies to appropriate administrative offices (ESU UPM 4.11).
- Further expectations may include a public presentation or performance for campus and/or community about the sabbatical project.

Post-tenure Review

Guiding Policy **UPM 4.03** Faculty Performance, Recognition, and Evaluation

Post-tenure review is intended to provide periodic and meaningful reflection upon performance for the applicant, the Dean, and any peers involved in the process. Post-tenure reviews must occur at least once every five (5) years. These reviews confirm that faculty are meeting expectations relative to their rank and assignment. Post-tenure review also helps to provide a broader view of patterns, priorities, goals, and meritorious achievements that may not be readily evident in single annual reviews.

A post-tenure review committee shall conduct the review. The academic unit's Dean shall form the post-tenure review committee, which must consist of at least five individuals, no more than half of whom can be from the academic unit of the faculty member under review.

The Post-Tenure Review shall consider the candidate's annual reviews and annual work plans for the past four years and shall include an evaluation of the faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship/creativity, and service as those factors are weighted in the academic unit's Faculty Recognition Document.

Tenured faculty members who receive an unsatisfactory post-tenure review evaluation will be placed on a one-year improvement plan, developed with input from the faculty to the academic unit administrative supervisor or direct supervisor and approved by the Provost. The one-year improvement plan should set goals that address the deficiencies noted in the post-tenure review and which can reasonably be achieved in one academic year. Faculty who do not satisfactorily complete the improvement plan are subject to an additional one-year improvement plan, dismissal, reassignment, or other personnel actions, as determined by the Provost.

Tenured faculty in phased retirement are excluded from post tenure review since they already have contractually agreed to a retirement date.

Appendices

A. Relevant University-wide policies

- Academic Appointments [UPM 3.04](#)
- Policies for Promotion [UPM 3.04](#)
- Merit [UPM 3.11](#)
- Policies & Procedures for Faculty Performance, Recognition, and Evaluation [UPM 4.03](#)
- Policies & Procedures for Post-tenure Review [UPM 4.03](#)
- Policies and Procedures for Tenure [UPM 4.04](#)
- Reappointment during the Probationary Period [UPM 4.04](#)
- Sabbatical Leave [UPM 4.11](#)

B. Sabbatical Application Forms & Rubrics

These materials are provided in Appendix B of the Canvas format of the Faculty Recognition Document

Application:

- Cover Page and Approvals
- KBOR Sabbatical Leave Agreement
- Description of Project

Evaluation:

- Peer Review (FRC/peer reviewers)
- Coverage of Duties (Dean)

Follow-Up:

- Final Report

C. Timelines

ACADEMIC YEAR ACTIONS & DECISIONS CALENDAR

All dates are deadlines. Early completion is encouraged. If the deadline falls on a holiday or weekend, the deadline will become the next available workday.

August 15: Faculty Notification Deadline

- Faculty being considered for retention, contract renewal, tenure, post-tenure review, are notified by their Dean
- Faculty eligible for promotion or sabbatical are notified by their Dean

August 30: Faculty Annual Review Deadline

- Excluding first year tenure-track faculty, all other faculty in all appointment types meet with their Dean to discuss the prior year's Annual Review and establish goals and workload for the current academic year

September 1: Faculty Requests Due

- All faculty in all appointment types submit requests to their Dean to be considered for retention, tenure, promotion, sabbatical, post-tenure review, and contract renewal

October 1: FRC Election Deadline

- **Faculty democratically determines which peers will form committees for faculty recognition & review matters**

October 1: Sabbatical Applications Deadline

- Faculty applying for sabbatical submit all materials

October 15: Faculty Support Materials Due

- Excluding first-year tenure-track faculty, all other faculty in all appointment types who are being reviewed submit review materials

October 15: Dean Assigns Peer Review Tasks

- Dean notifies FRC/peer reviewers of faculty requests and pending review activities
- For matters including retention, contract renewal, promotion, tenure, merit-based pay increases, sabbatical, chronic low performance, and post-tenure review, the Dean of each School/College will assign specific responsibilities according to appointment types and the elements of performance being assessed

October 31: Peer Sabbatical Recommendations

- Peer review committees submit recommendations to Dean for sabbatical requests

November 1: Second-Year Faculty Peer Review

- Peer review committees provide retention recommendations to Dean for tenure-track faculty in the second year of service.

November 15: Second-Year Retention Dean's Review

- Dean provides retention decision to Provost for tenure track faculty in second year of service.

November 15: Dean Sabbatical Recommendation

- Dean provides recommendations to Provost for sabbatical requests

December 1: First-Year Tenure-Track Faculty Dean Meeting Deadline

- 1st-Year Tenure Track Faculty meet with Dean to discuss the first semester and establish goals and workload for the second semester.
- First full review of 1st-Year Tenure Track Faculty occurs in the annual review by the Dean at the end of spring semester.

December 1: Provost Sabbatical Recommendation

- Provost provides recommendations to President on sabbatical requests

December 15: Sabbatical Decisions

- President's office notifies applicants for sabbatical leave of the decision on their applications

December 15: Second-Year Faculty Non-Reappointment Notification

- Provost provides notice of non-reappointment to 2nd year tenure track faculty who will not be retained.

December 15: Contract Renewal Peer Review

- Peer review committees provide recommendations to Dean for contract renewals

December 20: Tenure-Track Faculty 3rd+ Year Peer Review

- Peer review committees provide recommendations to Dean for retention of tenure-track faculty in 3rd+ year of service

December 20: Tenure & Promotion Peer Review

- Peer review committees submit recommendations to Dean for tenure and promotion decisions

January 30: Dean Recommendations for Retention of Faculty in 1st and 3rd + Year of Service

- Dean provides recommendations to Provost for retention of 1st year tenure-track faculty.
- Dean provides recommendations to Provost for retention of tenure-track faculty in 3rd+ year of service.

January 30: Dean Recommendations for Retentions and Renewals of Contract Faculty

- Dean provides recommendations to Provost for retention of contract faculty
- Dean provides recommendations to Provost for contract renewal for faculty in final year of non-tenure-track contracts.

February 1: Dean's Recommendations for Tenure Track Faculty

- No later than February 1 of each year, the Dean of the School or College is responsible for informing, in writing, each faculty member of their development, their fitness for their position, and their prospects for attaining tenure.

January 30: Dean Recommendations for Promotion & Tenure

- Dean submits recommendations for tenure and promotion decisions to Provost.

March 1: First-Year Tenure-Track Faculty Non-Reappointment Notification Deadline

- Provost provides notice of non-reappointment to 1st year tenure track faculty who will not be retained

March 1: Post-Tenure Review Materials Deadline

- Faculty identified for post-tenure review submit materials

March 15: Provost Notifications of Decisions on Tenure-Track Faculty 3rd+ Year Retentions

- Provost notifies faculty of decisions for retention of tenure-track faculty in 3rd+ year of service

March 15: Provost Recommendations on Tenures & Promotions

- Provost recommendations to President for tenure and promotion decisions

April 1: Tenure-Track Faculty Appeal Deadline

- Deadline for tenure-track faculty to appeal negative retention or tenure decisions.

April 1: Post-Tenure Review & Non-Contract Instructor Peer Review Deadline

- Peer review committees provide results of post-tenure review to Dean
- Peer review committees make recommendations to Dean for retention of non-contract instructors

April 15: Dean Post-Tenure Review Recommendations

- Dean provides findings from post-tenure reviews to Provost

April 15: Contract Non-Renewal Deadline

- Provost provides notice of non-renewal of contract faculty or presentation of new contracts

May 1: Tenure-Track Faculty 3rd+ Year Provost Terminal Appointment Deadline

- Deadline for notice of terminal appointment for all tenure track faculty with three or more years of service

May 15: Provost Post-Tenure Review Notifications

- Provost provides letters regarding post-tenure reviews

June 1: Faculty Annual Review Materials Deadline

- Faculty update materials for Annual Review consisting of efforts and achievements for previous academic year
- Materials consist of any additional evidence necessary for applying performance rubrics and illustrating progress in the areas identified for annual goals.

July 1: Dean Annual Faculty Reviews Deadline

- Dean provides an annual review letter to every faculty member in the School or College addressing their development, their fitness for their position, and (if applicable to the position) their prospects for attaining tenure or promotion. Annual review follows criteria and guidelines stipulated by the School or College Faculty Recognition Document.

TIMELINES BY APPOINTMENT TYPE

For ease of use and reference, actions and decisions are represented here as they affect each of the appointment types. All dates are deadlines. Early completion is encouraged. If the deadline falls on a holiday or weekend, the deadline will become the next available workday.

All Faculty

September 1: Faculty Requests Due

- All faculty in all appointment types submit requests to their Dean to be considered for retention, tenure, promotion, sabbatical, post-tenure review, and contract renewal
- October 1: Faculty democratically determine which peers will form the committee(s) for faculty consideration & recognition matters.
- April 1: Deadline for tenure-track faculty to appeal negative retention or tenure recommendations and/or decisions
- June 1: Faculty Annual Review Materials Deadline

Tenure Track Faculty in First Year of Service Applying for Second Year

- August 15: Tenure-Track faculty being considered for first-year retention are notified by Dean
- September 1: Faculty submit requests to be considered for retention.
- November 1: First-Year Tenure-Track Faculty submit requests to be considered for retention
- December 1: 1st-Year Tenure Track Faculty meet with Dean to discuss the first semester and establish goals and workload for the second semester
- January 30: Dean provides recommendations for retention of 1st year tenure-track faculty
- **March 1: Provost provides notice of non-reappointment to 1st year tenure track faculty who will not be retained**
- June 1: Faculty Annual Review Materials Deadline

Tenure Track Faculty in Second Year of Service Applying for Third Year

- August 15: Faculty being considered for second-year retention are notified by Dean
- August 30: 1st & 2nd-Year Faculty meet with Dean to discuss the prior year's Annual Review and establish goals and workload for the current academic year
- September 1: Faculty submit requests to be considered for retention.
- **October 15: 2nd year tenure track faculty submit materials for review**
- November 1: Peer review committees provide retention recommendations to Dean for faculty in second year of service
- November 15: Dean provides retention recommendation to Provost for tenure track faculty in second year of service
- **December 15: Deadline for notice of non-reappointment to 2nd year tenure track faculty who will not be retained**
- April 1: Deadline for tenure-track faculty to appeal negative retention or tenure decisions
- June 1: Faculty Annual Review Materials Deadline

Tenure-Track Faculty in 3rd + Year of Service

- August 15: Faculty being considered for retention in the 3rd + year are notified by Dean
- August 30: Faculty in the 3rd + year meet with Dean to discuss the prior year's Annual Review and establish goals and workload for the current academic year

- September 1: Faculty submit requests to be considered for retention
- **October 15:** 3rd + year tenure track faculty submit materials for review
- December 20: Peer review committees provide recommendations to Dean for retention of tenure-track faculty in 3rd+ year of service
- January 30: Dean provides recommendation to Provost for retention of tenure-track faculty in 3rd+ year of service.
- March 15: Provost provides recommendations for retention of tenure-track faculty in 3rd+ year of service
- April 1: Deadline for tenure-track faculty to appeal negative retention or tenure decisions.
- **May 1: Deadline for notice of terminal appointment for all tenure track faculty with three or more years of service**
- June 1: Faculty Annual Review Materials Deadline

Tenure-Line Faculty Applying for Tenure & Promotion

- August 15: Faculty being considered for tenure are notified by Dean
- August 15: Faculty eligible for promotion are notified by Dean
- August 30: Faculty being considered for tenure meet with Dean to discuss the prior year's Annual Review and establish goals and workload for the current academic year
- September 1: Faculty submit requests to be considered for tenure and/or promotion
- **October 15:** tenure-line faculty submits materials for promotion and/or tenure
- December 20: Peer Review committee submits recommendations to Dean for tenure and promotion decisions
- January 30: Dean submits recommendations to Provost for tenure and promotion decisions
- March 15: Provost makes recommendations for tenure and promotion decisions

Tenured Faculty Applying for Sabbatical

- August 15: Faculty eligible to apply for sabbatical are notified by Deans
- August 30: Faculty applying for sabbatical meet with Dean to discuss the prior year's Annual Review and establish goals and workload for the current academic year
- September 1: Faculty submit requests to be considered for sabbatical
- October 1: Faculty submit applications for sabbatical
- **October 31:** Peer Review committee submits recommendations for sabbatical applications
- **November 15:** Dean provides recommendations for sabbatical requests to Provost
- December 1: Provost submits recommendations to President on sabbatical requests
- **December 15:** Deadline for notifying applicants for sabbatical leave of the decision on their applications

Post-Tenure Review

- August 15: Faculty being considered for post-tenure review are notified by Dean
- August 30: Faculty identified for Post-Tenure Review meet with Dean to establish goals and workload for the current academic year
- March 1: Faculty submit post-tenure review materials
- April 1: Peer Review Committees provide results of post-tenure review
- April 15: Deans provide findings from post-tenure review to Provost
- May 15: Provost provides letter regarding Post-tenure reviews
- June 1: Faculty Annual Review Materials Deadline

Contract Faculty

- August 15: Faculty on Non-Tenure-Track Contracts are notified by Dean of which year of their contract they are in and if this is the final year of the term in their contract
- August 30: Faculty on Non-Tenure-Track Contracts meet with Dean to discuss the prior year's Annual Review and establish goals and workload for the current academic year
- September 1: Contract Faculty submit requests to be considered for contract renewal
- **October 15:** Non-Tenure-Track Contract Faculty submit materials for review
- December 15: Peer Review Committee provides review of contract faculty or recommendation for contract renewals for faculty in final year of contract
- February 15: Dean provides recommendations for retention of contract faculty or contract renewal for faculty in final year of non-tenure-track contracts
- March 1: Deadline for Non-Tenure-Track Contract Faculty to appeal negative retention or renewal decisions
- March 15: Provost provides notice of non-renewal of faculty in final year of contract or presentation of new contract
- June 1: Faculty Annual Review Materials Deadline

Non-Contract Instructors

- August 15: Non-Tenure-Line, Non-Contract Faculty (Instructors and Adjuncts) are notified of their appointment type and status by Deans
- August 30: Instructors meet with Dean/Supervisor to discuss the prior year's Annual Review and establish goals and workload for the current academic year
- September 1: Faculty submit requests to be considered for renewal.
- **March 1:** Instructors submit review documents
- April 1: Peer Review Committees make recommendations for retention of non-contract instructors
- June 1: Faculty Annual Review Materials Deadline

Annual Review

- June 1: Faculty update materials for Annual Review consisting of efforts and achievements for previous academic year. Materials consist of any additional evidence necessary for applying performance rubrics and illustrating progress in the areas identified for annual goals.
- July 1: Deans provide an annual review letter to every faculty member addressing their development, their fitness for their position, and (if applicable to the position) their prospects for attaining tenure or promotion. Annual review follows criteria and guidelines stipulated by the School or College Faculty Recognition Document.

TIMELINES BY REVIEWER TYPE

For ease of use and reference, actions and decisions are represented here as they affect each level of review. All dates are deadlines. Early completion is encouraged. If the deadline falls on a holiday or weekend, the deadline will become the next available workday.

Peer Reviewers

October 1: FRC Election Deadline

- Faculty democratically determines which peers will form committees for faculty recognition & review matters.

October 1: Receive Sabbatical Applications

- Faculty applying for sabbatical submit all materials

October 15: Receive Materials and Peer Review Tasks

- Dean notifies FRC/peer reviewers of faculty requests and pending review activities (retentions, tenures, promotions, sabbaticals, post-tenure reviews, contract renewals, chronic low performance, other.)
- For matters including retention, contract renewal, promotion, tenure, merit-based pay increases, sabbatical, chronic low performance, and post-tenure review, the Dean of each School/College will assign specific responsibilities according to appointment types and the elements of performance being assessed.
- Receive materials from faculty in all appointment types who are being reviewed (except first-year tenure track)

October 31: Sabbatical Recommendations

- Peer review committee submits recommendations for sabbatical requests to Dean

November 1: Second-Year Faculty Reviews

- Peer review committees provide retention recommendations for tenure-track faculty in the second year of service to Dean.

December 15: Contract Renewal Reviews

- Peer review committees provide recommendations for contract renewals

December 20: Tenure & Promotion Reviews

- Peer review committees submit recommendations for tenure and promotion decisions to Dean

March 1: Receive Post-Tenure Review Materials & Non-Contract Instructor Review Materials

- Receive materials from faculty identified for post-tenure reviews
- Receive materials from non-contract instructors

April 1: Post-Tenure Review & Non-Contract Instructor Peer Review Deadline

- Peer review committees provide results of post-tenure review to Dean
- Peer review committees make recommendations to Dean for retention of non-contract instructors

Deans

August 15: Notify Faculty

- All faculty being considered for retention, contract renewal, tenure, post-tenure review
- All faculty eligible for promotion or sabbatical

August 30: Annual Faculty Reviews

- Deadline to have met with all faculty in all appointment types (except first-year tenure track) to discuss the prior year's Annual Review and establish goals and workload for the current academic year.

September 1: Receive Faculty Requests

- All faculty in all appointment types submit requests to their Dean to be considered for retention, tenure, promotion, sabbatical, post-tenure review, and contract renewal

October 15: Assign Peer Review Tasks

- Dean notifies FRC/peer reviewers of faculty requests and pending review activities (retentions, tenures, promotions, sabbaticals, post-tenure reviews, contract renewals, chronic low performance, other.)
- For matters including retention, contract renewal, promotion, tenure, merit-based pay increases, sabbatical, chronic low performance, and post-tenure review, the Dean of each School/College will assign specific responsibilities according to appointment types and the elements of performance being assessed.

November 15: Dean provides recommendations to Provost for sabbatical requests

November 15: Second-Year Retention Reviews

- Dean provides retention recommendations to Provost for tenure track faculty in second year of service

December 1: Meet with First-Year Tenure-Track Faculty

- 1st-Year Tenure Track Faculty meet with Dean to discuss the first semester and establish goals and workload for the second semester

December 20: Dean Receives Tenure & Promotion Peer Review

- Peer review committees submit recommendations to Dean for tenure and promotion decisions

January 30: Dean Recommendations for Retention of Faculty in 1st and 3rd + Year of Service

- Dean provides recommendations to Provost for retention of 1st year tenure-track faculty.
- Dean provides recommendations to Provost for retention of tenure-track faculty in 3rd+ year of service.

January 30: Dean Recommendations for Retentions and Renewals of Contract Faculty

- Dean provides recommendations to Provost for retention of contract faculty
- Dean provides recommendations to Provost for contract renewal for faculty in final year of non-tenure-track contracts.

February 1: Dean's Recommendations for Tenure Track Faculty

- No later than February 1 of each year, the **Dean of the School or College** is responsible for informing, in writing, each faculty member of their development, their fitness for their position, and their prospects for attaining tenure.

April 1: Receive Post-Tenure Review & Non-Contract Instructor Peer Review Deadline

- Receive results of peer review committees post-tenure reviews
- Receive recommendations from peer review committees on non-contract instructors

April 15: Post-Tenure Review Recommendations

- Dean provides recommendations from post-tenure reviews to Provost

July 1 Annual Faculty Reviews

- Dean provides an annual review letter to every faculty member addressing their development, their fitness for their position, and (if applicable to the position) their prospects for attaining tenure or promotion. Annual review follows criteria and guidelines stipulated by the School or College Faculty Recognition Document.

Provost

December 1: Provost Sabbatical Decisions Recommendations

- Provost provides recommendations to Provost on sabbatical requests

December 15: First- & Second-Year Faculty Non-Reappointment Notification

- Provost provides notice of non-reappointment to 2nd year tenure track faculty who will not be retained

March 1: First-Year Tenure-Track Faculty Non-Reappointment Notification

- Provost provides notice of non-reappointment to 1st year tenure track faculty who will not be retained

March 15: Contract Non-Renewal Deadline

- Provost provides notice of non-renewal of contract faculty or presentation of new contracts

March 15: Provost Decisions on Tenure-Track Faculty 3rd+ Year Retentions

- Provost provides recommendations for retention of tenure-track faculty in 3rd+ year of service

March 15: Provost Recommendations on Tenures & Promotions

- Provost provides recommendations to President for tenure and promotion decisions

May 1: Tenure-Track Faculty 3rd+ Year Terminal Appointment Deadline

- Provost notifies all tenure track faculty with three or more years of service of terminal appointments

May 15: Post-Tenure Review Notifications

- Provost provides letters regarding post-tenure reviews

D. Evaluation Rubrics

FACULTY RECOGNITION DOCUMENT COMMON RUBRICS

These common rubrics were derived from criteria provided by faculty workgroups from each School or College. They are comprised of shared values and criteria provided by each School or College, organized into categories.

Each rubric specifies criteria to assess an individual's contributions as developing, proficient or expert.

These rubrics are intended for use in evaluation and formative feedback for improvement.

The categories of these rubrics are fixed and common to all Schools/Colleges. Within the categories, faculty in each School or College are afforded flexibility to adapt and further develop criteria appropriate for their areas.

General performance benchmarks are outlined in the common faculty recognition document template. Within those benchmarks, faculty may tailor expectations for achievement at different ranks and positions within their School or College.

The following rubrics are adapted from the common FRD template with School of Business & Technology-specific examples and criteria. These rubrics are intended for use in evaluation and formative feedback for improvement. They are guides, not checklists. Reviewers should consider the context and circumstances of each faculty member.

The scale of Developing, Proficient, and Expert is used across all rubrics:

- **Developing:** Minimal or limited performance; opportunities for growth identified
- **Proficient:** Meets expectations; demonstrates competence
- **Expert:** Exceeds expectations; demonstrates leadership and innovation

Teaching Evaluation Rubrics

Teaching excellence takes many forms, shaped by discipline, course level, delivery mode, and evolving student needs. Effective teaching centers on the alignment of course goals and instructional practices, the creation of motivating and welcoming learning climates, and consistent attention to student learning and feedback.

These rubrics are intended as a flexible guide to support thoughtful evaluation, not a checklist of prescriptive standards. Faculty are encouraged to provide context and narrative to help evaluators understand their unique teaching contributions. Each category is considered an essential piece of effective teaching practice.

Overall, the evaluator should ask: *How does this faculty member create meaningful learning experiences, foster student success, and reflect a commitment to continuous improvement in teaching?*

School of Business & Technology Additions: Teaching evaluations consider business education-specific elements including case-based instruction, business simulations, experiential learning, professional certification preparation (CPA, CMA, CFP, etc.), and integration of business software and tools.

Teaching Category 1: Student Learning Assessment

This category encourages evaluators to consider how faculty use learning assessment to guide instruction and support student growth. Methods will vary across disciplines and course levels.

Key question: *Does this faculty member use course-level assessment to understand, support, and enhance student learning?*

Business-specific examples: Case analyses, business simulations, capstone projects, Major Field Test performance, professional certification exam preparation assessments.

Criteria	Developing	Proficient	Expert
Alignment of Assessments with Outcomes	Assessments are poorly aligned with course learning outcomes, providing limited insights into student progress.	Assessments are aligned with course learning outcomes and measure students' understanding of key concepts.	Assessments are creatively designed to align with learning outcomes, measuring deep understanding, critical thinking, and application of knowledge.
Assessment Methods	Relies heavily on traditional, summative assessments with little variety.	Uses a mix of summative and formative assessments to evaluate student learning.	Employs a wide range of formative and summative assessments, including innovative, real-time assessments that provide continuous feedback to students.
Feedback Timeliness and Quality	Feedback is minimal, delayed, or vague, making it difficult for students to improve.	Feedback is provided in a timely manner and is generally useful for student improvement.	Feedback is personalized, actionable, and provided promptly, enabling students to apply it for meaningful improvement.
Equity in Assessment	Assessments account for few student needs, backgrounds, or abilities.	Assessments are accessible to most students and accommodate for some needs, backgrounds, or abilities.	Assessments are intentionally designed to be equitable and inclusive, offering varied formats and opportunities for all students to succeed.

Assessment data	Assessment data is minimally used to improve teaching and learning.	Qualitative and quantitative assessment data is used to monitor student progress, determine when intervention is needed, and personalize learning strategies to meet the needs of individual students.	Assessment data trends are used to inform classroom instructional strategies and make curricular changes. Instructors use assessment data to identify gaps in their own professional development.
------------------------	--	---	--

Teaching Category 2: Course Design

Course design reflects a faculty member's intentional planning, creativity, and responsiveness to the needs of their learners. Strong course design aligns content, structure, and outcomes in ways that engage students and supports academic programs.

Key question: *How thoughtfully and effectively is this faculty member designing courses to foster meaningful, student-centered learning?*

Business-specific examples: Alignment with professional certification requirements (CPA, CMA, CFP, etc.), integration of business software and tools (Excel, SAP, accounting software, data analytics platforms), industry-relevant curriculum design.

Criteria	Developing	Proficient	Expert
Learning Outcomes	Learning outcomes are unclear, poorly defined, or misaligned with course content. They lack specificity and provide little guidance for assessment, learning, or instructional planning.	Learning outcomes are clear, well-defined, and aligned with course content, assessments, and curriculum. They provide a clear roadmap for learning.	Learning outcomes are innovative, student-centered, and based on feedback and data. Outcomes reflect forward- thinking approaches that emphasize student growth and achievement.
Curriculum Design and Content	Course content is outdated, misaligned with curriculum, or otherwise unsuitable.	Course content is current, relevant, and aligned with the curriculum and learning outcomes. Materials are appropriately challenging for the intended audience. Course content that is relevant to the field and that addresses approved title, course description, and course learning outcomes.	Course content is cutting-edge, forward- thinking, and deeply integrated with real-world applications and student needs. Incorporates interdisciplinary perspectives and emerging trends.
Course Structure and Organization	Course structure lacks coherence: learning activities are poorly organized, confusing, or disconnected from learning objectives.	Course structure is logical, with clear organization and sequencing of learning activities. Resources are clearly labeled and accessible.	Course structure is highly organized, flexible, and student-focused, promoting an engaging learning experience that encourages exploration and self-directed learning.

Adaptation to Students' Needs	Content and materials are inflexible and fail to consider students' diverse needs, backgrounds, and learning styles.	Content and materials are somewhat flexible and take student diversity into account. Some accommodations are offered.	Content and materials are consistently adapted to meet the diverse needs, backgrounds, and learning styles of all students. Accessibility and inclusivity are prioritized.
--	--	---	--

Teaching Category 3: Teaching Practices

Teaching practices encompass the day-to-day choices faculty make to connect with students, present content, and build an engaging learning environment.

Key question: *How does this faculty member create an engaging and supportive classroom experience that promotes student learning?*

Business-specific examples: Case method instruction, business simulations, client projects, internship supervision, experiential learning activities, guest speakers from industry.

IDEA Score Threshold: An adjusted IDEA summary score of 45+ is presumed evidence of PROFICIENT performance in this category.

Criteria	Developing	Proficient	Expert
Engagement Strategies	Minimal use of engagement strategies. Students are mostly passive in the learning process.	Students are engaged through interactive activities, discussions, and active learning strategies that promote participation.	A variety of innovative and interactive engagement strategies are employed, fostering high levels of student engagement, collaboration, or enthusiasm.
Classroom Climate and Atmosphere	The learning environment discourages student motivation or self-efficacy. Students may feel unwelcome, disrespected or disengaged. Little attempt to address concerns voiced by students.	The learning environment is positive, inclusive, and encourages some opportunities for student interaction and collaboration. No consistently negative student ratings of teacher accessibility or interactions	The learning environment is dynamic, inclusive, and fosters a strong sense of community, trust, and collaboration among students.
Student-Centered Learning	Limited opportunities for students to take ownership of their learning. Instruction is primarily lecture-based.	Students are encouraged to take ownership of their learning through group work, problem-solving, or reflection.	Students are fully empowered to drive their learning, with ample opportunities for inquiry, self-reflection, and leadership. Activities are creative and/or highly student directed.

Instructor Availability	Instructor is rarely available to assist students outside of class or during office hours. Communication is inconsistent.	Instructor is generally available, offering scheduled office hours and some individualized support.	Instructor is highly available and proactive in supporting students, offering tailored help outside of class, and regularly checking in with struggling students.
Improve Opportunities for Work	Little or no evidence that instructor develops or uses course content and/or design strategies that advances students' knowledge and skills, prepares graduates for specialized and emerging careers, supports lifelong learning, or strengthens students' workforce readiness.	Instructor provides evidence that they develop and/or use course content and design strategies that advance students' knowledge and skills, prepares graduates for specialized and emerging careers, supports lifelong learning, and/or strengthens students' workforce readiness.	Instructor provides ample evidence of continuous development and uses of course content and design strategies that advances students' knowledge and skills, prepares graduates for specialized and emerging careers, supports lifelong learning, and/or strengthens students' workforce readiness.

Teaching Category 4: Reflection and Growth

Great teaching evolves through thoughtful reflection on feedback from students and peers. This category values faculty who learn from experience, seek out new strategies, and contribute to broader efforts to improve teaching and learning. Evaluators should look for patterns of intentional growth, not perfection.

Key questions: *How does this faculty member use feedback and self-reflection to improve their teaching effectiveness? How does this faculty member engage with the broader teaching community and contribute to instructional improvement?*

Business-specific examples: Engagement with business pedagogy scholarship, AACSB teaching development expectations, participation in discipline-specific teaching workshops and conferences.

Criteria	Developing	Proficient	Expert
Self-Reflection on Teaching	Little to no reflection on teaching effectiveness; little or no adjustments based on prior experience, student learning assessment, student, or peer feedback. .	Reflects on teaching practices and adjusts based on feedback from students and peers.	Consistently reflects on teaching practices, actively seeks feedback, and makes iterative adjustments to improve teaching effectiveness.
Integration of Student Feedback	Student feedback is not collected or considered in course design or delivery.	Student feedback is occasionally collected and used to make some adjustments to course delivery.	Student feedback is consistently collected, thoughtfully considered, and actively used to improve course design, delivery, and teaching methods.
Professional Development and Collaboration	No engagement in professional development or collaboration with peers.	Participates in professional development opportunities and occasionally collaborates with colleagues.	Actively engages in ongoing professional development and consistently collaborates with peers to enhance teaching practices and student outcomes.

Institutional Contributions	No contributions beyond their individual courses.	Contributes to program or institutional discussions about teaching, learning, and curriculum.	Leads or significantly contributes to institutional or program teaching initiatives or innovation.
--	---	---	--

Scholarship/Creativity Evaluation Rubrics

Scholarly & Creative activity is broad. Some aspects of Scholarship & Creativity generalize to all Schools and Colleges. Others are very discipline specific.

These rubrics provide a structure for understanding the scope, quality, and impact of a faculty member's work. These rubrics provide the prioritization for scholarship & creative endeavors to align with institutional values.

It is expected that these rubrics will be applied with flexibility and professional judgment. Reviewers should look for outcomes, not volume.

Faculty will rarely demonstrate strength in all three categories or in every criterion within a category. The context and circumstances of each faculty must be considered.

Overall, the evaluator should ask: *How has this faculty member used their advanced knowledge and skills to engage students, peers, and/or the community?*

School of Business & Technology Additions: Scholarship is categorized according to AACSB intellectual contribution types: Basic/Discovery scholarship, Applied/Integration scholarship, and Teaching/Learning scholarship.

Scholarship/Creativity Category 1: Student Engagement and Teaching Integration

At ESU, research and creative activities are most impactful when they connect to student learning. This category recognizes faculty who mentor students in research or creative work, **or** who bring scholarly insight directly into their teaching.

Key question: *How does this faculty member involve students in their scholarly or creative work or enrich teaching through their scholarly pursuits?*

Business-specific examples: Supervising student research projects, business plan competitions, student-involved consulting projects, undergraduate research assistants, co-authored publications with students.

Criteria	Developing	Proficient	Expert
Student Engagement	Minimal or no evidence of student involvement in faculty's research or creativity	Mentors and/or involves students in research and creativity in activities such as research projects, exhibitions, performances, presentations, productions, or co-authored projects.	Mentors and engages students in multiple aspects of research or creative projects, leading to student co-authored publications or presentations, exhibitions, performances, presentations, or productions.
OR			
Teaching Integration	Minimal or no connection between research/creative production and teaching, mentoring, or student learning.	Uses research/creativity achievements to enhance teaching, course content, or student learning.	Develops courses, teaching materials, or curriculum innovations based on research, influencing program and/or institutional practices.

Scholarship/Creativity Category 2: External Engagement and Collaboration

Scholarly & Creative work gains depth and relevance through collaboration, funding, or connection to community needs.

This category encourages evaluators to recognize diverse forms of impact and value to ESU through grant writing, interdisciplinary partnerships, and contributions to community or societal needs.

Impact should be viewed through the lens of the faculty member's specific discipline and personal goals.

Key question: *How does this faculty member expand their scholarship/creativity through collaboration, funding, and public engagement?*

Business-specific examples: Industry-sponsored research, business community partnerships, applied research with regional businesses, consulting that informs scholarship, SBDC projects, grant applications to business-focused funding sources.

Criteria	Developing	Proficient	Expert
Funding	Minimal engagement in grant writing or pursuit of internal or external funding opportunities. Efforts supported by noncompetitive unit or Foundation funds	Some success with internal, local, or statewide grant applications to fund scholarly pursuits; Prepares applications for external funding.	Successfully secures major external funding (state, federal, or private grants)
Public Impact	Minimal or no evidence of research or creative impact beyond academia.	Research/Creative activity demonstrates relevance to community or institutional needs.	Research/Creative activity significantly contributes to public policy, social change, or economic development.
Collaboration	Minimal or no evidence of interdisciplinary or collaborative scholarship.	Collaborates within the same field or across programs or within the institution.	Leads, facilitates, or contributes to interdisciplinary research/creative activity with state, region, national, or international collaboration.

Scholarship/Creativity Category 3: Research Productivity and Impact

This category focuses on the quality, visibility, and significance of scholarly or creative output, not simply quantity. Evaluators should consider the faculty member's annual record in context of the varied time required to complete specific projects.

Key question: *What is the quality and impact of this faculty member's scholarly or creative work, and how does it contribute to their discipline?*

Business-specific expectations: Publication requirements align with the tiered structure based on terminal degree alignment (see Tenure section). Publications in high-quality journals (as defined by ABDC, Cabells, SJR, or School-approved list) are expected. AACSB intellectual contribution categories (Basic/Discovery, Applied/Integration, Teaching/Learning) provide the framework for evaluating scholarly productivity.

Criteria	Developing	Proficient	Expert
Scholarship &/or Creative Production	Minimal identified work or goals for publications or research output of scholarly significance / Minimal identified work or goals for adjudications, commissions, compositions, exhibitions, fellowships, rehearsals, patents, performances, productions, publications or books, films, recordings, or showcases of scholarly, creative, and applied significance	Demonstrates progress on a record of peer- reviewed/publicly- presented adjudications, commissions, compositions, exhibitions, fellowships, rehearsals, patents, performances, productions, publications or books, films, recordings, or showcases	Demonstrates completed projects generating a body of work, including high-impact adjudications, commissions, compositions, exhibitions, fellowships, rehearsals, patents, performances, productions, publications or books, films, recordings, or showcases.
Research &/or Creativity Quality	Research or creative work lacks rigor or depth.	Research or creative work demonstrates thoughtful research methodology or creative ingenuity, yielding reliable findings or creative works of quality recognized in the discipline.	Research or creative work demonstrates rigor and innovation and contributes to advancements in the field.
Professional Presentations of Scholarly &/or Creative Work	Minimal conference presentations or dissemination of scholarly/creative work. conference/seminar/workshop exhibitions, demonstrations,	Presents research at professional conferences, exhibitions, or creative performances at state or national levels.	Presents at national or international conferences, keynote addresses, or major exhibitions/performances and involves students in presentations.

	performances, presentations, productions, showcases or dissemination of scholarly/creative work.		
--	---	--	--

Service Evaluation Rubrics

These rubrics are intended to recognize contribution and leadership in activities that strengthen the institution, supports student success, or connect the university to the broader community.

Evaluators should consider the depth of commitment, overall impact, and alignment of service efforts with institutional goals.

Reviewers should look for outcomes, not volume. Faculty will rarely demonstrate strength in all four categories or in every criterion within a category. The context and circumstances of each faculty must be considered.

Overall, the evaluator should ask: *In what ways has this faculty member used their advanced knowledge and skills to contribute to the operations of the University, their discipline, or the community?*

School of Business & Technology Additions: Service expectations prioritize Category 1 (Student Support) in alignment with institutional values. Business-specific service contexts are recognized throughout.

Service Category 1: Student Support and Collaboration

Service to students goes beyond the classroom; it includes mentorship, recruitment, and building a supportive learning community.

This category values faculty who invest in student growth and who help connect students to the university and to one another.

Key question: *How does this faculty member support student success outside the classroom and foster a collaborative academic environment?*

Business-specific examples: Advising business student organizations (e.g., business clubs, Beta Gamma Sigma), internship coordination, career placement support, professional mentoring, student competition coaching.

Criteria	Developing	Proficient	Expert
Student Engagement, & Retention	Rarely participates in student support activities or shows limited awareness of student needs.	Consistently participates in advising or mentoring, supports student engagement efforts.	Leads or initiates student-focused programs with demonstrably measurable impact on student outcomes.
Mentoring & Student Support	Provides minimal or inconsistent guidance to students outside their courses.	Meets regularly with students for mentoring or career/professional advising	Develops and leads structured mentoring programs with demonstrated student development outcome
Recruitment Efforts	Does not engage in recruitment activities.	Participates regularly in recruitment events or activities.	Designs and leads strategic recruitment or retention efforts; partners with admissions or other external groups.
Interdisciplinary Projects	No documented participation in interdisciplinary activities.	Participates in interdisciplinary projects.	Initiates or leads interdisciplinary collaborations with sustained institutional or public impact.

Service Category 2: Institutional Service & Leadership

ESU thrives when faculty participate actively and take initiative in shared governance, strategic planning, and community-building.

This category emphasizes the scope and impact of a faculty member's internal service, including leadership, committee work, and program development.

Key question: *How does this faculty member contribute to the university's operations, culture, and progress through institutional service and leadership?*

Business-specific examples: AACSB accreditation committee service, assurance of learning/assessment activities, curriculum committee work, strategic planning participation, faculty governance.

Criteria	Developing	Proficient	Expert
Institutional Service	Little to no participation in department, school, or university committees. Rarely attends meetings or attends meetings but does not meaningfully contribute.	Actively contributes to institutional service through committees or curriculum work.	Leads institutional initiatives; chairs committees; demonstrates broad impact and initiative.
Committee Involvement	Sporadically attends or minimally contributes to committees.	Regularly attends, participates, and follows through on committee responsibilities.	Leads or coordinates committee efforts that result in institutional improvements.
Event Participation	Seldom participates in program or university events	Regularly contributes to events or programs aligned with unit strategic goals.	Organizes and leads events with significant institutional or program strategic goals.
Collegial Collaboration & Leadership	Rarely engages in collaborative efforts or avoids interdisciplinary service.	Works collaboratively within program, unit, or institutional committees.	Leads cross-unit initiatives; models effective service practices.
Faculty Governance	Limited involvement in faculty governance structures.	Regularly participates in governance meetings and decision-making processes.	Leads governance efforts, driving policy changes and organizational improvements.

Service Category 3: Professional Service & Engagement

Faculty serve their disciplines by participating in professional organizations, reviewing scholarly work, and helping shape academic standards.

This category values engagement that advances a field or supports peers in meaningful ways. Impact can be formal or informal, local or national.

Key question: *How does this faculty member contribute to their academic or professional community beyond campus?*

Business-specific examples: Service in business-related professional organizations (AAA, AMA, AIS, FMA, DSI, etc.), maintaining professional certifications with service components, journal reviewing, conference organization.

Criteria	Developing	Proficient	Expert
Professional Service	Minimal engagement in professional organizations or scholarly service.	Maintains active membership in professional organizations, serves on organization or editorial boards, contributes to conferences, or serves as a peer reviewer.	Holds leadership roles in professional organizations, organizes major conferences, serves in editorial roles on professional publications, serves on accreditation teams, or contributes significantly to the profession.
Conference Leadership	Minimal participation in conferences or professional gatherings.	Attends and occasionally presents at conferences or workshops.	Organizes conferences, facilitates professional learning, or leads conference initiatives.
Scholarly Peer Review	Minimal participation in peer review processes.	Serves as a peer reviewer for journals, conferences, or professional publications.	Serves as an editor, manages peer review processes, or shapes scholarly discourse.

Service Category 4: Community & Civic Engagement

As a public institution, ESU benefits from faculty who apply their expertise to serve the broader community.

This category recognizes those who participate in outreach, serve on advisory boards, or contribute to civic efforts in ways aligned with their discipline. Contributions may be service-based, educational, or consultative.

Key question: *How does this faculty member use their academic knowledge and skills to benefit the public good and build community relationships?*

Business-specific examples: Industry advisory board participation, SBDC consulting, executive education, community business development, pro bono consulting for nonprofits, serving on local business or economic development boards.

Criteria	Developing	Proficient	Expert
Community Engagement & Civic Service	Minimal engagement in community or civic service.	Participates in community outreach, advisory boards, or professional consulting.	Leads or facilitates major outreach initiatives, serves in high-impact community roles, or organizes civic programs that align with university goals.
Public Outreach	Minimal involvement in public-facing educational efforts.	Participates in community education or public awareness efforts.	Leads or facilitates public workshops, forums, or major outreach efforts to promote educational goals.
Advisory Roles	Minimal participation in advisory roles.	Serves on local advisory boards or committees.	Holds leadership positions and/or plays active roles on advisory boards, shaping community initiatives.
Professional Service to Community	Minimal engagement with community & civic organizations, and/or engagement does not demonstrate application of academic or area of expertise.	Applies academic or area expertise in civic organizations and community.	Demonstrates a record of applying academic or area expertise and skills in ways that help civic organizations and community to advance their goals.

