

Criteria and Procedures for Tenure and Promotion

School of Accounting

Moore School of Business

February 2012

Approved by UCTP – April 9, 2014

Tenure and promotion procedures are set forth in *The Faculty Manual* of the University of South Carolina. The most recent revision of the Faculty Manual was December, 2013. Though *The Faculty Manual* provides guidelines for tenure and promotion unit policy, it is the responsibility of each unit to formulate specific criteria and procedures for tenure and promotion. This document details the criteria and procedures to be used by the School of Accounting in the Moore School of Business.

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

Awarding of tenure and promotion in the School of Accounting in the Moore School of Business is based on a candidate's contribution in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service, and on the candidate holding the earned doctorate. The requirements to be met in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service for tenure and promotion are specified below. The evidence to be considered in evaluating whether the criteria have been met is also specified. The recommendations of eligible faculty regarding tenure and promotion must be based on the requirements and evidence of record detailed in this document. The criteria are intended to ensure that these recommendations and evaluations are made in accordance with clear standards and are based on professional merit.

Teaching and scholarship are weighed most heavily in tenure and promotion decisions. Service is necessary but not sufficient for tenure and promotion.

In all three areas of contribution, performance will be reviewed for the entire academic career of the candidate with primary attention given to the period during which the candidate was at the current rank. Criteria for all tenure and promotion decisions shall require a record of accomplishment indicative of continuing development of the faculty member in research, teaching, and service, and appropriate progress toward development of a national or international reputation in a field. Criteria for tenure at any rank must require evidence of consistency and durability of performance. Thus, length of service completed by a faculty member at a given rank is a valid consideration in formulating recommendations.

Requirements for tenure at the associate professor and professor levels are the same as for promotion to those ranks. These requirements also apply to a faculty member who is being considered for tenure upon hiring. In that case, scholarship, teaching, and service will be evaluated on the basis of performance in prior positions. In the case of application for early tenure and promotion, the same criteria shall be used.

General Standards for Assessment of Faculty

In assessing a candidate's performance for tenure and/or promotion the following general standards shall be used:

- Outstanding: The candidate's performance is far above the minimally effective level. In regard to research and scholarship, output is of very high quality, and a national/international reputation is evident.
- Excellent: The candidate significantly exceeds the minimally effective level of performance. In regard to research and scholarship, output is already of high quality, and a national/international reputation is clearly possible, if not likely.
- Good: The candidate's performance is clearly above the minimally effective level. In regard to research and scholarship, he or she shows promise of high quality in the future.
- Fair: The candidate meets the minimally effective level of performance.
- Unacceptable: The candidate has accomplished less than the minimally effective level of Performance.

Criteria for all tenure and promotion decisions shall require a record of accomplishment indicative of continuing development of the faculty member in research, teaching, and service, and appropriate progress toward development of a national or international reputation in a field. Criteria for tenure at any rank must require evidence of consistency and durability of performance.

Evidence of Record

This section describes the evidence to be considered in evaluating a candidate's record. In evaluating specific evidence, consideration shall be given to both quantity and quality.

Scholarship

A record of sustained, effective involvement in this area is required of all tenure and promotion candidates. Scholarship is contribution to the store of knowledge in an area through (a) ***theoretical analysis*** or (b) ***systematic collection, classification, and/or analysis of data***. Scholarship includes the presentation of new ideas, the synthesis of existing ideas, the communication of existing ideas to a new audience, the definition/recognition of a new problem area, or progress toward the resolution of business and accounting problems.

Both the quantity and quality of a candidate's scholarship are important. However, the quality of the scholarship shall be the major criterion for its evaluation. For the purposes of evaluation, quality is defined in terms of ***(1) importance of the information revealed, (2) conceptual/theoretical sophistication, and (3) methodological rigor.***

Evidence of a candidate's contribution to scholarship, ranked in order of importance by categories, includes, but is not limited to, the following:

Category 1

Publication of articles in refereed academic journals and publication of scholarly books.

Category 2

Publication of scholarly book chapters or monographs, publication of papers in refereed proceedings, publication of articles in refereed professional journals, and acquisition of research grants and contracts from outside the University.

Category 3

Publication of articles in non-refereed journals, presentation of papers at academic and professional meetings, chairing research sessions or discussing research papers at such meetings, and presentation of papers as an invited speaker in workshops.

Category 4

Preparation of bona fide research proposals, preparation of working papers, and preparation and publication of case collections.

Candidates are not expected to have made a contribution in each category. However, evidence must exist that the candidate has made a contribution in category 1. Evidence from categories 2, 3, and 4 is not sufficient in the absence of evidence from category 1.

Articles in non-refereed sections of refereed journals receive less credit than do articles in refereed sections.

The quality of a book/monograph shall be the major criterion for its evaluation. Readings, edited books, or proceedings shall be given less importance than books/monographs that extend the frontiers of knowledge. Special credit will be given to items in the latter category as compared to textbooks that compile and organize existing knowledge. In general, books/monographs are not required for acceptable performance in the area of scholarship.

While deserving of recognition, the acquisition of research grants and contracts from outside the University is not required for acceptable performance in the area of scholarship.

Generally, *papers presented at national meetings* of academic societies shall be evaluated higher than papers presented at local or regional meetings. Additionally, the value assigned to professional papers is flexible and will be determined by such factors as: (a) the quality of the paper, (b) the nature of the competition, and (c) whether or not the paper was invited. However, neither competitive nor invited papers will be considered as substitutes for refereed journal articles. Papers presented at professional meetings shall be considered desirable but not sufficient to be considered an acceptable performance in this area.

Teaching

Teaching is a multifaceted activity that includes in-class performance, student development, curriculum development, teaching material development, and professional executive education.

Teaching evidence falls into three categories as outlined below. Items within each category are presented in no particular order. Candidates are not required to have made a contribution in each

item in each category. Evidence of a candidate's contribution to teaching, ranked in order of importance by categories, includes, but is not limited to, the following:

Category 1

Course Content: Analysis of syllabi, texts, exams, and other course materials for rigor and current development.

In-Class Performance: Evaluations of a candidate's teaching performance by students and faculty, and honors and awards received for teaching.

Category 2

Student Development: Chairing of dissertation and thesis committees, serving on dissertation and thesis committees, and involvement with students in non-dissertation research projects.

Course and Course Material Development: Development of new courses; development of instructional material and methods including but not limited to textbooks, work books, cases and exercises, visual media, and computer software that are related directly to the candidate's teaching. Of these, widely used textbooks will be given more weight.

Amount of Teaching: Course load (number of courses taught per year), course level (undergraduate, masters or doctorate), number of students, and number of different courses taught.

Category 3

Student Advising: Involvement in student counseling and advising at undergraduate, masters and doctoral levels, and participation in student organizations.

Professional Seminars: Seminars and presentations that deal with pedagogy, curricula, or similar educational issues.

Professional Executive Education: Evaluations of a candidate's teaching performance by participants, design/renovation of programs, and awards and honors received for teaching.

Service

Service includes service to colleagues, the School of Accounting, the Moore School of Business, the University of South Carolina, the State of South Carolina, the academic accounting profession, and the local and business community. It is expected that each faculty member will serve in those areas best suited to the faculty member's interests and abilities. Not all faculty members are expected to provide the same quantity or types of service. However, each faculty member is expected to work constructively with colleagues and to make a service contribution to the School of Accounting.

The quantity of service should increase with rank. Very little service is expected of the assistant professor, more is expected of the associate professor, and still more is expected of the full professor.

Evidence of a candidate's contribution to service includes, but is not limited to, the following

areas:

- Service to the School of Accounting: Performance on School of Accounting committees; cooperation with colleagues on research projects and teaching assignments; attendance and participation in workshops, faculty meetings, and other functions sponsored by the School of Accounting.
- Service to the University and the State: Performance on committees of the Moore School of Business, and the University of South Carolina; administrative responsibilities and functions; and special projects for the University and state government agencies.
- Service to the Academic Community: Leadership roles in the administration of academic and professional organizations; editorial review board membership and review work for academic journals; reviews of papers for academic organizations; service as an external reviewer for promotion and tenure at other colleges/universities; and book reviews.
- Service to the Local and Business Community: Pro-bono consulting for, academically based presentations to, and involvement with, community and business groups; testimony before governmental bodies; and consulting that contributes to the faculty member's professional growth, enhances instruction, or enhances the reputation and stature of the University of South Carolina.

Requirements for Tenure and Promotion

The School of Accounting's evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion is based on a candidate's record in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service as described in the faculty manual. The level at which a candidate shall perform to be granted tenure at, or promoted to associate or full professor shall be based on the quality and quantity of activities in each area, with quality being the primary consideration. The following describes requirements for tenure at or promotion to the associate professor and professor levels. A faculty member may not be tenured at the rank of assistant professor.

Tenure at or Promotion to Associate Professor

The School of Accounting is committed to achievement in research, teaching, and service. To receive tenure at or promotion to associate professor, a candidate must be excellent in research and good in teaching and service. There must be evidence of national or international stature in a field.

Tenure at or Promotion to Professor

To earn tenure and/or promotion at the rank of professor in the School of Accounting, a candidate must be excellent in research and teaching, and good in service. There must be evidence of national or international stature in the field.

Procedures for Tenure and Promotion

The tenure and promotion procedures to be followed by the School of Accounting (SOA) are described below. The procedures are designed to ensure that the evaluations and recommendation for tenure and promotion are based on professional merit. The SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee shall supervise all matters related to tenure and promotion.

Eligibility for Tenure and Promotion

Faculty members appointed at the rank of assistant professor who have not previously held tenure-track positions at another institution of higher learning normally will not be recommended for tenure until they are in at least their fourth year at the University of South Carolina. Faculty members appointed at the rank of associate professor or professor who have not previously held tenure-track positions at another institution of higher learning normally will not be recommended for tenure until they are in at least their third year at the University of South Carolina. However, in rare cases where time in rank is significant and performance in rank has occurred over a period of years, tenure will be granted simultaneously with appointment when his/her record in the areas of research, teaching and service clearly merit it. There is no difference between the standards applied to faculty who apply for tenure in the penultimate year of the probationary period and those who apply for tenure prior to the penultimate year. Time and accomplishments in a faculty position at another educational institution may be considered in evaluating a candidate for tenure or promotion, however performance during an appointment in the SOA will be given greater weight.

All non-tenured tenure-track faculty members who have completed the minimum years of service are considered for tenure and all tenure-track faculty members below the rank of professor are considered for promotion each year. Each eligible faculty member in the Moore School of Business (MSB) will receive annual written notification from the Dean of the MSB by the date stated on the university calendar posted on provost's Web site. A faculty member who intends to apply for tenure or promotion in the next cycle must so inform the dean no later than 15 calendar days after the first notification. On the dates listed on the official calendar, the SOA must provide the provost with a list of those faculty members who intend to apply for tenure or promotion. The list must also include any faculty members in their penultimate year who have not stated an intent to apply for tenure and must, therefore, include all who are in their penultimate year.

The SOA tenure and promotion procedures will comply with the timetable issued by the Office of the Provost and with the times defined in *The Faculty Manual* of the University of South Carolina, Columbia Campus. The Chair of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee shall notify each faculty member eligible for promotion or tenure of the date the candidate's file materials are due. The notice must be in writing and must be sent at least one month before the candidate's file is due. A candidate who is going up for his/her first promotion may use either the criteria in place when the candidate is hired or the criteria in place when the candidate seeking is seeking his/her first promotion. A candidate going up for their second promotion must use the criteria in effect at that time.

Responsibility for Candidate's File

The candidate bears primary responsibility for preparation of the file on which the decision will be based. This includes maintaining the records and documentation that eventually will be

needed for the file. In addition to the tenure and promotion file, the candidate also will provide specific materials requested by the Chair of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee that will be required for external reviewers or other uses in the tenure and promotion process. Such materials include a current curriculum vita and copies of published articles and current working papers to be sent to external reviewers, and copies of student teaching evaluations to be used by the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee in providing a synthesis of the candidate's teaching performance.

Candidates should follow University Committee on Tenure and Promotion guidelines for putting their files together. The candidate is responsible for delivering the completed file to the Chair of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee by the date specified in the letter from the Chair. The Chair of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee will be available to advise in the assembly of the candidate's file, but the ultimate responsibility is that of the candidate.

Composition of School of Accounting Tenure and Promotion Committee

Only tenured members of the SOA (excluding professors holding emeritus rank) may vote on an application for tenure or promotion. Faculty members of equal or higher rank may vote on a candidate for tenure but only faculty of higher rank may vote on promotion. In this regard, faculty on official leave (e.g., on sabbatical or for medical reasons) are eligible to serve on the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee. A faculty member on official leave may vote if he or she has notified the Director of the SOA in writing of a desire to do so before beginning the leave and he or she is familiar with the evidence. A faculty member in the SOA required to make a tenure and/or promotion recommendation at a higher administrative level will not be a member of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee. Any otherwise eligible faculty member who has a conflict of interest or a family or other close personal relationship with the candidate that could affect his or her objectivity shall not vote or otherwise participate in the process.

The SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee shall elect a Chair subsequent to the Committee's vote on tenure and promotion applications in the Fall semester but at least by April 15. The newly elected Chair shall serve a term of two years in length. The outgoing Chair of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee will notify the Director of the SOA, the Dean of the MSB, the Provost of the University, the Chair of the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion, and the Faculty Senate the name of the new Chair by May 15. The Chair is required to be a tenured full professor. The SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee must consist of at least five (5) members. If necessary, the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee members eligible to vote shall develop a policy to select additional qualified members from other disciplines within the MSB to achieve at least five (5) voting members.

Responsibilities of School of Accounting Tenure and Promotion Committee

Internal and external evaluations will be used to assist in the evaluation of a candidate's research, publications, and other professional and scholarly activities. At least five (5) external reviewers shall be secured from a field of scholars who have expertise in the candidate's field of research. . The Chair will ask members of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee to submit names of potential reviewers. The Chair is responsible for selecting a sufficient number of reviewers from the combined list provided by members of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee to ensure that at least five (5) external reviews are provided. External reviewers must be obtained from a

list of impartial scholars at peer or aspirant institutions within the field, outside the University of South Carolina. If a person can be shown to be one of the leading scholars in a particular field, that person may be used as an outside evaluator even if he or she is at an institution that is not peer or aspirant. Persons who have co-authored publications, collaborated on research, or been colleagues or advisors of the applicant normally should be excluded from consideration as outside evaluators. All evaluators must be asked to disclose any relationship or interaction with the applicant. The outside evaluators must be selected by the unit except as provided below for jointly appointed faculty. The outside reviewers will not be disclosed to the candidate.

The Chair of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee is responsible for contacting the outside reviewers and securing their agreement to participate in the review process. The Chair of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee will provide the outside reviewers with the candidate's vita, all or a representative sample of the candidate's research papers, and a copy of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Criteria. The Chair will encourage the external reviewers to submit their reviews, curriculum vitae, and, if available, short biographical sketches by the specified deadline. The Chair will place the completed reviews, copies of the letters requesting the reviews, and copies of the external reviewers' vitae in the candidate's file. Confidentiality of the external reviewers' letters will be respected, to the extent allowed by law.

The SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee is responsible for providing a synthesis of evaluations of the candidate's teaching performance and a summary of supporting evidence for the candidate's file. The Chair of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee will designate a member of the committee to provide this synthesis and summary. The teaching summary must include as a minimum (1) average rating of overall instructor performance of each course taught each semester; and (2) comparisons of the teaching student evaluation results from the same semester from faculty who teach other sections of the course or from faculty who teach courses at the same course level. Other departmental and college comparison ratings may also be used. The summary should give context such as whether the faculty member has strict grading standards, whether there are historically low evaluations for given courses, and other contextual information. Peer evaluations are also required to be in the primary file. Other teaching functions and the weight to be given to them in evaluating teaching performance that is specified in the unit criteria should also be included in the file. These include, but are not limited to, advisement and mentoring of students and student organizations; creation of teaching materials, techniques or programs; supervision of PhD students; and supervision of research or independent study by undergraduate or masters-level students.

Peer and student evaluations of teaching must be included in the candidate's file. The Director of the SOA should arrange for senior faculty members to observe the classroom teaching of faculty members below the rank of Professor to build a peer review file over a period of time. Peer reviews should consider such factors as lecture style, class syllabus, appropriateness of the exam process, efforts to provide creative learning experiences, and evidence of the faculty member's growing mastery of the subject matter.

Once the candidates' tenure and/or promotion files are complete, the Chair of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee will notify in writing the eligible members of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee that the files are available for review. The Chair also will schedule a meeting of the committee members eligible to vote on each candidate. Both the Dean of the MSB and the Director of the SOA shall be notified by the Chair of the SOA Tenure and

Promotion Committee of the pending meeting of the committee. Meetings at which candidates are considered for promotion and/or tenure are generally closed to everyone except those individuals eligible to vote on the candidate. A meeting may, however, by vote of the committee, be opened to anyone the committee wishes to be present at the meeting. At the scheduled meeting or by subsequent date determined by the Chair of the committee, each eligible faculty member will, by secret ballot, either vote to abstain, or vote yes to support or no to reject each candidate's application for tenure and/or promotion. Eligible faculty members need not be present at the meeting at which the candidate is considered in order to vote. In such cases, if votes are taken at the scheduled meeting, sealed absentee ballots delivered in advance of the meeting to the Chair of the committee are allowed. Each eligible faculty member must provide written justification for his/her vote. These justifications, which need not be signed, must be based on and should make specific reference to the SOA Tenure and Promotion Criteria. A unit vote in support of a candidate's application for tenure and/or promotion will consist of more than 50 percent of the voting committee members, excluding abstentions. That is, abstentions or failures to vote will not be counted in determining a majority vote.

The Chair of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee will count the votes along with the Director of the SOA. The Chair of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee will notify all candidates in writing as to whether their application was supported or not supported. The Chair also will notify the eligible faculty members of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee of the decision(s). The vote count will not be revealed to the candidate or the Committee members. All deliberations of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee and materials, including outside evaluators' letters and written justifications of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, shall remain in strictest confidence and be available only to those entitled to access the candidate's file.

If the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee vote is in support of tenure and/or promotion, the Chair of the committee will place the recorded votes and written justifications in the candidate's file and forward the file to the Director of the SOA. The Director of the SOA will enter a vote of yes for support, no to reject, or abstain to not vote on each candidate's application for tenure and/or promotion. The Director of the SOA also will write a letter to justify his/her vote and place this letter in the candidate's file. The Director of the SOA will forward the file to the Dean of the MSB.

If the unit vote does not support tenure and/or promotion, except as noted below, the candidacy will not be considered further beyond the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee. The Chair of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee will inform the Director of the SOA and the Dean of the MSB of the negative vote. Candidates not recommended shall be informed by the Chair of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee of appeal procedures as specified in the *Faculty Manual* of the University of South Carolina, Columbia Campus.

Upon written request of a candidate not recommended, the Chair of the SOA Tenure and Promotion Committee will place the recorded votes and written justifications in the candidate's file and forward the file to the Director of the SOA. The Director of the SOA will enter a vote of yes for support, no to reject or abstain from voting and write a letter to justify his/her vote or abstention. The Director of the SOA will forward the file to the Dean of the MSB.

The unit must inform the provost of any candidate in his or her penultimate year who receives a negative recommendation and does not request that his/her file be sent forward. The University

Grievance Committee shall hear appeals upon request from all persons dissatisfied with the president's decisions regarding tenure or promotion.

Faculty with Joint Appointments

The criteria for granting tenure or promotion to a jointly appointed faculty member shall be those of the primary unit. For faculty holding joint appointments, each secondary unit must be given an opportunity to propose outside evaluators and to comment on evaluators proposed by the primary unit. Primary and secondary unit Tenure and Promotion Chairs should work together to obtain a suitable, representative group of evaluators. In any event, an evaluation must be solicited from at least one evaluator nominated or approved by each secondary unit's tenure and promotion chair.

Each secondary unit's tenure and promotion committee will have an adequate opportunity to review the final tenure and/or promotion file and a summary of the views of that committee will be forwarded to the SOA's tenure and promotion chair for inclusion in the candidate's file at least five days prior to the meeting of the SOA tenure and promotion committee.

A memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the School of Accounting and the secondary unit to which the faculty member holds a joint appointment shall include (1) identification of the tenuring unit; (2) teaching load and split of teaching load between the primary and secondary units; (3) formula and criteria for sharing indirect cost return (IDCR) among the units; and (4) service responsibility load and split between the units. The MOU will include signatures of the jointly appointed faculty members, the unit heads of the primary and secondary units, the deans of the colleges in which the units reside, and the provost. The teaching load for a joint appointment should not be greater than for a faculty member of the same rank in the primary unit. The service load for a joint appointment should be comparable to normal service load of a faculty member of the same rank in the primary unit.

Revision of School of Accounting Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Procedures

The tenured faculty members of the School of Accounting are responsible for formulating the specific criteria and procedures for tenure and promotion applicable to faculty of the SOA. Revisions to these criteria and procedures will be made in accordance with the procedures specified in *The Faculty Manual* of the University of South Carolina, Columbia Campus. Proposed revisions must be approved by more than 50 percent of the SOA tenured faculty with abstentions and failures to vote not being counted in determining a majority vote. The date of the most recent revision of the SOA Criteria and Procedures for Tenure and Promotion and the date of the *Faculty Manual* in effect at the time of the approval of the unit criteria revisions will be included as part of the document. At a minimum, the SOA Criteria and Procedures for Tenure and Promotion shall be reviewed for possible revision every five years.