

Criteria for Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Professorial Merit

Department of Marketing

Southeast Missouri State University

Underlying Philosophy

This document sets forth the departmentally-approved guidelines for promotion, tenure, and, post-professorial merit consistent with University Faculty Handbook guidelines. Guidance is provided for presenting evidence of accomplishments in the areas of Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Growth, and Service.

It is important that the candidate recognizes the fact that recommendations pertaining to tenure and promotions in academic rank are based on qualitative judgments concerning the evidence presented by the candidate using the departmental Record of Service format. The committees and administrators *qualitatively evaluate* the items of evidence provided for each category for their relevance towards *significant achievement* and express their judgments using the terms **Outstanding, Superior, Good, and Unacceptable**. The detailed criteria outlined in the document are the minimum required for promotion.

Definitions

Executive Summary (optional): The candidate may provide an optional self-assessment that summarizes accomplishments in Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Growth, and Service and indicates the candidate's perception of the rating in each area

Areas: The term "area" signifies Teaching and/or Professional Growth and/or Service.

Significant (record of achievements): The candidate is able to indicate how their accomplishments relate to and/or contribute to achievement of the mission of the Department, College, and/or University. The requirement for significant achievement may be met by either a single act of considerable merit or a sustained record of performance.

Requirements for Promotion

Consideration for promotion will be based primarily upon the candidate's demonstration of a "significant" record of achievements relating to scholarly work, teaching effectiveness, and service over the mandated review period based on university guidelines. The rating categories for promotion are "Outstanding", "Superior", "Good", and "Unacceptable".

Professor: To achieve promotion to professor, the candidate must obtain a minimum rating of outstanding in one area and ratings of superior in the remaining two areas.

Associate Professor: To achieve promotion to associate professor, the candidate must obtain a minimum rating of superior in the two areas of Teaching Effectiveness and Professional Growth, and a rating of good in Service.

Post-Prof Merit: Post-Professorial Merit is awarded according to the relevant provisions of the Faculty Handbook.

(NOTE: In general, items should appear in only one location. In circumstances that a candidate believes an item warrants duplicate listing, justification for the duplicated inclusion should be provided to distinguish the entries.)

I. Teaching Effectiveness

Effective teaching is an important area of responsibility of the faculty member and may be demonstrated by the faculty member through the use of a variety of sources which indicate (A) delivery of effective instruction, (B) currency in his/her instructional field, and (C) accessibility to students. For promotion and/or tenure, candidates shall submit a portfolio of output measures providing evidence of teaching effectiveness. According to the *Faculty Handbook*, "Because standardized rating forms and departmental assessments may not adequately capture the nuances and variations across disciplines or between types of courses within a discipline, the use of the results of student evaluations may not be compelled in any kind of personnel decision (such as promotion, tenure, merit pay, termination, etc.) and may only be used if the individual faculty member wishes them to be so used." It is further stated that "Demonstrating one's teaching effectiveness, however, is the responsibility of the individual faculty member and may be done in a variety of ways, such as other types of student evaluations, peer evaluations, portfolios, pre- test/post-test or other "value-added" outcomes measures." (Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3, Section C-10, Faculty Senate Bill 12-A-34.) It is recommended that some consistent form of feedback from students be provided. It should be remembered that student evaluations are affected by a variety of factors including course difficulty, time of day, GPA, length of course, class size, method of delivery (face-to-face or online), to name a few.

The information presented in the following sections is not meant to be an exhaustive or all-inclusive list of the types of evidence a faculty member may provide, but rather to serve as examples of the types of information that a faculty member may present to support their candidacy. The list is not intended to serve as a checklist in which all items must be attained, but instead serves as suggestions for activities that may provide significant value and depth to the students' educational experience. The order of items in a list does not necessarily reflect their importance in the promotion/tenure/post-professorial merit process.

A. Delivery and Support of Effective Instruction

1. A sample of course-planning activities and materials (class syllabi, course outlines, bibliographies, assignments, exams, graded student work, course materials, etc.)
2. Delivery of instruction through different modes such as online, HyFlex, or Interactive TV.
3. Teaching in one of the University's study abroad programs, in a departmentally approved study abroad program, or as a visiting professor at an institution outside of the United States.

4. Student evaluations of instruction (a summary of the results of neutrally administered student evaluations of instruction conducted during the relevant time period).
5. Chairperson, peer and/or Dean evaluations using departmental (or university) approved/accepted criteria (including classroom observation reports).
6. Participant evaluations of teaching effectiveness during workshops and/or seminars conducted.
7. Student and/or alumni responses to assessment instruments (alumni surveys, etc.) used by various University entities.
8. Integration of activities and information focusing upon the various issues and areas (written and oral communications, technology, internationalization and globalization, diversity, ethics, etc.) consistent with the college's mission and vision statements.
9. Integration of active learning. (Examples: field trips and plant visits.)
10. Number of course preparations, new courses taught, and instruction in different programs.
11. Other evidence to support the delivery and support of effective instruction.

B. Currency in the Instructional Field

1. Development of new courses (including on-line courses not previously offered as on-line courses) and /or proposals for new courses.
2. Major revisions to existing courses.
3. Development of new academic programs.
4. Attendance at conferences, seminars, and workshops related to maintaining currency in the instructional field.
5. Incorporation of library assignments and computer usage in classes.
6. Development of innovative instructional techniques and/or course materials.
7. Application of new instructional technologies in the classroom.
8. Maintaining the currency of existing courses
9. Integration of "real-world" examples or practical applications in classes.
10. Completion of published textbook reviews.
11. Achievement of professional certification.
12. Continuing Professional Education (CPE, CLE, etc.) required to maintain professional certification.
13. Attainment and maintenance of university-approved certification for online courses taught.
14. Other evidence of currency in the instructional field.

C. Accessibility to Students

1. Academic/career advisement of students (such as up-to-date advising of students regarding course selection, program changes, career opportunities, and information on graduate programs, etc.).
2. Assistance in helping students secure internships and/or employment or graduate school admissions (network connections and introductions, providing references and recommendations, sending/displaying alerts to job and internship opportunities).
3. Supervision of student projects, papers, theses, independent studies, student internships and/or serving on student graduate committees.

4. Involvement in student programs, such as the Jane Stephens Honors Program, International Programs, or other college/university-organized mentor program.
5. Advisor (sponsor) of and/or involvement in University/HCBC-approved student organizations.
6. Supervision of students in state, national and international competitions.
7. Maintaining office hours in excess of the minimum specified in the university's Faculty Handbook.
8. Providing online or face-to-face assistance to students outside of the classroom, such as help sessions or other formal or informal meetings.
9. Other evidence that demonstrates accessibility to students

D. Performance Evaluation of Teaching

- Outstanding:** To achieve a performance rating of OUTSTANDING, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of effective instruction and evidence of five of eleven examples from category A; six of fourteen examples of involvement in category B, and four of nine examples in category C.
- Superior:** To achieve a rating of SUPERIOR, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of effective instruction, and evidence of four of eleven examples from category A and eight of twenty-three examples combined from categories B & C.
- Good:** To achieve a rating of GOOD, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of effective instruction and evidence of three of eleven examples from category A and six of twenty-three examples combined from categories B & C.
- Unacceptable:** Insufficient evidence that instruction meets the rating of "Good" results in a rating of "Unacceptable."

II. Professional Growth

Evidence of professional growth shall include intellectual activities and contributions that strengthen the teaching function (instructional development) and/or lead to the expansion (basic research) or application of knowledge (applied research). Output from intellectual contributions shall be subjected to public scrutiny by academic and professional peers. Candidates are responsible for making the case for the scope of their scholarly work and the review status.

Potential sources to justify the scope and level of review of scholarly work include, but are not limited to, Cabell's, Scimago Journal & Country Rank (SJR), Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) list, the Washington & Lee rankings, and other field/discipline-specific evidence. They may also provide the acceptance rate and/or citation rate, when available. Candidates should indicate their specific role in multiple author publications.

Refereed publications are accorded greater significance than non-refereed publications. Refereed proceedings are accorded less significance than refereed publications in national/international journals. Publication and presentation are not limited to traditional meanings, but also include other outlets, for example, online publications.

A. Scholarly Activities that are Refereed/Externally Reviewed

1. Publications (articles, cases, etc.; print or electronic) in peer-reviewed journals (academic, professional, pedagogical)
2. Textbooks by a reputable publisher
3. Scholarly books by a reputable publisher
4. Refereed chapters in scholarly books by a reputable publisher
5. Research monographs
6. External grants of substantial size and/or importance

B. Other Scholarly Activities and Professional Development

1. Proceedings from scholarly meetings
2. Papers presented at academic or professional meetings
3. Publicly available research working papers and applied research reports
4. Papers presented at faculty research seminars
5. Publications in trade journals
6. In-house journals
7. Book reviews
8. Non-refereed publications (articles or cases; print or electronic), presentations, and/or proceedings
9. Editorship/Editorial Review Board/Reviewer of a professional journal/proceedings/Special Issue Editor.
10. Served as a reviewer (journals, books, conferences, grants, etc.)
11. Achievement/maintenance of professional certifications
12. Participation in faculty internships
13. Development or publication of instructional software
14. Publicly available materials describing the design and implementation of new curricula or courses
15. Honors and awards received for scholarly activity
16. Research-related workshops attended (e.g. research methods workshops, grant writing workshops, research security training, etc.)
17. Internal Grants awarded
18. Other significant scholarship activities or evidence of professional development

C. Performance Evaluation of Professional Growth

For Category A ONLY, separate instances within a single item (such as peer-reviewed journal articles) count for each instance of scholarly activity.

Outstanding: To achieve a performance level of OUTSTANDING, the candidate must present evidence of significant achievement within the review period. Significance is reflected in a body of scholarly work published in

respected peer-reviewed outlets. Indicators of respect include stature and distribution of the outlet, its listing in bibliographic databases, citations of the scholarly work, and/or other indicators described by the faculty member and judged as indicators of respect.

For example, this requirement may be met by:

- Three peer-reviewed journal articles, or equivalent from the items listed in Category A and evidence of an ongoing research agenda; (or)
- Two peer-reviewed journal articles, or equivalent, at least three other items from either Category A or B items, and evidence of an ongoing research agenda.

Superior: To achieve a performance level of SUPERIOR, the candidate must present evidence of significant achievement within the review period. Significance is reflected in a body of scholarly work published in respected peer-reviewed outlets. Indicators of respect include stature and distribution of the outlet, its listing in bibliographic databases, citations of the scholarly work, and/or other indicators described by the faculty member and judged as indicators of respect.

For example, this requirement may be met by:

- two peer-reviewed journal articles, or equivalent from the items listed in Category A, at least two other contributions from Category B, and evidence of an ongoing research agenda.

Good: To achieve a performance level of GOOD, the candidate must present evidence of achievement within the review period.

For example, this requirement may be met by:

- one peer-reviewed journal article, or equivalent from the items listed in Category A item and evidence of an ongoing research agenda.

Unacceptable: Insufficient evidence that professional growth meets the rating of “Good” results in a rating of “Unacceptable”.

III. Service

Service refers to support given to the university, the academic discipline, professional organizations, the community/region, or students. Evidence of service to the university should include active service that promotes the mission and goals of the University, the College, the Department, or society.

A. Service to the University/Campus

1. Chairperson of a departmental, college, or university committee or task force.
2. Membership on a department, college or university committee or task force.
3. Involvement in prospective student recruitment.
4. Development and presentation of professional workshops and/or training seminars for internal university constituencies.
5. Service to other units of the University.
6. Involvement in programs and activities sponsored by the Douglas C. Greene Center for Innovation and Entrepreneurship, Catapult Creative House, or College of Business and Computing related programming.
7. Other evidence of service to the campus.

B. Service to the community (local, regional, national, and/or international)

1. Involvement in professional consulting for clients.
2. Development and presentation of professional programs.
3. Involvement in extension activities, such as continuing education courses and entrepreneurial outreach activities
4. Contributions of professional expertise to not-for-profit organizations and/or civic groups.
5. Other evidence of service to the community or society.

C. Service to Academic and Professional Organizations

1. Officer or board member of an academic or professional organization.
2. Referee/reviewer of papers for a professional organization.
3. Discussant or chairperson of a session during a professional organizational meeting.
4. Track chair and/or program chair of a professional organizational meeting.
5. Editorship/Editorial Review Board/Reviewer/Special Issue Editor/etc. of a professional journal/proceedings.
6. Other evidence of service to academic and professional organizations.

D. Service to Enrolled Students

1. Advisor for undergraduate students and/or graduate students and/or complex advising situations.
2. Advisor (sponsor) of and/or involvement in University/HCBC-approved student organizations.
3. Involvement in an HCBC learning community
4. Supervision and coach/mentor of students for state or national competition.
5. Sponsor/plan student field experience (domestic or international)
6. Involvement in student programs, such as the Jane Stephens Honors Program, International Programs, or other college/university-organized mentor program.
7. Out of load supervision of internships, and/or involvement in arrangements of internships, placements, etc.
8. Planning/coordinating student-focused activities, e.g., HCBC learning community activities or Welcome Back event.
9. Participation (not planning or sponsoring) in student field experience.
10. Attendance at university, college, or department student-focused programs/events.

11. Supervision of student projects, papers, theses, independent studies, student internships and/or serving on student graduate committees.
12. Other evidence of service to students.

E. Performance Evaluation of Service

- Outstanding:** To achieve a performance level of OUTSTANDING, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of significant service to the university demonstrated by 4 of 7 items from Category A (including college or university level service and/or leadership in a department or college level committee), involvement in Categories B **and** C, and at least 5 of the 12 items in Category D.
- Superior:** To achieve a performance level of SUPERIOR, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of service to the university demonstrated by 3 of 7 items from Category A (including college or university level service and/or leadership in a department or college level committee), involvement in either Category B **or** C, and at least 4 of the 12 items in Category D.
- Good:** To achieve a performance level of GOOD, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of service to the University demonstrated by 2 of 7 items from Category A and at least 3 of the 12 items in Category D.
- Unacceptable:** Insufficient evidence that service meets the rating of “Good” results in a rating of “Unacceptable”.