CRITERIA FOR TENURE, PROMOTION, AND POST-PROFESSORIAL MERIT
DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

Introduction

This document is intended to achieve the following four objectives:

1. Set forth a tenure, promotion, and post-professorial merit program that is consistent with university and the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) and other accrediting agency guidelines.

2. Provide guidance for candidates for tenure, promotion, and post-professorial merit.

3. Highlight activities in teaching, professional growth, and service viewed as more important to attaining tenure, promotion, and post-professorial merit to help candidates plan and organize their dossier.

4. Provide a guide for tenure and promotion committees and administrators to evaluate faculty performance, approve tenure, recommend promotion, and award post-professorial merit.

The *Faculty Handbook* (chapter 2, section F, subsection 2), indicates departmental "criteria are developed with an acknowledgment that on rare occasions faculty members who do not meet minimum standards in every area may be able to support such a powerful case for promotion that their applications deserve consideration through the regular promotion process. In those unusual instances, the dossier…must indicate that the objective criteria are not completely met, and the faculty member's dossier must unequivocally demonstrate exceptional merit." Faculty performance shall be evaluated using the terms good, superior, and outstanding.

Furthermore, if within any area (teaching, professional growth, or service) the candidate's qualifications satisfy the criteria for two or more categories of performance (outstanding or superior, or superior or good, etc.), the candidate will be judged to have attained the higher category.

Requirements for Promotion

Consideration for tenure, promotion, or post-professorial merit will be based primarily upon the candidate's demonstration of an "effective" record of achievements relating to professional growth, teaching effectiveness, and service over the review period based on university guidelines. For purpose of this document, "per year" refers to the calendar year.

"Effective" means achieving attainable outcomes that benefit students in teaching, research and practice in scholarship, and the community in service.

Because of the inter-connected nature of the teacher-scholar model, items could be placed in multiple categories (e.g., teaching effectiveness and service to students). It is at the candidate's discretion to report evidence in the category that best supports the overall narrative of the dossier. Evidence may not be included in more than one category.

Professor: To achieve promotion to professor, the candidate must obtain a minimum rating of outstanding in one of the two areas of teaching effectiveness or professional growth, 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.

Assistant Professor: To achieve promotion to assistant professor, the candidate must obtain a minimum rating of good in each of the three areas.

Post-Prof Merit: Criteria established in the *Faculty Handbook* (chapter 2, section F, subsection 2) are used for determining post-professorial merit. This section states that "criteria for the first award of post-professorial merit shall be the same as those for the promotion from Associate Professor to Professor." For subsequent applications faculty members may select either to meet the criteria for promotion to Professor or to "contract an exception to the criteria" as described in this same section of the *Faculty Handbook.*

Teaching Effectiveness:

Effective teaching may be demonstrated through use of a variety of sources indicating (A) delivery of effective instruction, (B) currency in the instructional field, and (C) accessibility to students. For promotion, tenure, and/or post-professorial merit, candidates shall submit a portfolio of output measures providing evidence of teaching effectiveness.

For guidance on using student evaluations of instruction in the promotion and tenure dossier refer to the *Faculty Handbook* (chapter 3, section C, subsection 10).

Note: Teaching effectiveness is an important criterion in the overall evaluation of a faculty member and is also the most difficult to evaluate. For this reason, such evidence might include, for example, student learning such as pre- and post-tests and samples of student work, peer observations, student ratings, and testimonials from current or former students. Since student ratings are influenced by many non-academic variables, their ratings should never be used as the sole measurement of teaching performance.

Requirements for all submissions:

1. The candidate is required to list all courses taught during the evaluation period, including delivery format, enrollment number and number of credit hours.

2. Provide evidence of effective instruction. For example, evidence might include evaluation from students, peers, or self-evaluation.

A. Delivery of effective instruction

Delivery of effective instruction is typically demonstrated by the faculty member through a combination of measures such as, but not limited to, the following:

1. Student evaluations (if included, should be submitted in accordance with *Faculty Handbook* (chapter 3, section C, subsection 10) guidelines).
2. Interpretation/explanation of the most recent student evaluations, and modifications made to address problems or concerns of prior evaluations (if included).
3. Number of course preps, level and type of courses taught (e.g., required/elective, undergraduate/graduate, seniors/freshmen, etc.), class size, and any other descriptive that may have affected teaching success.
4. Degree of challenge, extent of manual grading for learning artifacts, material currency requirements, etc. related to the amount of effort required to maintain relevancy and provide instruction.
5. Unique challenges, special circumstances, and supplemental teaching-related activities faced or undertaken by the faculty member.
6. Chairperson, peer, and/or dean evaluations (including classroom observation reports).
7. Participant evaluations of teaching effectiveness during workshops and/or seminars conducted

8. Student and/or alumni responses to assessment instruments (alumni surveys, etc.) used by various university entities.
9. Effective course-planning activities and materials (class syllabi, course outlines, bibliographies, assignments, exams, graded student work, course materials, etc.)
10. Integration of activities and information focusing upon the various areas associated with CLOs and/or PLOs.
11. Conversion of a course to a different delivery mode (online, blended, time-frame, etc.).
12. Evidence regarding field trips and experiential learning opportunities outside the classroom (e.g. to the Douglas C. Greene Center for Innovation and Entrepreneurship or Catapult Creative House).
13. Other evidence to support effective delivery of instruction.

B. Currency in the instructional field

Currency in the instructional field is typically demonstrated by a variety of measures, such as, but not limited to, the following:

1. Development of new courses and/or proposals for new courses.
2. Major revisions to existing courses.
3. Development or modification of new or existing academic programs.
4. Teaching in one of the university's study abroad programs, or in a departmentally approved study abroad program.
5. Teaching as a visiting professor at another institution.
6. Attendance at conferences, seminars, and workshops related to maintaining currency in the instructional field.
7. Development of innovative instructional techniques and/or course materials.
8. Application of new instructional technologies in the classroom.
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) required to maintain professional certification.
13. Attendance at conferences, seminars, and workshops for gaining new knowledge in the discipline and/or for improvement of teaching.
14. Other evidence of currency in the instructional field.

C. Accessibility to students

Accessibility to students may be demonstrated by the faculty member through a combination of measures, such as, but not limited to, the following:

1. Quality academic/career advisement of students (up-to-date advising of students regarding course selection, program changes, career opportunities, and information on graduate programs).
2. Assistance in helping students secure internships, employment and/or graduate school admission.
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, and the mentoring programs.
5. Involvement in university/HCBC-approved student organizations, including learning communities.
6. Supervision of students in state, national and/or international competitions.
7. Providing assistance to students outside of the classroom.
8. Conducting tutoring or other learning sessions outside the regular course schedule.
9. Other evidence to support accessibility to students (e.g., extended office hours, after hours support, virtual office hours).

D. Other factors for consideration (optional)

If there is additional information the candidate feels should be considered that does not fit in a category provided above or unique circumstances the candidate would like to explain, the candidate may include that content in this section of the document.

The information presented in the three categories above (A, B, C) is not an exhaustive or all-inclusive list of evidence a faculty member may provide. The order of items in a list does not reflect importance or weight in the promotion, tenure, or post-professorial merit process. Justification of the items should include the significance of the activity. The candidate is not expected to present evidence for all items in categories A, B, or C.

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 three examples from category A and two examples of involvement in each of the other two areas (categories B and C, "currency in the instructional field" and "accessibility to students").

Superior: To achieve a rating of SUPERIOR, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of effective instruction, and evidence of two examples from category A and involvement in the other two areas (categories B and C, "currency in the instructional field" and "accessibility to students").

Good: To achieve a rating of GOOD, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of effective instruction and evidence of one example from category A and involvement in at least one of the other two areas (categories B or C, "currency in the instructional field" and "accessibility to students").

Unacceptable: Insufficient evidence of effective instruction and lack of involvement in one of the other two areas (categories B or C, "currency in the instructional field" and "accessibility to students").

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 (applied research) of knowledge. 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 (international, national, regional), and the review status (refereed or non-referred). They should also provide the acceptance rate and/or citation rate, when available. Candidates should indicate their specific role in multiple author publications.

On page 49, the 2020 AACSB standards define *Intellectual Contributions* as "original works intended to advance the theory, practice, and/or teaching of business. Further, intellectual contributions may have the potential to address issues of importance to broader society. The contributions are scholarly in the sense that they are based on generally accepted academic research principles and are disseminated to appropriate audiences."

As with HCBC research reassignment guidelines, scholarship activities are assigned point values that, when totaled, result in an overall rating for professional growth. Justification for point values must be provided for all activities. The candidate is required to submit within the record of service a table showing the activities included and the points earned for each activity with total points earned included.

The following are abbreviated in the table below. Australian Business Deans Council Journal Quality List is abbreviated as ABDC. ABDC ranks journals from highest to lowest as A*, A, B, and C. The Scimago Journal and Country Rank is abbreviated as SJR. SJR ranks journals from highest to lowest as Q1, Q2, Q3, and Q4. Both of these ranking lists are referred to in the table below by their abbreviations.

	Activity	Points awarded
1	"A" level (from externally verifiable list, such as ABDC "A," SJR "Q1", etc.) refereed journal publication (e.g., research, case study, teaching note).	10
2	Publication of first edition scholarly book or textbook by a reputable publisher; revised editions would be valued at 50 percent.	10
3	Authorship/co-authorship of external grant proposal awarded with a value of $100,000 or more.	10
4	"B" level (from externally verifiable list, such as ABDC "B," SJR "Q2," etc.) refereed journal publication (e.g., research, case study, teaching note).	7
5	Editor of peer-reviewed journal.	6
6	Publication of first edition practitioner book by a reputable publisher; revised editions would be valued at 50 percent.	5

	Activity	Points awarded
7	Publication of an edited volume (book or journal)	5
8	Authorship/co-authorship of external grant proposal awarded with a value between $50,000 - $100,000.	5
9	"C" level (from externally verifiable list, such as ABDC "C," SJR "Q3," etc.) refereed journal publication (e.g. research, case study, teaching note).	4
10	Chapter in scholarly compendium, book, or monograph.	4
11	Authorship/co-authorship of external grant proposal awarded with a value between $10,000 - $50,000.	4
12	Associate editor of peer-reviewed journal.	4
13	Refereed journal publication in outlet not otherwise listed.	3
14	Publication of article in professional publication.	3
15	Editorial board member.	3
16	Participation in faculty internship.	3
17	Authorship/co-authorship of grant proposal (internal or external) awarded with a value less than $10,000.	2
18	Award received for published paper/presentation.	2
19	Published book review.	2
20	Publication in peer-reviewed conference proceedings (also eligible for journal publication points).	2
21	Attendance in credit-earning courses to maintain currency in the field.	2
22	h-index >= 10 or i10-index >=10 over the last 5 years (obtained from Google Scholar).	1.5
23	Academic presentation to business/industry.	1
24	First time presentation of paper/panel participant in academic or industry conference.	1
25	h-index of 5 – 9 or i10-index of 5 – 9 over the last 5 years (obtained from Google Scholar).	1
26	Reviewer for journal, conference, book, grant agencies, etc. Points awarded for each individual manuscript reviewed.	0.5
27	h-index of 1 – 4 or i10-index of 1 – 4 over the last 5 years (obtained from Google Scholar).	0.5
28	Attendance at seminars and workshops related to professional growth/research.	0.5
29	Other evidence of research. Justification for point value must be provided. Multiple research artifacts may be reported (max of 3 points per item).	0.5-3

Other factors for consideration (optional)

If there is additional information the candidate feels should be considered that does not fit in a category provided above or unique circumstances the candidate would like to explain, the candidate may include that content in this section of the document.

Performance Evaluation of Professional Growth

Outstanding: To achieve a performance level of OUTSTANDING, the candidate must present evidence of effective achievement in scholarly activities, including two refereed journal articles or equivalent and scholarly activity. Faculty must earn at least 15 points (without rounding) using the defined scale.

Superior: To achieve a performance level of SUPERIOR, the candidate must present evidence of effective achievement in scholarly activities, including two refereed journal articles or equivalent and scholarly activity. Faculty must earn at least 12 points (without rounding) using the defined scale.

Good: To achieve a performance level of GOOD, the candidate must present evidence of effective achievement in scholarly activities, including one refereed journal article or evidence of scholarly activity. Faculty must earn at least 6 points (without rounding) using the defined scale.

Unacceptable: Insufficient evidence of achievement in the area of intellectual contributions. Fewer than 6 points earned over the review period.

Service:

Service refers to support given to the university, students, the academic discipline, and to professional organizations or to the community/region. Evidence of service to the university should include active service that promotes the mission and goals of the university, the college, the department, and program. Justification for point values must be provided for all activities. The candidate is required to submit within the record of service a table showing the activities included and the points earned for each activity with total points earned included.

	Activity	Points awarded
A1	Chair of university committee or task force, per year (cannot also claim membership).	3
A2	Chair of college committee or task force, per year (cannot also claim membership).	2.5
A3	Chair/coordinator for programs and activities sponsored by the Douglas C. Greene Center for Innovation and Entrepreneurship or Catapult Creative House, per year (cannot also claim membership).	2.5
A4	Chair of department committee or task force, per year (cannot also claim membership).	2
A5	Membership on university committee or task force, per year.	2
A6	Membership on college committee or task force, per year.	1.5
A7	Involvement in planning/coordinating university, college, or department activities, per year.	1.5
A8	Membership on department committee or task force per year.	1
A9	Development and presentation of professional workshops and/or training seminars for internal university constituencies.	1
A10	Service to other units of the university.	1
A11	Attendance at university, college, or department programs/events. Points available for each event, with a maximum of 3 points available.	0.5
A12	Alternate for university or college committee, per year.	0.5
A13	Other evidence of service to the university, college, department, and program. Justification for point value must be provided. Multiple service commitments may be reported (max of 3 points per commitment).	0.5-3

B. Service to students*

	Activity	Points awarded
B1	Faculty advisor to active student organization or HCBC learning community, per year.	3
B2	Supervision and coach/mentor of students for state or national competition.	3
B3	Sponsor/plan student field experience (domestic or international)	2
B4	Involvement in student programs, such as the Jane Stephens Honors Program, First Step, and/or the Mentor Program. Multiple service commitments may be reported.	2
B5	Out of load supervision of internships, and/or involvement in arrangements of internships, placements, etc.	2
B6	Involvement in planning/coordinating student-focused activities, e.g., HCBC learning community activities or Welcome Back event.	1.5
B7	Involvement in student recruitment activities, such as admission meetings, athlete recruitment events, and high-school visits.	1
B8	Participation (not planning or sponsoring) in student field experience.	1
B9	Advisor for a substantial number of students and/or graduate students and/or complex advising situations. Justification must be provided for how advising exceeds standard load.	1
B10	Attendance at university, college, or department student recruitment events. Points available for each event, with a maximum of 3 points available.	0.5
B11	Attendance at university, college, or department student-focused programs/events. Points available for each event, with a maximum of 3 points available.	0.5
B12	Supervision of student projects, such as graduate papers, theses, independent studies, honors contracts, internships, applied research projects and/or serving on a student's graduate committee. Multiple service commitments may be reported.	0.5
B13	Other evidence of service to students. Justification for point value must be provided. Multiple service commitments may be reported (max of 3 points per commitment).	0.5-3

*Activities may not also be counted in teaching effectiveness

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

	Activity	Points awarded
C1	Service on city or county advisory board, per year.	3
C2	Elected officer of board of directors of a community service organization, per year.	3
C3	Member of board of directors of a community service organization, per year.	2
C4	Involvement in university, college, or department extension activities, including continuing education, small business development, and entrepreneurial outreach.	2
C5	Professionally-related contributions to civic groups/community service organizations.	1
C6	Involvement in professional consulting, per event.	1
C7	Involvement in ongoing professional relationship consulting, per year.	1
C8	Representing university/college at community events.	1
C9	Other evidence of service to the community. Justification for point value must be provided. Multiple service commitments may be reported (max of 3 points per commitment).	0.5-3

D. Service to academic and professional organizations**

	Activity	Points awarded
D1	Officer of an academic or professional organization, per year.	4
D2	Board member of an academic or professional organization, per year.	3
D3	Conference program chair for academic or professional meeting.	3
D4	Editor of conference proceedings.	3
D5	Editorial board member, per year.	3
D6	Associate editor of conference proceedings.	2
D7	Track chair for academic or professional meeting.	2
D8	Session chair/discussant for professional or academic conference.	1
D9	Textbook and/or supplemental package reviewer.	1
D10	Membership in academic organizations, per year.	1
D11	Membership in professional organizations related to teaching discipline, per year.	1
D12	Reviewer for journal, conference, book, grant agencies, etc. Points awarded for each individual manuscript reviewed.	0.5
D13	Other evidence of service to academic and professional organizations. Justification for point value must be provided. Multiple service commitments may be reported (max of 3 points per commitment).	0.5-3

**Activities may not also be counted in professional growth.

E. Other factors for consideration (optional)

If there is additional information the candidate feels should be considered that does not fit in a category provided above or unique circumstances the candidate would like to explain, the candidate may include that content in this section of the document.

Performance Evaluation of Service

Outstanding: To achieve a performance level of OUTSTANDING, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of high level effective service (e.g., leadership positions and/or high involvement) to the university, college, department, and program and evidence of effective service across the other three areas ("service to students," "service to the community," or "service to academic and professional organizations"). Faculty must earn at least 20 points using the defined scales with a total of at least 8 points for category A, and a total of at least 12 points between the other three categories (B, C, D).

Superior: To achieve a performance level of SUPERIOR, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of effective service to the university, college, department, and program and evidence of effective service across the other three categories ("service to students," "service to the community," or "service to academic and professional organizations"). Faculty must earn at least 15 points using the defined scales with a total of 5 points for category A, and a total of at least 10 points between the other three categories (B, C, D).

Good: To achieve a performance level of GOOD, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of effective service to the university, college, department, and program (category A) and to students (category B). Faculty must earn at least 10 points from the defined scales for categories A and B.

Unacceptable: Insufficient evidence of acceptable service in the four categories (A, B, C, and D). This is determined by the lack of ability to meet the requirement for good in service in this document.

Preparing the Dossier

Dossiers should be prepared in accordance with the *Faculty Handbook*. Dossiers that are not in compliance may be rejected from the review process.

The record of service should include an executive summary, indicating the candidate's self-evaluation level (e.g., outstanding, superior, or good) in each category and the total points earned in the professional growth and service categories. Candidates may also include a self-evaluation summary in each section of the record of service (i.e., teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and service).

Requirements for Probationary Faculty Members

Each probationary faculty member, regardless of rank, will provide evidence in each of the three dimensions listed above during the probationary period using the criteria outlined in this document and adhering to the polices of the *Faculty Handbook.*

Documentation for tenure is to be prepared in accordance with the guidelines stipulated in the section on the dossier in the *Faculty Handbook.* The candidate for tenure is required to have the appropriate terminal degree.

Probationary faculty are evaluated in accordance with university policies and procedures. Evaluations should be consistent with performance required for promotion to an academic rank and shall require positive evidence to support continued contributions and accomplishments in teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and service. For individuals hired at the assistant professor rank, it is necessary to demonstrate an expected continuing record of performance consistent with the criteria for promotion to associate professor to be considered for tenure.