

**CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION, TENURE, AND ANNUAL EVALUATION
DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT AND MARKETING
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY**

Underlying Philosophy

This document is intended to achieve the following three objectives:

- A. Set forth a promotion, tenure, and post-professorial merit program that is consistent with AACSB guidelines.
- B. Provide guidance for candidates for promotion, tenure, and post-professorial merit.
- C. Provide guidelines that reflect the true state of nature, that is, the way the promotion, tenure, and post-professorial merit systems function in the Donald L. Harrison College of Business and Southeast Missouri State University. While the three major areas of expectation (teaching, professional growth, and service) have not changed, not all the activities that candidates have historically used to validate their accomplishments in these three major areas are viewed as being as important as they once were. In highlighting those activities that are viewed as more important to attaining promotion, tenure, and post-professorial merit, this document provides insight into the way the system works, which will be useful to candidates as they plan and organize their promotion/tenure/post-professorial merit documents.

It should be pointed out that the following are guidelines only, and, in exceptional circumstances, a candidate's credentials may be such as to warrant a recommendation from the committee although all standards may not have been met. Furthermore, if a candidate's qualifications satisfy the criteria for two or more categories of performance (Outstanding or Superior, Superior or Good, etc.) within any area (Teaching, Professional Development, or Service), the presumption is that the candidate will be judged to have attained the higher of those two performance categories.

Requirements for Promotion

Consistent with AACSB standards, consideration for promotion will be based primarily upon the candidate's demonstration of a "sustained" and "significant" record of achievements relating to scholarly work, teaching effectiveness, and service over the mandated review period based on university guidelines. In this context, sustained means time in rank with an emphasis on the most recent five

year period. In this context, a "significant record of achievement" means that the candidate is able to indicate how his or her accomplishments relate to and/or contribute to achievement of the mission of the Department, College, and/or University. As indicated above, sustained performance is important to evaluation for promotion; significant multiyear gaps in recent performance will significantly disadvantage the candidate seeking promotion.

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

I. Teaching Effectiveness: Effective teaching, the most important of the three major responsibilities of the faculty member, 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." 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.

A.i.). Delivery of Effective Instruction

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

1. Student evaluations of instruction (a summary of the results of neutrally administered student evaluations of instruction conducted during the relevant time period. While student evaluations of instruction are not required, when submitted, nationally-normed student evaluations are generally preferred). Data submitted should include key criteria as identified by administrators of that normed instrument.
2. Chairperson, peer and/or Dean evaluations (including classroom observation reports).

3. Participant evaluations of teaching effectiveness during workshops and/or seminars conducted.
4. Student and/or alumni responses to assessment instruments (alumni surveys, etc.) used by various University entities.
5. Other evidence of the delivery of effective instruction.

ii). Efforts to Support the Delivery of Effective Instruction

1. Effective course-planning activities and materials (class syllabi, course outlines, bibliographies, assignments, exams, graded student work, course materials, etc.)
2. Integration of activities and information focusing upon the various issue areas required for inclusion in the BSBA core courses.
3. Other evidence to support the delivery of effective instruction.

B. Currency in the Instructional Field

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

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. Teaching in one of the University's study abroad programs, or in a departmentally approved study abroad program, or as a visiting professor at an institution outside of the United States.
5. Incorporation of library assignments and computer usage in classes.
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. Development and maintenance of web courses and web-enhanced courses.
10. Integration of "real-world" examples or practical applications in classes.
11. Completion of published textbook reviews.

12. Achievement of professional certification.
13. Continuing Professional Education (CPE) required to maintain professional certification.
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 input and output 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 and/or employment.
3. Other evidence of accessibility to students.

D. Self-assessment (optional)

1. Self-assessment of the candidate's strengths in teaching and continuous improvement efforts made toward teaching effectiveness.

The information presented in the three categories above (A,B,C) 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 his/her candidacy. The order of items in a list does not necessarily reflect their importance in the promotion/tenure/post-professorial merit process.

Performance Evaluation of Teaching

Outstanding: To achieve a performance rating of OUTSTANDING, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of sustained highly effective instruction and evidence of involvement in the other two areas (Categories B and C, "Currency in the Instructional Field" and "Accessibility to Students"). Highly effective instruction is most directly evidenced by Category A output measures where the candidate's aggregate portfolio of student and/or other quantitative evaluation measures are consistently in the middle range and above. Qualitative output measures indicate highly effective instruction.

Superior: To achieve a rating of SUPERIOR, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of sustained very effective instruction, and evidence of involvement in the other two areas (Categories B and C, “Currency in the Instructional Field” and “Accessibility to Students”). Very effective instruction is most directly evidenced by Category A output measures where most of the candidate’s student and/or other quantitative evaluation measures indicate very effective instruction.

Good: To achieve a rating of GOOD, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of effective instruction and evidence of 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 (see pg. 10 Performance Rating for Teaching Effectiveness – Satisfactory) and lack of involvement in one of the other two areas (Categories B or C, “Currency in the Instructional Field” and “Accessibility to Students”).

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 (using Cabell’s and/or other sources such as the college’s list/inclusions/guidelines) 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. While intellectual contributions in international or national outlets are usually given greater significance than those in regional outlets, the geographic scope of the outlet is not the only important criteria; the quality of the publication is of equal importance. 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. "Faculty members should make intellectual contributions on a continuing basis appropriate to the school's mission. The outputs from intellectual contributions should be available for public scrutiny by academic peers or practitioners." (AACSB IC.I) Successful progress in this area necessitates evidence of publication in national refereed journals.

Outputs from all forms of scholarship activities may include, but are not limited to, publications in the following two categories:

Category I

- 1.1 Publications in national and/or international peer-reviewed journals
(academic, professional, pedagogical)
- 1.2 Research monographs
- 1.3 Scholarly books
- 1.4 Chapters in scholarly books
- 1.5 Textbooks

Category 2

- 2.1. Publications in regional peer-reviewed journals (academic, professional, pedagogical).
- 2.2. Proceedings from scholarly meetings
- 2.3 Papers presented at academic or professional meetings
- 2.4 Publicly available research working papers and applied research reports
- 2.5 Papers presented at faculty research seminars
- 2.6 Publications in trade journals
- 2.7 In-house journals
- 2.8 Book reviews
- 2.9 Written cases with instructional materials, non-refereed
- 2.10 Instructional software
- 2.11 Publicly available materials describing the design and implementation of new curricula or courses
- 2.12 Grants
- 2.13 Other significant scholarship activities

B. Self-assessment (optional)

1. Self-assessment of the candidate's strengths in professional growth and continuous improvement efforts made toward professional growth. Intellectual contributions are demonstrated by documented achievements in applied scholarship, instructional development, and/or basic scholarship consistent with the above criteria. Applied scholarship is the application, transfer, and interpretation of knowledge. Instructional development is the enhancement of the educational value of instructional efforts in the discipline. Basic scholarship is the creation of new knowledge.

Performance Evaluation of Professional Growth

Outstanding: To achieve a performance level of OUTSTANDING, the candidate must present evidence of significant and sustained achievement. Significance is reflected in a body of scholarly work published in respected national/international 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: 1) Three national/international refereed journal publications (Category 1, item 1.1) over a five-year period and evidence of an ongoing research agenda; or 2) Two national/international refereed journal publications over a five-year period and one additional Category I (above) accomplishment and evidence of an ongoing research agenda; or 3) Two national/international refereed journal publications over a five year period plus five Category 2 (above) accomplishments and evidence of an ongoing research agenda.

Superior: To achieve a performance level of SUPERIOR, the candidate must present evidence of significant and sustained achievement. Significance is reflected in a body of scholarly work published in respected national/international 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: 1) Two national/international refereed journal publications (Category 1, item 1.1) over a five-year period and evidence of an ongoing research agenda; or 2) Two publications which include: one national/international refereed journal publication (Category 1, item 1.1) over a five-year period and one additional Category 1 (above) publication which must be judged equivalent in rigor and scope to Category 1, item 1.1 and evidence of an ongoing research agenda.

Good: To achieve a performance level of GOOD, the candidate must present evidence of achievement. For example, this requirement may be met by one national/international refereed journal publication (Category 1, item 1.1) over a five-five-year period and evidence of an ongoing research agenda.

Unacceptable: Insufficient evidence of achievement in the area of intellectual contributions; no publications in the last five-year period and/or no evidence of an ongoing research agenda.

III. Service: Service refers to support given to the university, the academic discipline, 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, and the Department.

A. Service to the University may be demonstrated by providing such examples as:

1. Membership on department, college and university committees.
2. Chairperson of a departmental, college, or university committee or task force.
3. Involvement in student recruitment activities.
4. Development and presentation of professional workshops and/or training seminars for internal university constituencies.
5. Service to other units of the University.
6. Supervision of internships, and/or involvement in arrangements of internships, placements, etc.
7. Advisor (sponsorship) or other involvement in student organizations.
8. Supervision of students in state and national competition.
9. Supervision of student projects, such as graduate papers, theses, independent studies, and applied research projects and/or serving on a student's graduate committee.
10. Involvement in student programs, such as the University Honors Program, First Step, and/or the Mentor Program.
11. Involvement in programs and activities sponsored by the Douglas C. Greene Center for Innovation and Entrepreneurship, Catapult Creative House or other College of Business related programming.
12. Other evidence of service to the campus.

B. Service to the community (local, regional, national, and/or international) may be demonstrated by providing such examples as:

1. Involvement in professional consulting.
2. Development and presentation of professional programs.
3. Involvement in extension activities, such as continuing education courses and entrepreneurial outreach activities.
4. Professionally related contributions to civic groups.
5. Other evidence of service to the community.

C. Service to academic and professional organizations may be demonstrated by providing such examples as:

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 of a professional journal/proceedings.
6. Other evidence of service to academic and professional organizations.

D. Self-assessment (optional)

1. Self-assessment of the candidate's strengths in service and continuous improvement efforts made toward service.

Performance Evaluation of Service

Outstanding: To achieve a performance level of OUTSTANDING, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of sustained service to the university and evidence of high-level sustained service (i.e., leadership positions and/or high involvement) in at least one of the other two areas ("Service to the Community," or "Service to Academic and Professional Organizations").

Superior: To achieve a performance level of SUPERIOR, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of sustained service to the university and evidence of sustained involvement in one of the other two areas ("Service to the Community," or "Service to Academic and Professional Organizations").

Good: To achieve a performance level of GOOD, the candidate must present evidence, over the review period, of sustained service to the University.

Unacceptable: Insufficient evidence of acceptable service in any of the three areas (Categories A, B, and C).

Requirements for Tenure

Each probationary faculty member, regardless of rank, will provide evidence in each of the three dimensions listed above for each year during the probationary period

using the criteria outlined above and adhering to the policies of the *Faculty Handbook*. Documentation for tenure is to be prepared in accordance with the guidelines stipulated in the **Record of Service** of the *Faculty Handbook*. The candidate for tenure is required to have the appropriate terminal degree in his or her chosen field of specialization.

Probationary faculty will be evaluated in accordance with university policies and procedures. Evaluations should be consistent with performance required for merit pay and 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. For individuals hired at the associate professor rank, it is necessary to demonstrate a continuing record of performance consistent with the criteria for promotion to full professor to be considered for tenure. For individuals hired at the full professor rank, it is necessary to demonstrate a continuing record of performance that would lead to an evaluation of outstanding in at least one dimension and superior in the remaining two dimensions of teaching effectiveness, professional growth and service to be considered for tenure.

Promotion and tenure qualifications of AACSB universities similar to Southeast Missouri State University were examined. The qualifications and standards given above are within the parameters of those examined.

Performance Rating: Annual Evaluation

In accordance with University policy, each faculty member shall be evaluated on an annual basis to determine eligibility for a salary increase. Faculty who are meeting minimum expectations, as determined by departmental criteria shall be eligible for a salary increase.

Performance Rating for Annual Evaluation: Teaching Effectiveness

Satisfactory: Evidence of delivery of effective instruction and evidence of involvement in one of the other two areas of teaching effectiveness (Categories B or C, "Currency in the Instructional Field," and "Accessibility to Students").

Unsatisfactory: Insufficient evidence of the delivery of effective instruction and lack of involvement in at least one of the other two areas of teaching effectiveness (Categories B or C, "Currency in the Instructional Field," and "Accessibility to Students").

Performance Rating for Annual Evaluation: Professional Growth

Satisfactory: Evidence of an ongoing research agenda. Such evidence may be provided by national and international refereed publications, regional refereed publications, presentation of papers at conferences, and/or working papers.

Unsatisfactory: Insufficient evidence of an ongoing research agenda.

Performance Rating for Annual Evaluation: Service

Satisfactory: Evidence of involvement in one of the three areas of service (Categories A, B, or C, "Service to the University," "Service to the Community," or "Service to Academic and Professional Organizations").

Unsatisfactory: Insufficient evidence of involvement in any of the three areas of service.

Performance Rating for Annual Evaluation: Comprehensive Rating

Satisfactory: A rating of satisfactory in all three areas of teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and service.

Unsatisfactory: A rating of unsatisfactory in at least one of the three areas of teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and service.