

Harmon College of Business and Professional Studies

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines 2024

P & T Guidelines Table of Contents

Position on Promotion and/or Tenure.....	2
Overview of Minimum Criteria to be Considered for Promotion and/or Tenure	3
Teaching.....	3
Scholarship.....	5
Service.....	8
Appendix 1: Evaluation of Effective Teaching	11
Appendix 2: Additional Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness	12
College Promotion and Tenure Procedural Guidelines	13

P&T HCBPS Guidelines - November 1, 2024 Version

Affirmed by majority tenured faculty vote on October 7, 2024

Harmon College of Business and Professional Studies

Position on Promotion and/or Tenure

This document articulates the expectations that Harmon College of Business and Professional Studies (HCBPS) faculty members must meet or exceed in order to be eligible for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. **It shall be the responsibility of candidates to explicitly address in their application how they believe they have met or exceeded these expectations.** In no way should these be construed as thresholds that, once reached, entitle candidates to positive recommendations and/or successful outcomes. While every effort is made in this document to outline as clearly as possible the criteria that will be used for decision-making, it is recognized within the college that promotion and tenure decisions are not only quantitative, but also qualitative in nature. For example, while extremely important in such decisions, professionalism is difficult to quantify. However, this does not lessen its impact on such decisions.

While the UCM *Policies and Procedures* treat promotion and tenure separately, it is the intent of HCBPS to (where applicable) treat them as joined. HCBPS Promotion and Tenure Guidelines are more stringent in some respects than minimum requirements stated in the *UCM Promotion and Tenure Policies*. The *UCM Promotion and Tenure Policies* should be consulted for any promotion and/or tenure procedure or matter not covered in the present document. Departments, with the approval of the HCBPS Dean, may establish requirements that are more stringent than those contained herein for the College. Credentials and terminal degree requirements are established by the faculty member's department/program and approved by the Dean and Provost.

While the three categories upon which faculty are typically evaluated (Teaching, Scholarship, and Service) are all important, Teaching is the first "hurdle" that must be cleared (given the mission, workload assignments, and resource allocations of UCM). In addition, expectations in each category (especially in Teaching) increase as rank to which one desires to be promoted increases.

Date of effectiveness: This 2024 revision will apply to new hires as of 2024 and to everyone who applies for promotion in the Fall of 2025 and henceforward.

OVERVIEW OF MINIMUM CRITERIA TO BE CONSIDERED FOR PROMOTION and/or TENURE

From Assistant Professor to Associate Professor: must demonstrate effective Teaching and at least meet expectations outlined in Scholarship and Service.

From Associate Professor to Full Professor: must demonstrate exemplary Teaching and exemplary Scholarship OR Service; must at least meet expectations in the remaining category.

Teaching

In support of the mission of UCM, The Harmon College of Business and Professional Studies is committed to excellence in teaching. Teaching involves the dissemination of knowledge, the stimulation of critical thinking, and the development of intellectual expression. Requisite skills necessary for excellence in teaching include communication skills; the ability to interest and motivate students to achieve high standards; the ability to create an engaging learning experience for students; the ability to generate enthusiasm for learning; fostering respect for student diversity; ongoing participation in professional development; adaptation with respect to individual student needs and learning styles; and evaluating students fairly and impartially in all aspects of education and instruction.

The following outlines the minimum expectations pertaining to teaching in order to be considered for promotion and/or tenure:

Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Candidates must provide a variety of evidence of teaching effectiveness (see P & T Appendix 1) and meet all instructional expectations that have been established in the *UCM Promotion and Tenure Policies*.

Associate Professor to Full Professor

Full Professors have the responsibility to serve as role models in the classroom. Therefore, candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Full Professor must provide evidence of exemplary teaching. Candidates demonstrate a continual progression and maturity in their teaching by showing that their instructional contributions are significant and multifaceted and have developed to a high level that has been continuous since the last promotion or initial appointment, whichever occurred last. Candidates must provide a variety of significant evidence that documents exemplary teaching (see P & T Appendix 1) and meets all instructional expectations that have been established in the *UCM Promotion and Tenure Policies*.

Relevant Teaching Effectiveness Requirements for ALL Candidates

The evaluation of teaching effectiveness for promotion and/or tenure requires objective evaluation of the data available and the application of professional judgment. Individuals involved in the evaluation process should consider available information included or linked within the dossier files.

While the dossier may include any relevant and reliable information to support teaching effectiveness, the following items **must** be included as evidence within the dossier and considered in the evaluation of teaching performance. Further information is explained below:

1. peer evaluations linked to an internal Google Drive Folder
2. all student evaluations linked to an internal Google Drive Folder
3. a copy of each syllabus linked to an internal Google Drive Folder
4. a statement in the body of the dossier by the candidate on how course modification(s) due to feedback has been implemented and evaluated for impact
5. a reflection in the body of the dossier by the candidate on the implementation of professional development plans for improvement of the candidate's teaching.

Documented Evaluations

i. Peer Evaluations:

Each candidate applying for tenure and/or promotion must include in the dossier an evaluation of classroom performance conducted by one's peer(s). Areas for evaluation may include (but are not limited to) any of the items included in Appendix 1 for which evidence is available. It shall be the responsibility of the candidate to work with the department chair to arrange this activity and select the peer that will conduct the evaluation. While candidates may include more peer evaluation results, at a minimum, they **must include:**

Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

The results from a peer evaluation conducted within 12 months of the date of application for tenure and/or promotion plus the results from two additional peer evaluations.

Associate Professor to Full Professor

The results from a peer evaluation conducted within 12 months of the date of application for tenure and/or promotion plus the results from one additional peer evaluation.

ii. Student Evaluations:

Faculty must administer a student evaluation tool approved by the college in every class of the fall and spring semesters **only**. Exceptions must be approved by the Dean. In interpreting the student evaluations, differences in subject matter, type and level of class, class size, as well as other factors considered significant should be taken into account. All student evaluations (excluding summer evaluations) administered since the previous promotion or initial employment at UCM (not to exceed 7 years) are to be included in the candidate's dossier.

Other Required Teaching Effectiveness Documentation in the Dossier

Candidates are responsible for clearly outlining their case for promotion and/or tenure in the dossier. Thus, evidence is expected to be provided to support the teaching attributes described in Appendix 1. The following three items must be included in the candidate's dossier.

A. Reflection by the candidate in the body of the dossier on the implementation of professional development plans for improvement of the candidate's teaching skills to enhance student performance.

B. Statement by the candidate in the body of the dossier on how course modification(s) due to self-reflection, peer feedback or student feedback has been implemented and evaluated for impact.

C. A copy of the syllabus from each course taught since their last promotion linked to an internal Google Drive folder. Unless there have been significant changes in the syllabus between semesters, faculty only need to submit one syllabus per class despite teaching it multiple semesters or times.

Additionally, the candidate is highly encouraged to provide evidence of teaching effectiveness as outlined in P & T Appendix 2. Individuals involved in the promotion and/or tenure process should evaluate documented and/or verifiable information concerning teaching performance available from sources other than the dossier and apply professional judgment in making a decision. This evaluation may include (but is not limited to) information concerning the teaching attributes described in P & T Appendix 1.

Scholarship

Definition of Scholarship

To be counted toward meeting the criteria, each instance of scholarship must be:

1. discipline-based or support the faculty member's discipline (including basic, applied, and the scholarship of teaching research);
2. applicable to the academic program goals and objectives related to the faculty member's assignment in agreement with and endorsed by the faculty member's department chair; and
3. unique (meant to prevent the 'double-counting' phenomenon- meaning a paper presentation or conference proceedings that subsequently leads to a refereed publication can only be used in the one category or the other; not both).

Departments, with approval of the college dean, determine guidelines for journals, grants, and other scholarly products meeting sufficient quality to satisfy the following criteria.

Definition of Refereed

Refereed, which may be used interchangeably with “blind peer reviewed” or “juried by peers”, is defined as a structured reviewing system in which at least two reviewers, excluding in-house review, evaluate the submitted works and advise as to acceptance. Generally, the goal of all peer review processes is to verify whether the work satisfies the standards for the discipline, identify any deviations from the standards, and provide suggestions for improvements.

Publications submitted for consideration for promotion and tenure must be published, digitally or hardcopy, prior to the date of dossier submission. An acceptance letter is not considered sufficient. A link to the full copy of the publication submitted for consideration should be included as evidence within the dossier. For a book, the candidate must include linked evidence of the front cover, copyright page, and table of contents within the dossier.

Faculty in Non-AACSB Accredited Programs Continuum of Achievement in Scholarship

Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Research consisting of a minimum of three refereed, scholarly publications (including blind peer reviewed books and monographs published by commercial or university press only) in the candidate’s professional area – not including the dissertation – while in the rank of assistant professor. One or more of the following can substitute for two of these three required publications:

1. Refereed paper presentation at regional, state, national or international meeting and the manuscript or abstract published in the proceedings (weight equals 1 for 1).
2. Refereed presentations and poster sessions at the national or international level (weight equals 3 for 1).
3. Externally funded grant (weight equals 1 for 1).
4. Chapter in a book (weight equals 1 for 1).
5. Other non-refereed articles as approved by department chair (weight equals 4 for 1)
6. Other discipline-specific artifacts that demonstrate substantial scholarly activity, which are otherwise unaccounted for, but endorsed by the candidate’s discipline level of review (e.g. significant contribution to accreditation reports).

Associate Professor to Full Professor

Research consisting of a minimum of four refereed, scholarly publications (including blind peer-reviewed books and monographs published by commercial or university press only) in the candidate's professional area while in the rank of associate professor. One or more of the following can substitute for two of these four required publications:

1. Refereed paper presentation at regional, state, national or international meeting and the manuscript or abstract published in the proceedings (weight equals 1 for 1).
2. Refereed presentations and poster sessions at the national or international level (weight equals 3 for 1).
3. Externally funded grant (weight equals 1 for 1).
4. Chapter in a book (weight equals 1 for 1).
5. Other non-refereed articles as approved by school chair (weight equals 4 for 1).
6. Other discipline-specific artifacts that demonstrate substantial scholarly activity, which are otherwise unaccounted for, but endorsed by the candidate's discipline level of review (e.g. significant contribution to accreditation reports).

Faculty in AACSB Accredited Programs Continuum of Achievement in Scholarship

The following scholarship guidelines apply only to faculty within programs under AACSB accreditation and align with faculty qualifications.

Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Research consisting of a minimum of three refereed, scholarly quality¹ journal articles in the candidate's professional area – not including the dissertation – while in the rank of assistant professor.

¹AACSB Faculty Footnote: *Quality publications are defined as journals that (1) are available for public review through means such as subscription, libraries, and electronic databases or are otherwise widely disseminated, and (2) at the time of publication:*

- a. *listed in Cabell's white list with a maximum self-reported acceptance rate of 50%, or*
- b. *listed in Washington & Lee's Law Journals list, or*
- c. *listed in the Australian Business Dean's Council Journal Quality list with a maximum self-reported acceptance rate of 50%, or*
- d. *listed in EconLit, only refereed journals with a maximum self-reported acceptance rate of 50%, or*
- e. *approved as an exception by the SoBA P&T review committee members. Only one exception may be granted when the faculty member submits documentation to substantiate that the journal [or text-book (1st edition only), scholarly book (1st edition only), chapter in edited scholarly books (1st edition only), provided such book or chapter is published in university press] aligns with the quality standards of other acceptable journals [book, chapter]. Publication quality will be assessed based on the journal's [book, chapter] quality metrics, including but not limited to impact factor, review process, etc., at the time of the article's [book, chapter] publication. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure the journal [book, chapter] meets the standards at time of publication.*

Two or more of the following can substitute for only one of the required publications:

1. Refereed paper presentation at a national or international meeting and the manuscript is published in the proceedings (weight equals 1 for 1).
2. Monographs published by university press (weight equals 1 for 1).

Associate Professor to Professor

Research consisting of a minimum of four refereed, scholarly quality journal articles in the candidate's professional area while in the rank of associate professor.

Service

Candidates for promotion or tenure are expected to present documentation supporting a strong record of service to the university and their profession or discipline. School or program guidelines specify which, if any, professional memberships, certifications, and licenses are needed in support of the school's/program's mission, program accreditation, or which serve to model for students an appropriate professional orientation. Artifacts documenting this service can be linked internally in the form of emails or online confirmations, or the department chair and department-level committee's progress of the dossier will indicate confirmation of the accuracy of these service appointments.

Continuum of Achievement in Service

Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

All the following minimum service expectations must have been met while the candidate was at the rank of Assistant Professor.

Service to the University

- a. at least two university or faculty senate committees
- AND
- b. at least two college or department or program committees.

These need not be four different committees. For example, substantial service** on a single committee for two years could be equivalent to substantial service on two different committees for only one year.

Alternatively, the candidate may satisfy two of the four service expectations through substitution of any other substantial acts of university service that are either specified in department guidelines or supported by letter from the Department Chair and Dean.

Service to the Profession or Discipline

The candidate must document active membership in any of the regional, state, national and international professional organizations or specialty professional associations specified in department/program guidelines to be relevant to the profession or discipline, necessary for program accreditation, or which serve to model for students an appropriate professional orientation.

Opportunities for service to the professional discipline may vary substantially by discipline. Consequently, interpretation of these criteria at the department level is critical.

Associate Professor to Full Professor

Regarding service, it is the expectation that Full Professors will have demonstrated leadership and contributed significantly to the enhancement and/or reputation of the institution. All the following service expectations must have been met while the candidate was at the rank of Associate Professor.

Service to the University

The candidate has the responsibility to substantiate and document that they have provided valuable and substantial service to the institution. This may be accomplished by discussing the impact of one's efforts expended:

- c. serving as chair or other highly influential member* of at least one university or faculty senate committee

AND

- d. a contributing member* or chair of three additional department, college, university, or faculty senate committees.

Two of the service expectations in category "b" above may be satisfied through any other substantial acts of university service that are either specified in department guidelines or supported by letter from the Department Chair and Dean.

These committees need not be four different committees. For example, substantial service** on a single committee for two years could be equivalent to substantial service on two different committees for only one year.

Finally, the candidate is expected to demonstrate ongoing service to the school or program through continual contributions to various school or program initiatives.

Service to the Profession or Discipline

The candidate must document both active membership and influential participation in any of the regional, state, national and international professional organizations or specialty professional associations specified in school guidelines to be relevant to the profession or discipline, necessary for program accreditation, or which serve to model for students an appropriate professional orientation.

Opportunities for service to the professional discipline may vary substantially by discipline. Consequently, interpretation of these criteria at the department level is critical.

***Note on Contributing or Highly Influential Member:**

Evidence of service as a “contributing member” or “highly influential member” is incumbent on the candidate to substantiate. For example, evidence may come in the form of a letter from the committee chair or explanation of the contribution the candidate made.

****Note on Substantial Acts of Service:**

Examples of substantial acts of University service could include, but are not limited to:

- 1. Sponsorship of student organizations or management of significant student activities.*
- 2. Student recruitment activities.*
- 3. Procurement of significant external gifts or donations to advance university, college, or school programs.*
- 4. Significant contribution to accreditation reports for university and/or school programs.*
- 5. Development of a new University sponsored community service program or substantial improvement to an existing University sponsored community service program.*
- 6. Contributions to school/program curriculum.*

The timeframe of consideration as one act of service typically means serving for one academic year.

Promotion and Tenure (P & T) Guidelines Appendix 1

Evaluation of Effective Teaching

While there is no one, complete definition of effective teaching on which everyone can agree, effective teaching performance should demonstrate:

1. Effective presentation and creation of an effective learning environment in the course.
2. Engaging learning experiences and environment within the course.
3. Appropriate pedagogy that is good for the class, teacher, and discipline.
4. Work as appropriate and required on curriculum development and special teaching techniques.
5. Use of appropriate tests for the class, teacher, and discipline.
6. Keeping current in one's discipline and area(s) of expertise as required for effective teaching performance.
7. Preparation and distribution of appropriate syllabi to students in each course.
8. Propriety of course content and applications.
9. Maintenance of scheduled office hours and additional availability as required to perform teaching related duties.
10. Ability to answer questions and counsel students concerning courses, discipline, and University matters.
11. Integrity and ethical conduct with students and peers.
12. An attitude of dignity and respect toward students and peers.
13. Sharing knowledge and opinions with students and colleagues and considering opinions of students and colleagues.
14. Ability to work effectively with students and peers on teaching related matters.
15. Ability to express opinions to students and colleagues on topics and issues for which a logical, well-developed point of view is held.
16. Effective communication skills.
17. Ability to interest and motivate students to achieve high standards.
18. Fair and impartial evaluation of students in all aspects of education and instruction.
19. Ability to generate enthusiasm for learning.
20. Respect for student diversity.

Promotion and Tenure (P & T) Guidelines Appendix 2

Additional Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness

In addition to the types of evidence identified in the *UCM Promotion and Tenure Policies*, and those required by the College, examples of teaching effectiveness may include but are not limited to the following:

1. Earned Online Teaching Certification.
2. Online or hybrid courses have passed UCM Online Course Certification.
3. Documentation or evidence showing student improvement in knowledge or competencies after course completion.
4. The presentation of data reflecting student performance on exit exams.
5. Evidence of significant contribution to program review leading to enhanced student learning and program improvement.
6. Implementation and evaluation of the engaging and impactful student activities/exercises to enhance learning outcomes.
7. Evidence of significant contribution to accreditation review leading to enhanced student learning and program improvement.
8. Documentation reflecting course audits conducted by the candidate and/or colleagues.
9. Distinguished teaching awards or other recognition.
10. Grants that have been obtained by the faculty member to enhance teaching skills.
11. Invitations from other educational institutions or agencies to demonstrate effective teaching.
12. Demonstration of skill in instructional design through incorporation of current research and technology to enhance teaching effectiveness.
13. Mentoring and promoting student research.

COLLEGE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES

Candidate's Digital Dossier

The candidate must utilize the dossier outline and internal Google Drive folders to link artifacts supporting their candidacy. Consistency in formatting is essential to an efficient and timely review process. While failure to comply with formatting requirements alone is not grounds for denying promotion or tenure, the candidate must follow the procedural guidelines for ease of review. Items that are not included or not otherwise linked to the dossier but are explicitly stated as a requirement must be provided for the review, or they cannot be considered for review.

Candidates should post on the first page of the dossier, just below the heading, the year and college guidelines by which they intend to be reviewed. A link to the guidelines needs to be provided.

Evaluation

The candidate's departmental colleagues should be the first level of dossier evaluation. The tenured faculty in the candidate's department along with the department chair are charged with validating the authenticity of the material in the dossier and dossier appendix. The candidate's colleagues in the department are the reviewers most knowledgeable about the relative stature of scholarly venues accessible in the discipline, the appropriate organizations, and their prestige within the discipline, idiosyncrasies of program assessment instruments, etc.

It is incumbent on the departmental reviewers, the department committee, department chair, and college committee to clearly stipulate the rationale and provide written justification for the recommendations to the succeeding levels of review. This shall be communicated by a letter at each level of review.

Each committee level of review within the College shall designate a chair that provides the signature on the candidate's recommendation letter. Nonetheless, it is the responsibility of the committee as a whole to compose the letter. The letter should provide a declaration of whether the candidate met the standards for each area (e.g. teaching, scholarship, and service for tenured/tenure-track candidates), a justification for this determination in each section, and the committee's final determination.

Due to the nature of the digital dossier process, recommendation letters at each level of review within the College will be delivered to the candidate via email no later than 11:59 PM on the University established due date.

Perpetual Deadline Table

UCM Policy Level of Review	HCBPS	Perpetual Deadline (on or before)
Faculty member submits dossier to department.	Faculty submits dossier to department committee.	September 1
Department submits recommendations to chair	Department committee submits recommendations to chair.	September 15
Chair submits recommendations to college	Chair submits recommendations to college committee.	September 30
College committee submits recommendations to dean	College committee submits recommendations to dean.	October 15
Dean submits recommendations to provost	Dean submits recommendations to provost.	October 31
Provost submits recommendations to president	Provost submits recommendations to president.	January 10
President reports February/March Board Meeting	President reports to BOG	Feb/March Board Meeting