CAL POLY HUMBOLDT

School of Business

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion for the School of Business

Starting Year for Department RTP Document: 2024/25
Intended Length for the use of Department RTP Document: 5 years

School of Business faculty performance is assessed by an evaluation of A) *Teaching Effectiveness*, B) *Research/Scholarly or Creative Activities*, and C) *Service to the Department, University, Profession, and Community*. The evaluation criteria for each are outlined below and include accomplishments in each of the three categories at the level of *Excellent, Good, and Minimum Essential*.

Outcomes for tenure and promotion for candidates following the normal timeline are determined by the table below (adapted from Appendix J, section IX.A.2.c):

A. Teaching	B. Scholarly or Creative Activities	C. Service	Outcome
Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Acceptable
Excellent	Good	Good	Acceptable
Excellent	Excellent	Minimum Essential	Acceptable
Excellent	Minimum Essential	Excellent	Acceptable
Excellent	Excellent	Good	Acceptable
Excellent	Good	Excellent	Acceptable
Excellent	Good	Minimum Essential	Unacceptable
Excellent	Minimum Essential	Good	Unacceptable
Not Excellent	Excellent, Good, or Minimum Essential	Excellent, Good, or Minimum Essential	Unacceptable

The Initiating Unit Personnel Committee (IUPC) will evaluate candidates in each area based on the criteria listed below, and clearly document this evaluation in their review letter.

A. Demonstration of Teaching Excellence

1. Introduction

The language in Appendix J, section IX.B.1.a.5 is used as a guide regarding the teaching effectiveness of a candidate for tenure and promotion in the School of Business. Specificity is added in the section below based on departmental standards on teaching effectiveness.

Appendix J, section IX.B.1.a.5 section states:

Teaching effectiveness is assessed primarily through collegial evaluation of classroom teaching and summary analysis of student evaluations by peers. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness shall be based primarily on written statements from colleagues within the candidate's academic discipline(s). The statements should be supported by direct observation of the candidate's performance. Such observations can take place in a variety of ways, such as classroom visitations, team teaching, guest lecturing, etc. Multiple observations, conducted over a period of time, are preferable to a single observation conducted solely for personnel purposes.

2. Departmental Standards for Teaching Effectiveness:

Teaching effectiveness is evaluated via the following:

i. Collegial Faculty Evaluations: The IUPC will encourage all members of the School of Business faculty at or above the rank of the candidate to write collegial letters each semester that include descriptions of and reflections on their observations of the faculty candidate. While faculty at or above the rank of the candidate in the School of Business are encouraged to undertake such observations, other tenure-track faculty, lecturers, or relevant staff with expertise in the discipline-area are welcome to make teaching observations with the consent of the candidate. Letters should address the teaching effectiveness criteria outlined within Appendix J. Additional assessment instruments that may be used to conduct teaching evaluations include the instructional observation checklist and quality learning and teaching best practices promoted by the Cal Poly Humboldt Center for Teaching and Learning.

When assessing teaching effectiveness, the School of Business identifies the following key indicators of excellence that candidates should aim to achieve.

- Evidence of adapting teaching methods to meet changing pedagogical goals of the program or changing technologies in the candidate's discipline.
- Development of clear, coherent, organized course syllabi which follow all university guidelines, such as information about course materials, course requirements, a detailed course outline, and an assessment plan.

- Development of new teaching materials and/or assessment materials, including embedded assessment that supports accreditation processes.
- Development of clear, coherent, and organized learning management system course sites.
- Utilization of a variety of methods to assess student learning.
- Utilization of a variety of assignments and instructional materials that meet different educational backgrounds and learning abilities.
- Emphasis on hands-on problem-solving in real life business situations via projects, assignments, activities, and/or discussions.
- Involvement of students in classroom discussions and encouragement of active student participation in the learning experience, including allowing students time to process and answer questions, and listening to student comments and questions using supporting/reflective listening.
- Creation of a learning environment characterized by mutual respect and critical thinking whereby students can freely ask questions, share diverse perspectives, question ideas, dig deeper into subject matter, have an equal opportunity to learn, and elicit funds of knowledge or prior knowledge from students in relation to the subject.
- Demonstration of communication capabilities that signify strong command of course material, ability to explore topics from more than one perspective, ability to respond constructively to changes in student attentiveness, and create an environment where students feel welcomed and have an equal opportunity to learn.
- Demonstration that class sessions are well organized and have a logical flow that is easy to follow, and time is used well.
- Inclusive and equitable learning environment where students feel safe and welcomed and have an equitable opportunity to learn.

ii. Student Evaluations: Student evaluations for all courses taught by the candidate during the relevant period are also significant in assessing a candidate's teaching effectiveness. Assessment of student evaluations will include an analysis of average item scores from the survey across all courses. Evaluations should demonstrate consistently high levels of teaching performance. If there is a mean item score of 3.5 or lower on any item in the student evaluations for any course, then the candidate should discuss this in the PDS and indicate measures being taken to address and improve these results. In addition to quantitative scores of student evaluations, students' qualitative comments from the student evaluations are also used to assess a candidate's teaching effectiveness if trends are present.

iii. Professional Development Activities in Teaching: This may include reviewing literature and research in teaching subject areas, planning and/or participating in professional development activities, developing and improving teaching and assessment methods, receiving and maintaining a relevant certification, designation or license, attending conferences and/or seminars relevant to teaching subject areas, and/or conducting research or other activities related to teaching but not published or disseminated as scholarly work.

iv. Other Written and Signed Materials from Students (if any): The IUPC will solicit evaluative letters from students that speak to candidates' teaching effectiveness at the end of each regular academic term. Student letters will be sent directly to Academic Personnel Services and automatically included in the candidate's file. Candidates must also provide critical reflection on their pedagogy and on student and faculty evaluations of their teaching in the PDS.

3. Criteria for Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor

Excellence in teaching effectiveness is assessed primarily through collegial faculty evaluations of classroom teaching, analysis of student evaluations, professional development activities in teaching, and other written and signed materials from students. Excellence in teaching effectiveness must be achieved for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

4. Criteria for Promotion to Professor

The Department expects that successful candidates for promotion to full Professor continue to demonstrate all the qualities required for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (i.e., excellence in teaching). A candidate seeking promotion to full professor should exhibit leadership in program enhancement, including curriculum reforms, assessments, and the advancement of field-specific pedagogy where appropriate.

B. Research/Scholarly or Creative Activities

1. Introduction

The School of Business requires faculty to engage in regular research, scholarly, and/or creative activities for achieving the Department's primary mission of teaching. Each member of the faculty is expected to pursue activities that contribute directly to the candidate's intellectual growth and professional development. Equal value is placed on disciplinary scholarly/creative works (e.g., within the faculty member's area of teaching expertise) and interdisciplinary efforts related to the field of business, sustainability, or teaching.

Categories of Research/Scholarly or Creative Activities.

Contributions shall be in accordance with areas specifically indicated below. They are organized in two categories. No relative importance or weighting is implied by the order within each category.

Category I:

i. Peer reviewed publications: Peer-reviewed academic papers or similar publications that represent original, disseminated research contributions to knowledge or compile, organize and analyze material, including:

- Authored (or co-authored) textbooks or books.
- Refereed journal articles.
- Refereed book chapters.

ii. *Awarded major external grants:* evidence of subsequent work performed by the candidate on the project.

Category II:

i. *Contributions, including but not limited to:*

- Funded internal grants (e.g., seed grants for research, graduate student support, etc., awarded by on-campus selection committees).
- Meeting proceedings (e.g., peer-reviewed publications in connection with meetings, including those held on campus).
- External grant applications (e.g., proposals in support of original research when such proposals were submitted to established funding agencies for competitive evaluation).
- Conference presentations or symposia based on professional expertise (e.g., presentations, peer-reviewed published abstracts from papers or posters presented at meetings, including those held on campus).
- Funded external grant reports prepared for government agencies, businesses, or nonprofits.
- Other scholarly publications such as technical reports, book reviews, instructional materials, etc.

Standards for Peer-Review

The School of Business follows a science/practitioner model of scholarly inquiry and defines the process of peer-review to include independent assessments of scholarly/creative contributions by academic and non-academic reviewers. The School of Business values and invites peer-review from non-academic leaders in public and private sectors of society, particularly practitioners working in the faculty candidate's area of expertise, if an academic peer-review has not occurred. Need for peer-review from non-academic/practitioner reviewers may arise in a number of situations, for example, when submitting work to practitioner-oriented conferences or in connection with certain activities organized or commissioned by non-academic institutions (including private firms).

2. **Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor**

Each member of the IUPC shall evaluate the research/scholarly or creative activities of faculty being considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor according to three categories of

performance: *Excellent, Good, Minimum Essential* (from Appendix J). For promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, only the research and scholarly or creative activities over the review period since the last successful application for previous promotion will be recognized. The School of Business defines these categories as follows:

> Excellent – At least three contributions from Category I, at least one of which is a peer-reviewed publication, AND two contributions from Category II. Alternatively, candidates may submit evidence of at least four contributions from Category I. A minimum of two Category I or II contributions must have occurred during the candidate's residency at Cal Poly Humboldt.

> Good – At least two contributions from Category I, at least one of which is a peer-reviewed publication, AND two contributions from Category II. Alternatively, candidates may submit evidence of at least three contributions from Category I. A minimum of one Category I or II contributions must have occurred during the candidate's residency at Cal Poly Humboldt.

> Minimum Essential – At least one Category I peer-reviewed publication, AND two contributions from Category II. Alternatively, candidates may submit evidence of at least two contributions from Category I.

C. Service to the Department, University, Profession, and Community

1. Introduction

The School of Business recognizes service in the following categories: *Department/University* and *Profession/Community*. Candidates will list and describe all unassigned time service activities and provide a brief statement regarding the candidate's contribution to each activity, including role(s) and time commitment. When documenting service, faculty should clearly indicate whether the service is related to *Department/University* and *Profession/Community*. The following is a list of possible service activities for each category, which may not be comprehensive. Appendix J, Section IX.B.3.5 provides that the candidate may submit an activity for evaluation that is not included in the core definition of service as put forth in Appendix J, Section IX.B.3. A candidate may make the case that an activity not listed in one of these categories should count as a contribution to service for purposes of evaluation. The candidate's IUPC will determine whether the activity should be evaluated as part of the candidate's service and in which category of activity it will be placed. Service should be documented and supported by evaluative letters, if appropriate.

Department/University Service:

- Service on committees at the university, college and/or departmental level, including chairing standing committees and membership on either standing or ad hoc committees.

- Mentoring other faculty members, organizing, directing, and/or implementing faculty development activities.
- Participating in departmental curriculum reforms, assessment, and accreditation initiatives.
- Contributing individually and/or collaboratively to the development and improvement of academic programs.
- Serving as an academic advisor for a student club or organizations and helping to organize and supervise student events.
- Serving as the academic advisor for a graduate student internship, thesis, or research project resulting in academic credit.
- Advising students on academic, career, or life coaching related matters.
- Collaborating throughout the campus community on projects, workshops, presentations, and other campus activities.
- Hosting community functions or events that promote the School of Business, business disciplines, sustainability initiatives, or student networking.
- Hosting events for experiential learning and community engagement (e.g., hosting events that require significant time investment and improve our students' learning experience while providing valuable research and service to local communities).
- Participating in outreach and recruiting events on or off campus.
- Any other service activities that directly benefit the university.

Profession/Community Service:

- Service at meetings of professional organizations
- Chairing or organizing academic or professional meetings, symposia or contributed paper sessions.
- Service as a reviewer for professional publications, especially peer-review of manuscripts of journal articles, books, textbooks, and the like.
- Service as an editor or member of an editorial board for a professional journal.
- Service as an elected officer within community groups, including membership on local boards, that promote the business profession or sustainability initiatives.
- Writing for non-academic publications, including newsletters, magazines, articles, or op-ed pieces directed to the general public.
- Presentations of lectures or other instruction delivered to community groups or organizations.
- Service as a reviewer for grant applications submitted to professional granting agencies.
- Service in community groups, including membership on local boards or other evidence of activity in community governance.
- Participating in collaborative endeavors with schools, industry, civic agencies, or other community organizations.
- Unpaid service for public or private agencies.
- Any other activities that benefit the community and the profession.

2.   Evaluation

The overall service activities are assessed primarily through the evidence provided by the candidate in their PDS, and evaluative letters by people with direct knowledge of the service. Faculty should describe their service contributions along with an estimate of the hours devoted to each contribution (a detailed log of hours is not required). The School of Business recommends that effort of more than a few hours on a specific service activity be documented with a letter of support from an appropriate person regarding the contributions made by the candidate, if such a request is appropriate or feasible.

3.   Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor

The IUPC shall review the material submitted by faculty as evidence of service, and evaluate these contributions as *Excellent, Good, or Minimum Essential* (from Appendix J). When evaluating the candidate's service hours, the IUPC will take into account the quality of these contributions as reflected in the service letters written for the candidate. A candidate seeking promotion to full professor is expected to demonstrate leadership within both university and departmental committees. The School of Business defines Excellent, Good, or Minimum Essential as follows:

> Excellent - An average of at least 120 service hours per year and evidence provided by the candidate about service contributions.

> Good - An average of at least 70 service hours per year and evidence provided by the candidate about service contributions.

> Minimum Essential - An average of at least 48 service hours per year and evidence provided by the candidate about service contributions.

<div align="center">End of the Document.</div>