REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICIES OF THE SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
EFFECTIVE FALL, 2022

Committee Organization and Responsibilities

The Department of Business Administration will follow these procedures and criteria in its employment of the university-wide Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) guidelines. This document is meant to be a guideline used in conjunction with the document outlining current university-wide RTP policies. Nothing in this document shall contravene the university-wide procedures.

Department of Business Administration RTP Committee members shall consist of three members elected from the tenured faculty. They shall have three year rotating terms that start and end on June 30 with staggered terms; one member elected each year. When replacements are needed, they shall be elected to fill the remaining term of the person they are replacing. The Committee Chair shall normally be the person in his/her third year on the Committee. The RTP Committee shall determine deviations from this norm. The Chair is responsible for ensuring university RTP procedures are followed and timelines met. The Committee Chair serves as a coordinator of other Committee members and the candidates throughout the period of preparing the RTP documents. One member of the Committee serves as advisor for each candidate, and is responsible to have draft documents on that candidate for the Committee to review. The Committee meets as soon as possible each fall to identify which members will be working as faculty advisors with which candidates. At this meeting a date is set, which may be earlier than the university-wide deadline, for submission of materials by candidates to the advisor.

In preparing the draft departmental recommendation, the advisor carefully analyzes the candidate's materials found in the candidate’s Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) and explains their significance within the context of the discipline, the Department, and the University. The entire Committee reviews and edits the final documents. These documents become part of the WPAF and are transmitted to the Department Chair, who has the option of preparing a short, additional evaluation and recommendation based on the candidate's documentation.

A Note on "Files"

All official documents pertaining to a faculty member are stored electronically in the OnBase Reappointment Tenure and Promotion system. This system contains all documents in a file referred to as the Personnel Action File (PAF). The PAF contains electronic forms of items such as letters of appointment and all documents pertaining to promotion and tenure such as peer observations of teaching effectiveness and records of scholarly contributions. A faculty member may access his or her own file at any time, and can enter items such as letters of commendation, award certificates, and other items which are germane to the RTP process during periods prescribed by the Faculty Affairs office. Any administrator of faculty matters at the level of department chair or higher can also enter items, provided that the faculty member is notified in advance. For example, negative items such as letters of complaint by students or records of disciplinary actions could be entered as well as items noting positive achievements. The faculty member has five business days after notification to respond to any proposed entry.

Administrators of faculty affairs and members of RTP committees can also view the contents of the file.

The PAF also is considered to contain all documents referred to in documents present in the file. For example, if an RTP document lists a paper published by the faculty member, then that paper is part of the PAF, even though the paper may not be present in the file.

Most documents make it to the PAF via requirements of the RTP process. Each tenure or promotion review cycle begins with a candidate submitting to the Departmental RTP committee via the OnBase system (on or before the deadline for file completion set each year by Faculty Affairs) a set of materials documenting his or her accomplishments, and containing items required for review, such as peer and student evaluations of teaching. Upon receipt by the departmental RTP committee, these items form the nucleus of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). From the day items are received by the departmental RTP Committee, the WPAF is considered to constitute a portion of the PAF.

As the review process proceeds for a given cycle, documents associated with the review process are then added to the WPAF. These may include items such as the written recommendations of each review committee, official letters specifying the actions of committees or the University President, and responses of the candidate to committee recommendations. Items referred to in any document in the WPAF are considered to be part of the file, even if they are not electronically contained in the file. Upon completion of the review, the WPAF is then entered into the PAF.

A. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

Student evaluations for all courses taught through the current evaluation cycle shall be utilized each evaluation cycle, per union contract (CBA).

Peer observations for a full performance review cycle will consist of a minimum of two per review cycle.
Peer observations for a periodic performance review cycle will consist of a minimum of one per review cycle.

Peer observers shall meet with the candidate to arrange a suitable time for the visit and also receive from the candidate a course outline or course syllabus, and a representative set of other materials students receive from the candidate. Following the peer observation, each reviewer shall prepare a typed document that addresses criteria of teaching effectiveness given in the university-wide RTP policy using the attached Department of Business Administration Class Evaluation form. In addition to discussion of the candidate's success in meeting the criteria required by the university-wide RTP policy, the documents shall include information on the:

- Instructor observed
- Class observed
- Observer
- Time

- Date
- Number of students in attendance
- Number of students enrolled
- Topics discussed in class
- Level of student participation and acceptance of student input
- Teaching styles and methods observed, including visual and "hands-on" techniques observed (e.g. labs and demonstrations)
- Problems, if any, that could be improved
- Utility of materials made available to students
- Utility of documents that clarify course goals and grading policy
- Utility and methods used to evaluate students
- Laboratory protocols and directions if applicable
- Course strengths
- Course weaknesses

The attached Department of Business Administration Class Evaluation form shall be used for all peer evaluations conducted for RTP purposes.

Expectations for Teaching Performance

Over the relevant evaluation period for the tenure decision as well as for promotion to either Associate Professor or Professor, the Department of Business Administration expects the candidate to demonstrate:

- A minimum composite average score of student evaluations of 3.0 (on a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the maximum) for all RTP-evaluated courses
- The overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness by peers as "good;"

B. Evaluation of Scholarship, Research, Creative Achievement and Professional Development

The Department expects candidates to develop a record that establishes a presumption that they will continue to meet the minimum five-year expectations established by the department for continuing academic evaluations. A probationary faculty member who has Prior Service Credit (PSC) will be expected to meet this same goal, but as a minimum with at least half of the work done while at Sonoma State University prior to award of tenure. The remainder of this document will refer to this type of faculty as PSC Faculty. Unless otherwise noted, ‘candidate’ or “faculty member” includes both PSC and non PSC candidates. [Note: PSC status is relevant only to the tenure decision. In evaluations where candidates are ranked (e.g. promotion and sabbaticals), only work done at SSU is considered.]

SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Scholarly Requirements for Tenure and Promotion

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor*

A faculty member must demonstrate an ability to publish original work. Therefore, a faculty member must have a minimum of three (3) Category 1 activities in her or his discipline during the five years preceding the tenure and promotion decision. A faculty member with only two Category 1 activities in the five years preceding the tenure and/or promotion decision must complement her or his scholarly record with other activities that demonstrate an active research agenda. Therefore, a faculty member with only two (2) Category 1 activities in the five years preceding the tenure and/or promotion decision should have a minimum of two (2) Category 2 activities during this period in addition to the required Category 1 activities. PSC credit guidelines also apply to Category 2 activities.

*****For the tenure decision, PSC faculty may include publications granted to a faculty member under PSC credit guidelines found above in Section B. For promotion to either Associate Professor or Professor, or other evaluations where candidates may be ranked, all requirements for intellectual contributions from either Category 1 or Category 2 must have been completed while a faculty member at SSU.

Promotion to Professor

Within the five year period before the faculty member can be considered for promotion to Professor, the faculty member must have a minimum of three (3) Category 1 activities in her or his discipline, or two (2) Category 1 activities in the five years preceding the promotion decision and a minimum of two (2) Category 2 activities. Again, for PSC faculty, all requirements for intellectual contributions from either Category 1 or Category 2 must have been completed while a faculty member at SSU.

Category 1

I Scholarly Activities Outlets

Publication of an article or case study in a journal that meets any one of these criteria is considered to be an acceptable scholarly activity for tenure and promotion.

1. The journal is listed in Cabells.
2. The journal appears on the Australian Deans Business Council list.
3. The journal is double-blind peer reviewed.*

4. Pre-publication approval in a journal is granted by the DBA Scholarly Activity Committee (SAC). **

5. Publication in an on-line open-access journal approved by the DBA SAC.

* Should the faculty member be a member of the editorial staff of the outlet to which the article will be submitted, review of the DBA SAC is required prior to submission.

* In order to support quality in scholarly activity, if the faculty member chooses to submit an article under this condition, it will be the responsibility of the member to demonstrate the outlet's editorial process involves sufficient rigor. Generally, rigor may be demonstrated through provision to the DBA SAC all comments of the reviewers as well as the author's response to these comments.

Additionally, it will be the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure that the journal under consideration for submission is not predatory in nature. A journal may be evaluated for predatory characteristics in several manners. A journal that does not appear on Cabells *Predatory Reports*, or a journal that does not contain in large part the characteristics of predatory journals provided on the attached list, will be assumed to be non-predatory in nature. NOTE: A requirement for payment for publication is not alone a determination that the journal is predatory in nature.

**A faculty member whose scholarly activity does not match any activity or outlet listed in Category 1 or Category 2 may request guidance and/or approval of the outlet and/or activity from the DBA Scholarly Activity Committee (SAC). The DBA SAC is a committee formed and elected specifically for the review of scholarly activity for DBA faculty. Membership in the DBA SAC is comprised of one tenured Full Professor from each of the concentrations within the DBA. Faculty members shall be elected to this committee by a vote from the concentration's TT faculty. Areas that may share a significant disciplinary relationship, such as Accounting and Finance for example, may, upon the unanimous vote of TT faculty from each concentration, combine representation by a single faculty member chosen from either concentration.

II Scholarly Activities Outlets

A publication determined by the DBA SAC to have met one of the following criteria is considered to be an acceptable scholarly activity for tenure and promotion provided it meets the criteria found above in Section 1.

1. The topic of interest is determined to be novel.

2. The topic of interest makes a meaningful contribution to the disciplines of business, economics or related areas.

3. The topic of interest makes a measurable contribution to the disciplines of business, economics, or related areas.

III Scholarly Activities Outlets

Other scholarly activities considered to be acceptable for tenure & promotion.

1. Articles published in trade journals relevant to the practice of business, economics or related disciplines.

2. A publication of an academic textbook addressing a subject in business, economics or

related disciplines.

3. A chapter or a case published in a book or academic textbook addressing a subject in business, economics or related disciplines.

4. A research monograph addressing a subject in business, economics or related disciplines which appears in an academic journal or similar outlet such as an academic book.

5. Development and production of instructional software in the disciplines of business, economics or related areas.

6. Principal investigator on research grants from external agencies in excess of $25,000 with a white paper or research report disseminated by the sponsoring agency.

7. Any scholarly activity that the DBA SAC has determined fosters innovation and creativity in the disciplines of business, economics or related areas.

Category 2

Scholarly Activities Outlets

1. Publications in proceedings of international, national or regional academic conferences addressing a subject in business, economics or related disciplines.

2. Presentations of papers at academic conferences addressing a subject in business, economics or related disciplines.

3. Revisions to a published textbook addressing a subject in business, economics or related disciplines.

4. Principal investigator in research grants of less than $25,000 from internal or external agencies in connection with scholarly work.

5. Publication of an open-source on-line text, software or other media, revised periodically, addressing a subject in business, economics or related disciplines that is freely available online (e.g. on https://bookdown.org).

6. Creation of a package of instructionally based material addressing a subject in business, economics or related disciplines posted on an open access social media platform for use by the general public.** (requires SAC review)

7. Publication of a book, addressing a subject in business, economics or related disciplines, that has not been subject to either editorial or peer review.

Characteristics of a Predatory Journal (from Eriksson & Helgesson, 2017)
Note that the idea with this list is not to say that any journal fulfilling any of the points below is a predatory journal. But the more points on the list that apply to the journal at hand, the more skeptical you should be.

- The publisher is not a member of any recognized professional organisation committed to best publishing practices (like COPE or EASE)
- The journal is not indexed in well-established electronic databases (like Medline or Web of Science)
- The publisher claims to be a “leading publisher” even though it just got started
- The journal and the publisher are unfamiliar to you and all your colleagues

- The papers of the journal are of poor research quality, and may not be academic at all (for instance allowing for obvious pseudo-science)
- There are fundamental errors in the titles and abstracts, or frequent and repeated typographical or factual errors throughout the published papers
- The journal website is not professional
- The journal website does not present an editorial board or gives insufficient detail on names and affiliations
- The journal website does not reveal the journal's editorial office location or uses an incorrect address
- The publishing schedule is not clearly stated
- The journal title claims a national affiliation that does not match its location (such as "American Journal of …" while being located on another continent) or includes" international" in its title while having a single-country editorial board
- The journal mimics another journal title or the website of said journal
- The journal provides an impact factor in spite of the fact that the journal is new (which means that the impact cannot yet be calculated)
- The journal claims an unrealistically high impact based on spurious alternative impact factors (such as 7 for a bioethics journal, which is far beyond the top notation)
- The journal website posts non-related or non-academic advertisements
- The publisher of the journal has released an overwhelmingly large suite of new journals at one occasion or during a very short period of time
- The editor in chief of the journal is editor in chief also for other journals with widely different focus
- The journal includes articles (very far) outside its stated scope
- The journal sends you an unsolicited invitation to submit an article for publication, while making it blatantly clear that the editor has absolutely no idea about your field of expertise
- Emails from the journal editor are written in poor language, include exaggerated flattering (everyone is a leading profile in the field), and make contradictory claims (such as "You have to respond within 48 h" while later on saying "You may submit your manuscript whenever you find convenient")
- The journal charges a submission or handling fee, instead of a publication fee (which means that you have to pay even if the paper is not accepted for publication)
- The types of submission/publication fees and what they amount to are not clearly stated on the journal's website
- The journal gives unrealistic promises regarding the speed of the peer review process (hinting that the journal's peer review process is minimal or non-existent)—or boasts an equally unrealistic track-record
- The journal does not describe copyright agreements clearly or demands the copyright of the paper while claiming to be an open access journal
- The journal displays no strategies for how to handle misconduct, conflicts-of-interests, or secure the archiving of articles when no longer in operation

Source: Eriksson, S. & Helgesson, G. (2017). The false academy: predatory publishing in science and bioethics. *Medicine, Health Care, and Philosophy*, 20(2), 163-170

A Suggested Timeline of Scholarly Activities required for Tenure

The timeline listed below serves only as a guideline for probationary faculty to assist in self-evaluation of progress towards meeting the minimum requirements for tenure and should not be used by an RTP committee at any level for evaluation of a candidate, formal or otherwise.

Year 1: The candidate should show activity in research and professional development

Year 2: The candidate should show active progress in the research and professional development categories. Examples of active progress in this area include continued development of research and proposal writing, funding of grants, participation with students in a professional meeting, collection of data in research, and preparation and submission of manuscripts. A reasonable target would be at least one (1) Category 1 or Category 2 acceptance by the end of year 2.

Year 3: The candidate should show active progress in research and professional development. Examples would be active expansion of activities already begun in prior years, participation in professional meetings, publication of findings in refereed journals, students' participation at professional meetings. Reasonable progress would be at least one (1) Category 1 acceptance by the end of year 3. For PSC faculty, reasonable progress would be either one (1) Category 1 publication or one (1) Category 2 activity completed while at SSU as of this period.

Year 4: In addition to the examples of activities in this area described above, candidates should have some evidence of active written participation in their fields (publications in refereed journals, book chapters, reviews, etc.). By the end of year 4, reasonable progress would be either a second Category 1 acceptance or several Category 2 acceptances. PSC faculty should have met all of the PSC requirements as stated above as of this period.

Year 5 or 6: At the time the candidate applies for tenure, the candidate must have either three (3) articles or contributions in Category 1 that have been published or accepted for publication, or two (2) Category 1 contributions that have been published or accepted for publication, and a minimum of two (2) Category 2 contributions that have been published or accepted for publication.

Research Expectations for Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor

Candidates who are seeking promotion more than three years after their last promotion or after having been granted tenure are expected to meet, at least, the minimum department scholarly activity expectations noted earlier in this document.

B. Evaluation of Service to the Department, School University and Outside Community

DBA faculty are expected to engage in active, non-compensated service to the department, school, university and surrounding communities either through formal membership in standing committees, membership on intermittent committees such as a tenure-track faculty search, or any *ad hoc* service activity which makes a significant contribution to the operation of the department, school, university or an entity in the outside community. New faculty are not expected to share fully in committee work and student advising in their first year of service, but they are expected to have a record of full participation in various service activities at the time they apply for tenure.

Expectations for Service

Over a 5-year evaluative period for either tenure or promotion, faculty other than those in their first year at SSU are normally expected to engage in at least two significant service activities per year.

Examples of Departmental, School and University Service Activities

Service may include, but are not limited to activities such as:

Formal membership on department, school or university committees
Membership on a search committee for tenure track faculty or administrative personnel
Advisor to a student club or organization
Participating in the annual AACSB assessment day
Service on the Faculty Senate and any of its committees
Coordinator of Graduate activities
Participation in student orientations
Any *ad hoc* activity requiring a significant time component for completion

Examples of Service Activities to the Outside Community

Public and community service may vary from the local community to the larger communities of the faculty's discipline, the state or the world. "Local community service" may be the community of residence as well as that local to the University.

Service may include, but are not limited to activities such as:

Member of the board of directors of a non-profit organization
Officer of a K-12 Parent Teacher Organization
Significant work for a charitable organization
Coaching or mentoring as part of a youth sports league or club
Professional development activities to one's discipline such as a journal editor or reviewer (see attached list)

It is especially important, in this area, for the candidate to take primary responsibility for providing all appropriate evidence to the Department RTP Committee, which is responsible for substantiating and evaluating public service.

In all cases the department RTP Committee will look at the overall record of the candidate and make exceptions, as needed, to explicit requirements of the policy.

Per the CBA, faculty must indicate in their document if they have received compensation for any service activity.

Professional Development Activities

The Department of Business Administration encourages its faculty members to be active in the academic and professional community and values such activity. The following is a non-exhaustive list of activities that fall into this category. The department encourages probationary faculty to explore the possibility of participating in such activities but recognizes that some of these activities may be more appropriate for and more available to tenured faculty members.

1. Panel member or symposium member at an academic or professionalconference;
2. Reviewer for a journal;
3. Reviewer of papers for an academic or professional conference;
4. Reviewer of papers/cases for academic or professional organization;
5. Publication of teaching support materials (test bank, instructor's manual);
6. Editor of a peer reviewed journal;
7. Member of the editorial board of a peer reviewed journal;
8. Editor of a peer reviewed conference proceedings;
9. Editor of a book of readings;
10. Book review in a peer reviewed journal;
11. Officer of regional or national academic/professional organization;
12. Act as a discussant, chairperson, or division chair for an academic orprofessional conference;
13. Serve as a board member for an external profit, not-for-profit or governmentalorganization;
14. Provide consulting services to an external party in accordance to the consulting policy of the University and in the faculty member's primary discipline area;
15. Speaking engagements to a community or a professional association;
16. Committee or task force work for an academic or professional association;
17. Obtaining and maintaining a professional certification/designation;
18. Development of a new course or a new degree program;
19. Faculty residency/internship in a for-profit or not-for-profit organization; and,
20. Secondary investigator in research grants of any amount from internal or external agencies.