

**REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION POLICIES OF THE SONOMA  
STATE UNIVERSITY  
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION  
(Approved by the Department of Business Administration on May 4, 2005)  
(Revised on May 5, 2010)**

**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 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 making sure 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 (the WPAF-see below) 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 kept in Faculty Affairs in a single file referred to as the Personnel Action File (PAF). It contains such things as letters of appointment and documents pertaining to promotion and tenure. A faculty member may view his/her own file at any time, and can enter items such as letters of commendation or award certificates. Any administrator of faculty matters from department chair up 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 days to respond to proposed entries.

Administrators of faculty affairs and members of RTP committees can also view the contents of the file. A signed access log records all such viewings.

The PAF also is considered to contain all documents referred to in documents physically 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 it may not be physically present in the file. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to maintain all such documents not contained in the file in a binder in the Department Office.

Most documents make it to the PAF via the route of the RTP process. Each tenure or promotion review cycle begins with a candidate submitting to his/her departmental RTP committee (on or before a published deadline) a set of materials documenting his/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 year, documents associated with the review process are added to the WPAF. These include items such as 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 physically contained in the file. Upon completion of the review, the WPAF is physically entered into the PAF.

#### **A. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness**

Student evaluations from at least two courses shall be utilized each evaluation cycle, per union contract (CBA). If evaluations have been collected from more than two classes, the candidate, together with the Chair of the Department RTP Committee, shall decide which class evaluations are to be added to the WPAF. Any disagreement in this regard shall be resolved by the Department's RTP Committee as a whole.

For peer observations (a minimum of two per review cycle), the candidate shall select and recommend observers to the Department RTP Committee. If the Department RTP Committee accepts the observers, they shall (1) meet with the candidate to arrange a suitable time for the visit and (2) receive from the candidate a course outline and representative set of other materials students receive from the candidate. Following the peer observation, the reviewers shall each 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 these required criteria, 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 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; and,
- Course weaknesses.

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

### **Expectations for Teaching Performance**

The Department of Business Administration expects:

- Average student evaluations of at least 3.0 (on a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the maximum) in RTP-evaluated courses; any criterion where the average score is substantially below 3.0 needs to be addressed;
- Overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness by peers as "good;"
- Meeting of classes, office hours, and student conferences;
- Attendance at faculty meetings concerned with multiple section courses where the candidate is teaching one or more of those sections;
- Advising students in the Business Administration program regarding upper division major requirements, especially options in concentration areas, as well as career and graduate school opportunities; and
- If teaching evaluations do not meet the minimum standard, the document should show how the issues are being addressed.

### **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. The minimum for support for tenure is presented in below. [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**

**Research Activity**

A faculty member must demonstrate an ability to publish original work. Therefore, a faculty member should have at least two (2) publications in his/her discipline during the last five years in Category 1. In his/her first three years a PSC faculty will be expected to have accomplished, while at SSU, two (2) publications in Category 1, or one (1) in Category 1 and one (1) in Category 2.

**Category 1**

1. Articles and cases in peer reviewed academic journals;
2. Articles in trade journals;
3. Scholarly or teaching related textbook publications;
4. Chapter or a case in a scholarly book or teaching related textbook;
5. Research monograph;
6. Development and production of instructional software; and,
7. 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.

A faculty member with only two publications in the last five years must complement his/her publication record with other activities that demonstrate an active research agenda. Therefore, a faculty member with only two (2) Category 1 publications in the past five years should have at least two (2) activities during the last five years in Category 2: PSC faculty with only one (1) Category 1 publication while at SSU are expected to have at least one (1) Category 2 activity in the first three years at SSU.

**Category 2**

1. Publications in proceedings of national or regional academic conferences;
2. Presentations of papers at academic conferences;

3. Revisions to a published textbook; and,
4. Principal investigator in research grants of less than \$25,000 from internal or external agencies in connection with scholarly work.

A faculty member with three (3) or more Category 1 publications, at least two (2) of which must have been done at SSU, does not need to complement his/her publication record with other activities that demonstrate an active research agenda and therefore is not required to engage in the activities delineated above in Category 2.

### **Professional Activity**

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 professional conference;
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 on 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 or professional conference;
13. Serve as a board member for an external profit, not-for-profit or governmental organization;
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.

## **Research Expectations for Tenure**

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. The committee would normally expect to see 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, serving as reviewer for journals or professional panels, or acting as a consultant to industry or educational programs. The committee would normally expect to see at least one (1) Category 1 acceptance by the end of year 3. For PSC faculty, the committee would expect to see either one (1) Category 1 publication or one (1) Category 2 activity while at SSU by this date.

Year 4:

A part of the evaluation will focus on the progress of research and professional development. In addition to the examples of activities in this area described above, it would be expected that candidates would have some evidence of active written participation in their fields (publications in refereed journals, book chapters, reviews, etc.). By the end of year 4, the committee would normally expect to see the either a second Category 1 acceptance or several Category 2 acceptances. PSC faculty will be expected to have met all of the PSC requirements as stated above by this date.

Year 5/6:

By the time the candidate applies for tenure, either three (3) articles or contributions in Category 1 will have been accepted or two (2) such contributions and at least two (2) Category 2 contributions will have been published or accepted for publication.

## **Research Expectations for Promotion to Associate or Full 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 expectations.

### **C. Evaluation of Service to the University**

In addition to the criteria listed in the university-wide document under service to the University, the Department requires that each member share the work of running the Department by serving on departmental committees, being responsible for departmental equipment and facilities, advising students and coordinating departmental activities as necessary. 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 university service by the time they apply for tenure. Faculty are expected to become active in student organizations and functions.

## **Expectations for University Service**

Over a 5-year evaluative period, faculty are normally expected to serve each year, except the first, on at least one department or school committee and one university or school committee.

Faculty are expected to attend the following and similar events;

- First School and Department meetings each semester;
- Professional and teaching development workshops held by the School or Department;
- New and transfer student orientations;
- Commencement exercises;
- Advising workshops held for faculty; and,
- Events honoring students and or faculty in the Department (e.g. graduation dinner).

### **D. Evaluation of Public Service and Service to the Community**

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

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 whether or not they were paid for their service activity.



**New Faculty – Six Years to Tenure**

	<b>End of Year One</b>	<b>End of Year Two</b>	<b>End of Year Three</b>	<b>End of Year Four</b>	<b>End of Year Five</b>	<b>End of Year Six</b>
<b>Teaching</b>	Average student evaluations of 3.0. Peer evaluations of “Good”. Meet office hours, Attend faculty meetings, Advise Students.	Average student evaluations of 3.0, Peer evaluations of “Good”. Meet office hours, Attend faculty meetings, Advise Students	Average student evaluations of 3.0. Peer evaluations of “Good”. Meet office hours, Attend faculty meetings, Advise Students	Average student evaluations of 3.0. Peer evaluations of “Good”. Meet office hours, Attend faculty meetings, Advise Students	Average student evaluations of 3.0. Peer Evaluations of “Good”. Meet office hours, attend faculty meetings, Advise Students	Average student evaluations of 3.0. Peer Evaluation of “Good”. Meet office hours, attend faculty meetings, Advise Students
<b>Research</b>	Show evidence of professional development	At least one Category 1 or Category 2 acceptance	At least one Category 1 acceptance	An additional Category 1 or several additional Category 2’s.	An additional Category 1 or several additional Category 2’s.	Met all minimum requirements
<b>Professional Development</b>			At least one professional activity from list			Two activities during the last five years from the list.
<b>University Service</b>		A minimum of 2 appropriate committee and appropriate departmental activities as per policy	A minimum of 2 appropriate committee and appropriate departmental activities as per policy	A minimum of 2 appropriate committee and appropriate departmental activities as per policy	A minimum of 2 appropriate committee and appropriate departmental activities as per policy	A minimum of 2 appropriate committee and appropriate departmental activities as per policy
<b>Community Service</b>		Appropriate external activity	Appropriate external activity	Appropriate. external activity	Appropriate external activity	Appropriate external activity

**PSC Faculty –**

	<b>Year One</b>	<b>Year Two</b>	<b>Year Three</b>	<b>Year Four/Five</b>
<b>Teaching</b>	Average student evaluations of 3.0 Peer evaluation of “Good”. Meet office hours Attend faculty meetings Advise Students	Average student evaluations of 3.0 Peer evaluation of “Good”. Meet office hours Attend faculty meetings Advise Students	Average student evaluations of 3.0 Peer evaluation of “Good”. Meet office hours Attend faculty meetings Advise Students	Average student evaluations of 3.0 Peer evaluation of “Good”. Meet office hours Attend faculty meetings Advise Students
<b>Research</b>	Show evidence of professional development	Continued evidence of professional development	One publication from Category One <i>or</i> Category Two while at SSU	Met all minimum requirements
<b>Professional Development</b>			One activity during the last three years from the list.	
<b>University Service</b>		A minimum of 2 appropriate committee and appropriate dept. activities as per policy	A minimum of 2 appropriate committee and appropriate dept. activities as per policy	A minimum of 2 appropriate committee and appropriate dept. activities as per policy
<b>Community Service</b>		Appropriate external activity	Appropriate external activity	Appropriate external activity

## DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION CLASS EVALUATION

### Evaluation of \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Instructions:**

You have been asked by the instructor named above and the Department of Business Administration RTP Committee to conduct a peer evaluation of the instructor's teaching effectiveness. An overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness by peers as "good" is one of the minimum expectations of the Department of Business Administration as stated in its current evaluation criteria.

Prior to the evaluation, please meet with the instructor to agree on which class meeting you will observe. At that time (or at a point early enough to allow your review before the observed class meeting) you should obtain a copy of the course syllabus or outline and a copy of any handouts relevant to the class. You should also:

- Determine the type of class (i.e., pre-business, core, concentration, other)
- Find out how many students are enrolled in the class
- Find out what students will have been asked to do to prepare for the class
- Inquire about the instructor's goals for the class session
- Ask if there is anything in particular the instructor would like you to focus on during the class.

Prior to observing the class meeting, please familiarize yourself with these instructions and the accompanying form so that you will be able to take the appropriate notes during the observation to allow you to complete the form afterward.

As soon as practicable following the observations, please prepare your report using the accompanying form. For each section asking for a rating, please clearly indicate your rating for that section based on the criteria listed. You may type additional comments following the rating as you deem appropriate. Also clearly indicate an overall rating.

In each section calling for comments, please feel free to add lines in order to type all of the comments you feel are necessary for a complete evaluation. In the "General Comments" section, please note how the class went in general and whether the students accomplished the goals the instructor had planned for the class. Also record any comments not within the scope of any of the specific areas. If applicable, please note any laboratory protocols and directions.

When you have typed your evaluation, please sign and date it and forward it to Tracy Navas in the School of Business & Economics office. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

## DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION CLASS EVALUATION

Reviewee \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_ Class Visited \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Students Present \_\_\_\_\_ Number Enrolled \_\_\_\_\_

Type of class (circle one):    LD Core        UD Core        Concentration        Other

Topics Discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

Describe teaching styles and methods observed, including visual and “hands-on” techniques observed (e.g., labs and demonstrations) \_\_\_\_\_

### Knowledge of Subject

1. Is the depth and breadth of material covered appropriate to the level of the course and the group of students?
2. Does the instructor incorporate recent developments in the discipline?
3. Does the instructor exhibit mastery of the content?
4. Is the instructor able to present and explain the content clearly?
5. Is the instructor able to solve or otherwise deal with problems raised during the lecture?

Rating:                      Needs work                      Good                      Excellent

### Enthusiasm

1. Does the instructor use facial expressions, posture, or motion to sustain student interest?
2. Does the instructor maintain eye contact with students?
3. Does the instructor demonstrate enthusiasm for the subject?
4. Does the instructor demonstrate enthusiasm for teaching?

Rating:                      Needs work                      Good                      Excellent

### Preparation and Organization

1. Does the instructor provide an overview of the lecture content?
2. Is the sequence of the content covered logically?
3. Does the instructor provide smooth transitions from topic to topic?
4. Did the instructor make distinctions between major and minor points?
5. Did the instructor provide occasional summaries and restatements of important ideas?
6. Did the instructor use clear and simple language and visual aids?
7. Are homework or reading assignments listed in the syllabus or announced hurriedly?

Rating:                      Needs work                      Good                      Excellent

### Clarity and Understandability

1. Can the instructor’s voice be easily heard?
2. Was the instructor’s voice raised or lowered for variety and emphasis?
3. Is the rate of speech appropriate for note taking?
4. Did the instructor engage in any habits that distracted from the presentation?
5. Is board work legible and organized?
6. Are visual aids readable and uncluttered?
7. How would you rate the utility of materials (e.g., handouts) made available to students?

Rating:                      Needs work                      Good                      Excellent

**Sensitivity**

1. Is the instructor able to call on the students by name?
2. Did the instructor's questions match the difficulty level of the material?
3. Does the instructor encourage student questions?
4. Does the instructor recognize and respond to signs of puzzlement, boredom and curiosity?
5. Does the instructor pause after questions to allow students time to think of an answer?
6. Did the instructor, when necessary, ask students to clarify their answers?
7. Was the instructor receptive to student suggestions or viewpoints contrary to his or her own?

**Rating:**                      **Needs work**                      **Good**                      **Excellent**

**Course syllabus**

1. Does the course syllabus follow the master syllabus for that course?
2. How would you evaluate the utility of the documents that clarify course goals and grading policy?
3. Are the course goals clear and appropriate?
4. Is the course grading policy clear and appropriate?

**Rating:**                      **Needs work**                      **Good**                      **Excellent**

**Overall Rating:**                      **Needs work**                      **Good**                      **Excellent**

**General Comments:**

---



---



---

**Course strengths:**

---



---



---

**Course weaknesses:**

---



---



---

**Was there anything that worked especially well or did not work well in the class?**

---



---



---

**Suggestions or strategies for improvement:**

---



---



---

**Reviewer** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ **date**

**Reviewee** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ **date**

*My signature indicates that I have read the above evaluation and understand that a copy will be placed in my Personnel Action File.*

N/A - Not Applicable

N/O - Not Observed