

Kean University

Tenure and Promotion Guidelines for Professorial Rank Faculty: Department Expectations for Scholarship, Teaching and Service Department of Management College of Business and Public Management

Table of Contents

PURPOSE.....	1
APPLIES TO.....	1
CAMPUS.....	1
ORIGINS OF THESE CRITERIA.....	1
MISSION OF THE DEPARTMENT.....	1
CONTEXT.....	1
Departmental Expectations for Scholarship.....	2
Tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor.....	2
Tenure and/or promotion to the rank of professor.....	2
Departmental Expectations for Teaching.....	2
Tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor.....	2
Tenure and/or promotion to the rank of professor.....	3
Departmental Expectations for Service.....	3
Tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor.....	3
Tenure and/or promotion to the rank of professor.....	3
DEPARTMENT PROCEDURES.....	3
ARTP Ratings for Performance 3	

Department of Management Expectations for Scholarship

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to present the standards and procedures for tenure and promotion for the Department of Management. The criteria presented in this document applies to the Tenure-Track Faculty within the Department of Management.

Origins of These Criteria

This report has been prepared as a result of the collective insights and recommendations from our faculty in the Management Department regarding the research criteria for tenure and promotion to the position of Associate Professor, and promotion to Professorship. A survey was conducted to gather opinions on various aspects of research output and quality. The responses received from eight faculty members form the basis of the proposed criteria.

In light of the survey results, the Department of Management recommends adopting a holistic and flexible approach to tenure and promotion criteria that emphasizes both quantity and quality of research outputs. While the Department of Management ARTP committee will refer to the criteria proposed to evaluate the quality, significance, and contribution of the faculty's research, the faculty's portfolio will be evaluated in conjunction with their contribution in teaching and service. Our department recognizes that there may be shifts in the emphasis of faculty's activities over the course of their careers.

Expectations of Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

1. Peer-Reviewed Journal (PRJ) Publication Expectations

- **Total Publications by Tenure Candidacy:** The Department of Management recommends 4-5 PRJ publications within the 5-year tenure review period.

2. Quality Assessment of Publications:

- Publications will be assessed for quality based on their ranking in either one (or more) of the following sources:
 - i) ABDC (100% faculty agreement)
 - ii) Scimago (75% faculty agreement)
 - iii) ABS (62.5% faculty agreement)
- **Quality Benchmark:** Department of Management recommends that 1 or 2 of the PRJ publications should be ranked as A in ABDC or Q1 in Scimago, as per 50% of the faculty's suggestion.

3. Authorship Position: The position of authorship on publications is not suggested to be a primary factor in the evaluation, as indicated by 50% of the faculty.

4. Recognition of Diverse Scholarly Contributions

- **Inclusion of Books and Book Chapters:** The Department of Management acknowledges books and book chapters as part of the evaluation criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professorship.
 - i) Two or three book chapters will be considered equivalent to 1 PRJ publication ranked B or C in ABDC depending on the quality of publication.
 - ii) One book will be considered equivalent to 1 PRJ publication ranked B or C in ABDC depending on the quality of publication.
- **Proceedings are Supplementary Indicator:** Department of Management recognizes conference proceedings as an indication of active scholarship, but they will not be included as a formal evaluation criterion.

5. Flexibility and Holistic Assessment: The Department of Management emphasizes that the criteria proposed here are guidelines to allow for growth and flexibility. The overall impact and contribution of the faculty members' research will be considered rather than solely focusing on numerical targets.

Expectations of Scholarship for Promotion to Full Professor

The Department of Management results of the survey we conducted for the research criteria for promotion to full professor show that 75% of our faculty recommends that the evaluation should be aligned with the AACSB criteria for being considered a Scholarly Academic (SA). The responses received from seven faculty members form the basis of the proposed criteria.

Our department's recommendations for the criteria to full professor are as follows:

Faculty members may sustain SA status by having at least two (2) articles published in peer-reviewed journals* within the five (5) year review period.

**Note: Peer-reviewed journals must be listed in at least one of the following sources: Cabell's, ABDC (Australian Business Dean's Council Journal list), AJG aka ABS (Academic Journal Guide - CABS Chartered Association of Business Schools), Scopus, SCIE (Science Citation Index Expanded), SSCI (Social Sciences Citation Index), EBSCO, Ulrich's, or within any of the sources listed on the AACSB Business Education Research Journal Rankings.*

Department of Management Expectations for Teaching and Service

Teaching Expectations

Faculty in the Department of Management are expected to demonstrate a commitment to high-quality instruction and continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness. The following criteria include the university's general guidelines as well as the department's evaluation of teaching.

1. Teaching Workload and Weighting

The Department of Management acknowledges that faculty roles evolve throughout their careers. The workload distribution for tenure and promotion is as follows:

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:

40% Scholarship, 30% Teaching, 30% Service

For promotion to Full Professor:

40% Scholarship, 20% Teaching, 40% Service

This distribution reflects the university's R2 designation, requiring all faculty, regardless of rank, to maintain a significant research agenda while also contributing to teaching and service.

Senior faculty are expected to take on greater mentorship and service-related responsibilities, including mentoring junior faculty, participating in accreditation processes, and contributing to institutional leadership.

2. Teaching Evaluation Criteria

Faculty members must provide a comprehensive dossier illustrating their teaching effectiveness. This dossier consists of required components that all faculty must submit and supplemental components, from which faculty must select at least two to include in their dossier.

Required Components (All Faculty Must Provide)

- Course evaluations and peer observations – These are the standard institutional measures for assessing teaching effectiveness.
- Quality and clarity of course materials – Includes syllabi, assignments, and assessments demonstrating organization, relevance, and alignment with learning objectives.
- Classroom activities, example cases, and instructional materials – Evidence of engaging and effective instructional strategies.
- Participation in peer observations – Faculty must engage in both receiving and conducting peer observations to foster continuous improvement.
- Student advising – Evidence of active engagement in academic advising and student support.

Supplemental Components (Provide At Least Two)

Faculty must select a minimum of two from the following list to further demonstrate teaching effectiveness:

- Evidence of extracurricular work relevant to course content – Examples include faculty-led student competitions, external collaborations, or applied learning experiences.
- New curriculum development – Involvement in designing new courses, revising existing courses, or contributing to programmatic curriculum updates.
- Additional student interviews and surveys conducted during the semester – Provides qualitative insights into student engagement and learning.
- Reciprocal peer observations – Where tenure-track faculty observe tenured faculty annually to enhance instructional development.
- Use of guest speakers and integration of technology – Demonstrates innovation and engagement with contemporary teaching methods.
- Participation in teaching conferences, presentations, or publications on pedagogical research – Demonstrates commitment to professional development and contribution to teaching scholarship.

3. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) and Discipline-Based Educational Research (DBER)

Faculty members are encouraged to conduct research on effective teaching practices within their disciplines. The department recognizes the value of both qualitative and quantitative studies in improving student learning outcomes. Faculty interested in pursuing SoTL or DBER should seek institutional support for research projects, publications, and dissemination of findings to enhance teaching effectiveness.

4. External Reviews for Teaching

External reviews should align with the department's teaching evaluation criteria, ensuring consistency with internal assessments. Reviewers should evaluate faculty based on core teaching competencies, pedagogical contributions, and student engagement, referencing faculty dossiers for evidence.

External reviews should provide formative, constructive feedback and may include class observations and student meetings to assess engagement. The goal is to complement internal evaluations, ensuring a holistic and fair assessment of teaching effectiveness.

The review process should include meetings with students and observations of faculty-student interactions beyond traditional lecture settings.

Service Expectations

Service is an essential component of faculty responsibilities and should be recognized in tenure and promotion considerations. The department values service contributions to the department, college, university, and to the profession.

1. Types of Service Contributions

Faculty are expected to engage in service activities that align with their expertise, interests, and career stage. To ensure meaningful contributions while maintaining flexibility, the following minimum expectations apply:

- *For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:* Faculty must engage in an average of at least two service activities per academic year.
- *For promotion to Full Professor:* Faculty must engage in an average of at least three service activities per academic year, reflecting their increased role in mentorship, leadership, and institutional service.

Examples of service contributions include:

- Serving on departmental, college, university and professional committees.
- Supporting student organizations and extracurricular initiatives.
- Student recruitment.
- Organizing events and conferences.
- Taking on leadership roles within the department or professional associations.
- Engaging in community outreach and partnerships.
- Serving as reviewers or editors for academic journals.

- Mentoring junior faculty and contributing to faculty development programs.
- Participating in accreditation assessments and program revisions.
- Unfunded grant proposals may be recognized as service if they: 1) Involve community engagement or interdisciplinary collaboration. 2) Contribute to the development of grant-writing capacity within the department or 3) Enhance the institution's research profile or provides learning opportunities for faculty and students.

2. Documenting Service Contributions

A service dossier should be maintained to document faculty contributions, including:

- A record of committee participation and leadership roles.
- Descriptions of service activities and their impact.
- Artifacts from service-related initiatives (e.g., program reports, event materials).
- Evidence of engagement in professional organizations.

3. Role of External Reviewers in Evaluating Service

External reviewers may assess faculty service, provided they are given clear guidelines and relevant details about faculty contributions.

APPROVED BY:

The Department of Management


APPROVED ON:

Date

**Tenure and Promotion Guidelines for Professorial Rank Faculty:
Department Expectations for Scholarship, Teaching and Service
Department of Management
College of Business and Public Management**

The aforementioned disciplinary expectations detailed have been developed reviewed and approved by the departmental faculty, the College Dean, and the Provost.

NOTE: For candidates for reappointment, the disciplinary standards in effect during a faculty member's first year of employment are used for reappointment and tenure decisions. Candidates for promotion use the disciplinary standards in effect in the year in which they apply for promotion.



Department Chair

1/30/2026

Date

College Dean

Date

Provost

Date

Review and Approval:
Effective Date: September 1, 2026

Policy Review Cycle: Years ending in 0 and 5 or as needed
This document may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the department's tenured and tenure-earning faculty. After an amendment, it must be approved by the Offices of the Dean and Provost.

Change History: