

Pepperdine Graziadio Business School

Proposed Tenure Guidelines

Introduction

It is noted that unwritten expectations regarding tenure have risen over time at PGBS, and the vast majority of other business schools would report this phenomenon as well. There have been groups of faculty and administrators working on tenure standards and processes since 2021 in recognition of this trend. All departments and disciplines have been represented. We appreciate their efforts. In addition, the Personnel Committee recognizes the inextricable link between resources (including time) and scholarship.

The intention of the proposed tenure guidelines is to:

- Clarify tenure expectations that can be clearly and consistently communicated to new tenure-track faculty upon their hire.
- Add more objective criteria for the Personnel Committee and administration to consider when reviewing tenure packages, with the intention to reduce subjectivity.
- Establish more clearly what it means to be a tenured faculty member at PGBS, both to the Pepperdine community and other stakeholders.
- Ensure consistency and alignment with the annual faculty evaluation process.

The Personnel Committee is cognizant that any changes to the tenure process and criteria should be incremental and clearly communicated, to be fair to individuals already on the tenure track. In addition, consideration should be given to a reasonable timeline for the implementation of any approved changes which will be included in the Faculty Handbook and voted on for approval by tenured faculty. If approved, these guidelines would apply to tenure track faculty hired after the date of approval.

Guidelines related to Teaching

Pepperdine has a history of teaching excellence. Successful candidates are expected to contribute to that tradition, linking to the university and PGBS missions. As a benchmark for effective teaching, successful tenure candidates should achieve an overall teaching effectiveness score on the student course evaluations that would be judged as performance at or above expectations as defined in the annual faculty evaluation for tenure-track faculty. The score should exclude any outliers, and be averaged over at least the last 3 years prior to applying for tenure.

A good teacher embodies several essential standards that contribute to effective teaching and student learning. These standards include (and are required in the current candidate's tenure data sheet provided by the university):

Mastery of Subject Matter: A good teacher demonstrates a deep understanding of the material they teach. They are well-versed in the theories, techniques, and concepts relevant to their field.

Effective Teaching Practices: Good teaching involves engaging instructional methods, clear communication, and adaptability. Teachers strive to provide meaningful and timely feedback to students and create an inclusive and dynamic learning environment.

Continuous Learning: Good teachers stay informed about new developments in their specialty area including their business application. They actively seek out professional development opportunities and stay abreast of advancements in education and technology.

Integration Across Curriculum: Good teachers aim to connect different subjects and weave interdisciplinary threads. They help students see the interconnectedness of business disciplines.

Technology Integration: Good teachers leverage technology appropriately and are effective in teaching across modalities (in-person and virtual). They make effective use of digital tools to enhance student learning, promote collaboration, and facilitate communication.

Student-Centered Approach: Good teachers prioritize student well-being and growth. They provide guidance, encouragement, and support, fostering a positive learning experience.

Evaluation and Reflection: Regular self-assessment is crucial. Good teachers review student evaluations, peer feedback, syllabi, grade distributions, and examination results to improve their teaching practices.

Contributions to Learning: Beyond the classroom, good teachers contribute by developing new courses, designing instructional materials, and mentoring students.

The overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness should include a review of all material that gives an indication of teaching performance. This includes but is not limited to student evaluations, peer teaching evaluations, syllabi, grade distributions, and assessment tools.

Guidelines related to Scholarly Achievement

Assessment of scholarly contributions is based primarily on tenure candidate publications in peer-reviewed journals (PRJ's). The ability to articulate a coherent research plan that has relevance to teaching and business practice and links to the PGBS and University mission is one of the essential attributes of thought leadership. Books, book chapters, and conference proceedings are not the primary focus of tenure decisions. As part of building a thematic research identity, faculty are encouraged to pursue these types of publications at later stages of their careers.

Quality Guidelines for PRJ's

No single PRJ quality guideline or measurement is universally accepted. Given its comprehensive scope, along with its reputation among peer business schools, the Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) list will serve as our primary guide to overall PRJ quality for tenure consideration. The 2022 ABDC list endorses 2,680 journals across many business disciplines with the following quality classifications:

- A* 7.41% (199)
- A 24.4% (653)
- B 31.9% (855)
- C 36.3% (973)

Although it is multidisciplinary in scope, it is recognized that the coverage of journals within the ABDC journal quality list is not universal across disciplines. Should a discipline or department wish to add journals to this list (or challenge the quality rating of journals on this list), the department would establish the case for the journal quality. Such evidence could include journal impact factors, verified acceptance rates, affirmation by external (to Pepperdine) experts, evidence of citations to the journal, how it addresses AACSB impact factors, and if it is included in other credible journal ratings lists. This process would occur by the end of the spring term, as frequently as once a year. At least 60% of the tenured faculty in the department, along with the department chair, would need to support the inclusion of a journal in this supplemental list or to change the quality rating of ABDC journals. The department chair would notify the Personnel Committee of the journal(s) to be added and its equivalent ABDC rating (A*, A, B, or C), or any changes of quality rankings for ABDC journals.

Quantity Guidelines for publications in PRJ's

The minimum expectation for any tenure candidate is that they are currently qualified as a Scholarly Academic in accordance with the current PGBS accreditation standards. Further, the tenure candidate must provide evidence that they will continue to be qualified as a Scholarly Academic for the foreseeable future. Such evidence includes a strong pipeline of work-in-progress that will lead to potential future publications in peer-reviewed journals.

Successful tenure candidates are expected to have at least one article in what is considered a high-quality journal, rated as either A or A* by ABDC, or noted as equivalent in the department's supplemental list. Well-positioned candidates publish annually (on average) in journals on the approved list. The Personnel Committee will also consider the amount of time it takes to publish in the journal, the rigor of the journal's reviewing process, and the impact of the journal in assessing the quantity of journal publications. Fewer high-quality publications may be equivalent, or superior, to more publications in lower-tier journals. Candidates are encouraged to engage in timely and frequent conversations with their department chairs to understand how to best position themselves to achieve tenure.

In addition to the PRJ that an article is published in, additional evidence of article quality and impact, including the number of citations received from other researchers and/or the number of

media mentions, will be considered. The Personnel Committee recognizes that the number of citations is greatly affected by time since publication.

Guidelines related to Professional, University, and Community Service

Faculty applying for tenure need to demonstrate service contributions to the profession, the university, and the community. This can be demonstrated by satisfactorily serving on at least one committee per year at the school or university level, being considered a good colleague, and being active in at least one professional organization by participating in conferences and/or serving as a reviewer for manuscripts. In addition, community service is demonstrated by participation in religious, community, or other nonprofit organizations.

External Reviewers

In addition to the normally required internal peer reviewers, tenure candidates will require two external reviewers, with input from the candidate on potential reviewers that should be provided at the beginning of their 4th year (or the penultimate year before coming up for tenure, if the candidate has a shortened clock). Conflict of interest must be avoided in the selection of reviewers; external reviewers cannot be a co-author with the candidate. The final selection of external reviewers will be jointly decided by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the Department Chair. The invitation to be an external reviewer will be sent from the Dean's office. External reviewers may comment on various aspects of a tenure package but will be asked specifically to evaluate the quality of the candidate's body of work in regards to scholarly achievement.

As part of their third-year review, tenure-track candidates should begin to articulate a coherent program of research that reflects the candidate's independent thought leadership on a topic or theme that is relevant to their discipline and the business community. This articulation should further develop as the candidate moves to the tenure application stage. This statement should provide guidance for identifying external reviewers.

Guidelines for the Third Year Review

Purpose

The Third Year Review serves as an essential assessment of a tenure-track candidate's progress toward obtaining tenure. The process for the Third Year Review is described in the PGBS Faculty Handbook as part of the PGBS Tenure Process. Using the Department Chair's review as input, the Personnel Committee provides feedback on the candidate's performance across teaching, scholarship, and service. The outcome helps determine whether the faculty member should be reappointed. It's important to note that reappointment does not guarantee a favorable tenure decision later. If the decision is not to reappoint, the year following the review becomes the terminal period of employment.

Submission Procedure, Evaluation Areas, and Process

The procedures for the Third Year Review align with those for tenure, with the following exceptions:

Faculty Data Form: In addition to standard information, the candidate expresses their goals for the next three years.

Peer and Supervisor Evaluation Forms: These forms include a summary section where reviewers outline the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, offering suggestions for improvement.

Recommendation

Upon reviewing all submitted materials, the Personnel Committee prepares an evaluative report. This report includes a recommendation regarding reappointment and is shared with the faculty member, their department chair, the associate dean for academic affairs, and the dean.

Revised: November 8, 2024