Martin V. Smith School of Business and Economics Personnel Standards
December 2024, revised February 2025

PROGRAM PERSONNEL STANDARDS

APPROVAL FORM

Discipline: Martin V. Smith School of Business & Economics

	08/05/2025	Jessica Lavariega Monforti	08/05/2025
RTP Committee Co-Chair	Date	Provost	Date

CONTENTS

Introduction
A. Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Committee
B. Teaching
C. Scholarly Activities
D. Professional, University, and Community Service
E. Professional Development Plan
F. Portfolio
G. Metrics for Scholarly Activities
H. Metrics for Professional, University, and Community Service

INTRODUCTION

The Martin V. Smith School of Business and Economics (Martin V. Smith School) is committed to achieving excellence in teaching, student learning, scholarship, and University development within a culture of collegiality and collective responsibility. The Martin V. Smith School encourages peer collaboration and review, faculty experimentation and assessment, and continuous evaluation of academic quality. Consistent with the mission of the University, the Martin V. Smith School places a high value on interdisciplinarity and innovation, and recognizes the importance of aligning resources with Program goals.

This document provides guidelines for the Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) process for Martin V. Smith School faculty members. Faculty members, including those serving on Program Personnel Committees should also review the current “University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Policy and Procedures” document and the CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement before beginning the review process, as review by the Program Personnel Committee should include both these standards and University policy. The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the accrediting body for schools of business, defines a participating faculty member as one that “actively and deeply engages in the activities of the school matters beyond direct teaching responsibilities.” Martin V. Smith School tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to be and maintain their status as participating. Scholarly Academic faculty as per the Martin V. Smith School definitions, which are in alignment with AACSB operationalized definitions.

This document shall be revised every five years or earlier at the request of the University President or by two-thirds vote of the Martin V. Smith School full-time tenure-track faculty voting as stated in the MVS Bylaws. This document will go into effect when approved by the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee and the Provost.

A. RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION (RTP) COMMITTEE

1. A program Personnel Committee (PPC) shall be constituted:

A. For the Martin V. Smith School, a Program Personnel Committee (PPC) shall be elected in the first full month of the Fall semester of each year. The PPC shall consist of at least three tenured members of the Martin V. Smith School faculty. The Martin V. Smith School may elect a PPC with three or five members.

B. If it is not possible for a PPC comprised of the tenured Martin V. Smith School faculty to serve the entire Martin V. Smith School faculty in a particular review cycle, tenured faculty members from outside the Martin V. Smith School may serve on the Martin V. Smith School PPC.

C. Members of the Martin V. Smith School PPC(s) shall be elected by a simple majority vote of the full-time, tenure-track Martin V. Smith School faculty as a whole.

D. The program chair shall evaluate faculty separately from the PPC unless they also serve on the PPC, in which case they shall offer their recommendation only through the PPC's recommendation, not separately and individually.

E. In promotion considerations, Martin V. Smith School PPC members shall have a higher rank than those being considered for promotion.

F. This document applies to all Martin V. Smith School faculty members as a whole, with no separate Program Personnel Standards document for individual faculty members.

B. TEACHING

Evaluation of teaching shall include all courses that are taught by the faculty through the University, including assigned Extended University courses. Evaluation of teaching shall prioritize stateside and Academic Year assignments. Faculty shall clearly note which classes were taught stateside and which classes constituted their Academic Year assignments. **Also, many faculty within the Martin V. Smith School do not have the opportunity to teach a variety of classes within their disciplines due to the design of our major and the needs of our students; all levels of review are reminded of this fact and candidates it affects are encouraged to note it in their teaching narratives.**

The AACSB's Teaching Effectiveness and Impact Standard requires faculty to be "current in their discipline and pedagogical methods, including teaching diverse perspectives in an inclusive environment" and to "demonstrate a lifelong learning mindset." Evaluation of Martin V. Smith School faculty members for retention, tenure and/or promotion shall be based on the following criteria:

Required Element

1. Appropriateness of instructional methods and materials demonstrated through course materials, including but not limited to syllabi, representative assignments, projects, and other supplementary materials provided by the candidate, and the candidate's narrative on teaching.

A. Methods are appropriate to the respective course content and objectives.

B. Materials selected are appropriate for the topic and reflect current issues/scholarship in the field.

C. Syllabi include all items required by the University and any subsequent Martin V. Smith School policy.

Required Element
2. Peer Evaluation of Teaching demonstrated by written evaluation by a tenured member of the faculty of CSU Channel Islands.

A. Assess the pedagogical effectiveness of teaching methodology, course materials and classroom presentation, and offer constructive suggestions for improvement as appropriate.

B. Peer evaluations by faculty from within the Martin V. Smith School shall use the teaching evaluation form approved by the Smith School. Please see Appendix 1 for the teaching evaluation form.

C. Peer evaluations by faculty from other disciplines may use either the Martin V. Smith School's form or write a letter of evaluation.

Required Element
3. Demonstrates consistent excellence in teaching, including Student Ratings of Teaching (SRTs).

A. SRTs recognize the candidate's ability to successfully organize, present, and assess the content of the course, to communicate effectively, and to engage students in the concepts and issues under discussion.

B. Candidates should explain any significant deviations in their teaching narrative, particularly for courses with experimental teaching methods and for courses offered for the first time.

C. PPCs must use Student Ratings of Teaching (SRTs) alongside peer evaluations and their own assessment of course materials provided when evaluating the candidate's teaching, remembering that previous research on such evaluations indicates students on average make systematically biased judgments of candidates from particular sex, racial, and ethnic backgrounds.

Required Element
4. Engages in efforts to improve teaching and learning, reflection, and responsive change.[1]

The candidate's narrative and appendices shall show active engagement in the process of becoming a critically reflective teacher, which is a process of continuous improvement. The three components of this element and examples of evidence for each component are defined as:

A. Continual effort to improve teaching and learning described in the teaching narrative, as evidenced by any of the following:
1. Involvement with faculty development opportunities
2. Consultation and/or work with colleagues in formal and/or informal ways to implement methods to increase teaching effectiveness

B. Reflection on teaching that demonstrates faculty efforts to continually improve their courses, as evidenced by:
1. Summary of and personal reflection on SRTs, student responses to teaching, and peer evaluation
2. Description of changes made in response to formal/informal midterm course evaluation
3. Revision of curriculum to ensure the infusion of new or innovative teaching practices, such as effective use of instructional technology, into course content and delivery

C. Responsiveness in teaching that improves student learning opportunities and experiences, as evidenced by:
1. Redesign of course structure and/or revision of assignments in response to assessments and feedback
2. Modification of instructional methods and technologies in response to feedback
3. Use of technologies to enrich student learning
4. Redesign of course structure to meet needs of English language learners and/or students with special needs
5. Incorporation of instructional methods and materials introduced during professional development events

Additional Elements
5. Demonstrates consistent excellence in teaching.

A. Teaching, advising, and/or mentoring awards, success of students in post-graduate endeavors, or other recognition/communication from students.

[1] This section borrows significantly from standard C in the General Personnel Standards.

B. Materials should demonstrate a pattern of persistent improvement or consistent excellence in teaching.

C. If candidates have evidence of high-impact teaching and learning practices that promote student success, they may include those here or in the section on professional service. Whether to treat these activities as teaching or professional service is a discussion candidates should have with their chair and dean before completing their portfolio, and may change from one review cycle to the next depending how the role the candidate takes in those practices changes over time (e.g., implementing a practice as part of an individual class may best be described as teaching, while coordinating the same practice for students across all sections of a course may better be treated as service, depending on what the candidate is doing and how the university treats the activity in their assigned workload).

D. Any factors that may impact students' evaluation of the course and instructor, including but not limited to the perceived academic rigor of the course.

Additional Elements

6. Participation in curriculum development and assessment of student learning may be demonstrated by the creation of new courses; the significant revision of existing courses, including experiential and project-based learning courses, curricula, or Programs; development or utilization of assessment tools; syllabi developed; materials presented to the Curriculum Committee; listings in catalogs.

A. Courses developed show alignment with the Martin V. Smith School and/or the University mission; e.g., the courses take an interdisciplinary, multicultural, service-learning, student-centered, and/or international focus.

B. When appropriate, curriculum utilizes technology and innovative approaches to enhance the effectiveness of course activities and materials to provide different perspectives on the curriculum, and/or to improve communication among course participants.

C. Candidates can also demonstrate teaching impact by sharing their teaching practices in seminars, guest lectures, and workshops (both within and outside the institution); through writing in mainstream and social media outlets; and through writing textbooks.

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for achievement that shows that they have made appropriate progress towards meeting the standards as described above, consistent with their time at rank, shall earn a rating of "On Track to Meet Program Personnel Standards" in Teaching. Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for achievements in Teaching that surpass reasonable expectations for their time at rank shall earn a rating of "On Track to Exceed Program Personnel Standards" in Teaching. Candidates shall build a case in their narrative describing how they meet or exceed standards in Teaching.

Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for achievement across the three elements described above shall earn a rating of “Meets Program Personnel Standards” in Teaching. Faculty who demonstrate and provide evidence for significantly exceeding the standards across the three elements shall earn a rating of “Exceeds Program Personnel Standards" in Teaching. Candidates shall build a case in their narrative describing how they meet or exceed standards in Teaching.

C. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

Per AACSB standards, intellectual contributions (IC) of the faculty are divided into (1) Basic or Discovery Scholarship, (2) Applied or Integration/Application Scholarship, and (3) Teaching and Learning Scholarship. These categories are defined as follows:

- Basic or Discovery Scholarship generates and communicates new knowledge and understanding and/or development of new methods. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the theory, knowledge, and/or practice of business, economics and management.

- Applied or Integration/Application Scholarship synthesizes new understandings or interpretations of knowledge or technology; develops new technologies, processes, tools, or uses; and/or refines, develops, or advances new methods based on existing knowledge. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the practice of business, economics, and management.

- Teaching and Learning Scholarship develops and advances new understandings, insights, and teaching content and methods that impact learning behavior. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the teaching of business, economics, and management.

All faculty are required, when necessary for accreditation purposes, to provide a verifiable record of their scholarly contributions delineated in the above fashion. As such, candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion are strongly encouraged to classify their scholarship in this fashion in their supporting information.

Evaluation of Martin V. Smith School faculty members for retention, tenure and/or promotion shall be based upon the following criteria:

Required Element

1. Engage in an ongoing program of scholarly activity that demonstrates intellectual and professional growth; produce scholarship achievements that contribute to the advancement, application or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary studies; disseminate scholarly work to appropriate publications and audiences. **There are three tracks for satisfying the requirements for scholarship**. Section C.1.C describes faculty who publish in Australian

Business Deans Council (ABDC) journals or section C.1.D describes faculty who publish outside of ABDC journals.

A. Faculty are required to publish scholarly works in refereed journals, peer reviewed books, book chapters, or other peer-reviewed electronic media. They may also present in peer-reviewed research conferences and seminars as part of meeting their requirements for scholarly activity.

B. All Martin V. Smith School candidates for tenure and promotion must, at a minimum, receive a rating of "Meets expectations" in scholarship for the purposes of tenure and promotion.

C. Faculty whose discipline is covered in the Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) journal rankings shall meet expectations based on a point system using that list. Details of the point system can be found in Table 1 under Section G Tables: Metrics for Scholarly Activities. As the list is updated periodically, faculty may use the point allocation for a journal in its highest-ranked year during their time under review.

1. A rating of "Meets expectations" means the total points obtained during the probationary period should be at least 15 points.
2. A rating of "Exceeds expectations" means the total points obtained during the probationary period should be at least 20 points.
3. A rating of "On track to meet expectations" means the total points equals three times the number of probationary years of service. All levels of review are asked to see point G below.
4. A rating of "On track to exceed expectations" means the total points equals four times the number of probationary years of service. All levels of review are asked to see point G below.

D. Faculty whose discipline is not covered by the ABDC journal ranking may choose to be evaluated under part C above, or use one of the following methods of evaluating their scholarship:

1. Provide, as part of their initial Professional Development Plan (and separate from the scholarly activities narrative), a list of journals in their discipline that would meet the various standards of (A*/A/B/C) for the purposes of recognizing their scholarship going forward. The PPC will confer with said faculty and approve the list.
2. Use the University-wide General Personnel Standards (GPS) Scholarly And/or Creative Activities requirements of three peer-reviewed publications (specified as "Tier One" in the GPS) to meet expectations, with additional publications (specified as "Tier One" or "Tier Two" in the GPS) exceeding expectations.

E. Faculty who publish articles or cases outside the ABDC list or their own disciplinary list as described in C.1.D.1 shall provide evidence regarding the quality of the journal and its review process so the PPC may assign their publication(s) an appropriate score. Faculty who publish outside the ABDC list and use the GPS as described in C.1.D.2

shall provide evidence in narratives so PPC can clearly determine whether publication(s) are Tier One or Tier Two.

F. For both tenure and promotion, acceptance by the peer-reviewed publication shall suffice for the purposes of meeting the requirements for scholarly activities.

G. Under the points system laid out in points C- E above, the Martin V. Smith School anticipates that progress to meet or exceed expectations will be nonlinear for many candidates; candidates will often cycle between “on track” and not “on track” during the first four years of review. Thus, all levels of review are reminded to examine and comment upon the candidate’s scholarship in progress as well as their accepted work.

H. Early promotion will require at least 1 paper in A* journal, or at least 2 papers in Type A journals (or their equivalents, for faculty under point D), and total points earned of at least 15. Faculty who publish outside the ABDC list and use the GPS as described in C.1.D.2, early promotion will require at least four Tier One publications.

I. For promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, only published items not considered in the last promotion may be considered.

2. Professional growth shall be measured in terms of consistent progress towards new and ongoing goals, as reflected in the Professional Development Plan (PDP).

Additional Elements
3. Candidates who *meet expectations of scholarly activity* as defined in points C and D above may provide additional evidence of their scholarly activities through the activities outlined below. Each of these points are worth one point towards *exceeding the standard in scholarship*, and combined may not exceed 3 points in total:

A. Non-peer-reviewed book chapters, books, films, videos, or other electronic media.

B. Reports of consulting assignments that contribute to teaching and/or to scholarship.

C. Earning patents or developing computer software.

D. Reports of applied research.

E. Earning grants, commissions, fellowships, prizes, or other scholarship-based awards.

D. PROFESSIONAL, UNIVERSITY, AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Martin V. Smith School faculty, as with all faculty at the University, have a baseline service expectation of 20 percent of their overall workload, as indicated by the assignment of the standard three WTUs for service. Note also that faculty who receive reassigned time for service

duties are expected to perform an amount of service consistent with that reassigned time in addition to the base 20 percent of their overall workload.

1. Faculty members are expected to participate regularly in shared governance through service on Senate Committees and Task Forces and/or University Committees. Appointment to a Committee, Task Force, or Working Group is not sufficient service. It is the candidate's responsibility to indicate their contribution to the work of the committee or task force.

2. Faculty are expected to participate regularly in Martin V. Smith School-related activities, such as serving on the Program Personnel Committee, participating in developing new courses, emphases, or degree Programs (if not used under teaching), serving as academic advisor, or other areas of Martin V. Smith School service.

High-impact teaching and learning practices may also best be described as professional service to the Martin V. Smith School rather than teaching (but not both) (as discussed in B.4.C above). Candidates should discuss how to treat such practices with their chair and dean when preparing their portfolio, and state their selections clearly in their RTP narratives.

3. Faculty are strongly encouraged, but not required to participate in service to the community beyond the University, such as:

A. Giving public talks, presentations, readings, or performances.

B. Serving as members or in leadership capacities on Boards of Directors of community groups or not-for-profit organizations, both local and global.

C. Serving as an external peer reviewer for promotion and tenure, for doctoral committees, for other programs/schools reviews, and for grant proposals.

D. Performing editorial assignments for academic journals, newsletters, and electronic media.

E. Editing or reviewing cases, chapters or course materials for textbooks or other pedagogical publications.

F. Serving in significant leadership roles in professional organizations.

G. Serving as mentors or judges for external organizations and/or competitions.

4. The quality of a faculty member’s service can be demonstrated through leadership and/or participation roles, the degree of initiation and/or consistency of the commitment to a task or tasks, impact of the service on the University and/or other constituencies, positive feedback from colleagues and others, and tangible products, results, or concrete accomplishments from the service provided. We encourage candidates to address any issues of cultural taxation and

identity taxation that have impacted their professional growth and accomplishments in the area of Service.

A. All Martin V. Smith School candidates for tenure and promotion must at a minimum receive a rating of "Meets expectations" in service based on a point system detailed in Table 2 in section Metrics for Professional, University, and Community Service. The point system baseline was determined by discussions with faculty of MVS. Individual faculty members may provide evidence of actual workload as we recognize that the workload may vary from year to year.
The PPC shall amend Tables 2 and 3 to include service activities not already contained therein when such activities arise or when candidates bring said activities to the attention of the PPC.

1. A rating of "Meets expectations" means the total points obtained during the probationary period should be at least 15 points.
2. A rating of "Exceeds expectations" means the total points obtained during the probationary period should be at least 20 points.
3. A rating of "On track to meet expectations" means the total points equals three times the number of probationary years of service. All levels of review are asked to see point G below.
4. A rating of "On track to exceed expectations" means the total points equals four times the number of probationary years of service.

B. Faculty members performing service may encounter particularly challenging service assignments or perform particularly well. Upon completing the service, faculty members may petition the PPC for a higher point total for a particular activity. The PPC, in consultation with the Martin V. Smith School department chairs and Dean, may increase individual points awarded by up to 2 points for an activity based upon the *ex-post* workload of the activity or the meritorious actions of the faculty member. The PPC shall document their decision in writing to the faculty member and to the Dean.

C. As noted in the General Personnel Standards, reviewers at all levels shall take into account the need for assistant professors to prioritize their teaching and scholarly activities during their probationary years. Therefore, while assistant professors are welcome to take on University-level service roles, the Martin V. Smith School respects and values assistant professors' choice to focus their service contributions in support of their department and the Martin V. Smith School.

E. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

1. A Professional Development Plan (PDP) is the faculty member's agenda for achieving the professional growth necessary to qualify for retention, tenure and promotion.

2. The initial PDP shall normally be prepared, reviewed, and approved (by the MVS School PPC and the lead administrator for the Martin V. Smith School) by the end of the faculty member's

first year of appointment. The CSUCI policy PDP requirements can be found in Section H of Senate policy 22-11.

3. The PDP shall describe the activities and intended outcomes the faculty member expects to achieve during the evaluation period.

4. PDP narratives shall not exceed 500 words (in each area) for teaching, scholarly activities and service. As noted in Scholarly Activities Section C.1.C and D above, faculty choose either ABDC journal list, their own journal list approved by the PPC, or the GPS of the University for assessment of scholarly publications. The faculty's choice should be included in the PDP scholarly activities narrative.

5. These narratives shall describe the faculty member's

A. Professional goals.
B. Areas of interest.
C. Resources required.
D. Expected accomplishments in the three evaluation areas to meet the Program Personnel Standards for retention and tenure.

6. The PDP will be reviewed by the PPC and the lead administrator for the Martin V. Smith School, each of whom will provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the Division of Academic Affairs but prior to the end of the faculty member's first full year of service.

7. In the event the PPC or the lead administrator for the Martin V. Smith School does not approve the PDP, the faculty member shall revise it and resubmit it within two weeks.

F. PORTFOLIO

1. The preparation of the Portfolio is the sole responsibility of the faculty member. The faculty member should be sure that the Portfolio is current and complete before submission to the PPC. Evaluations, recommendations, and rebuttals, if any, are added at the various levels of review. The portfolio must meet the requirements set out in the RTP policy.

2. If material documenting a substantial change in the status of an activity contained in the Portfolio becomes available after the Portfolio is declared complete, this new material may be added with permission from the University RTP Committee.

3. When weaknesses have been identified in earlier review cycles, the faculty member must address these weaknesses explicitly and show appropriate improvement.

G. TABLES

Table 1: Metrics for Scholarly Activities[1]

Scholarship Activities Type	Scholarship Activity/Output	Points per item
Peer-Reviewed Research Authorship	Published Peer-Reviewed Article (ABDC Ranking: A, B, C)	A= 6 points; B=5 points; C=4 points
	Additional points awarded if article is published in A* journals (ABDC Ranking)	3 points
	Additional points awarded if article is "interdisciplinary"	1 point
	Additional points awarded if article involves CI student co-author(s)	1 point
Peer-Reviewed Book Authorship	Published Peer-Reviewed[2] Scholarly Book by A+ Ranked University Publisher (APSR)[3]	9 points
	Published Peer-Reviewed Scholarly Book by A Ranked Academic Publisher (APSR)	7.5 points
	Published Peer-Reviewed Book Chapter	4 points
	Published non Peer-Reviewed Book Chapter	3 points
Research Conferences, Research Seminars, and Presentations (total not to exceed 4 points)	**Peer-Reviewed Research Conference Paper[4]**	**2.5 points**
	Oral (Podium) Presentation at Peer-Reviewed Academic Research Seminar[4]	**1.5 points**

Notes:

1. For faculty receiving any service credit at the time of hire, publication(s) during the service credit earning period should be included in the tally of total scholarly activities.
2. The peer review process for any scholarly book or book chapter should be verified in an official letter from the publisher.
3. "APSR" refers to the American Political Science Rankings of academic publishers. At the creation of this table, there were 10 A+ academic publishers and 37 A ranked academic publishers.
4. Candidates shall provide some measure of conference or seminar acceptance rate for a peer reviewed research conference paper or research seminar to count in the Research Conference, Seminar, and Presentation category.

Table 2: MVS PPS Metric for Service - University level

Service Category	Service Activities	Points (per year of service)
University Level Committee and Taskforce* - Tier 1 (Significant workload; high profile)	Academic Policy & Planning Committee (tenured)	3
	General Education Committee	3
	Faculty Affairs Committee	3
	Senate Budget Committee	3
	Local (MVS) Curriculum Committee	3
	Senate Exec Committee	4
	Academic Senator	3
	URTPC (tenured)	4
	President's Policy and Planning Council	3
	Strategic Resource Planning Committee	3
	Appointments, Elections, and Bylaws	3
	Academic & Admissions Appeals Committee	2
	Instructionally Related Activities (IRA) Committee	2
	Research & Grants Committee	2
	University IRB Committee	2
	Other Tier 1 (as created)	TBD
University Level Committee and Taskforce - Tier 2 (Low to Moderate workload)	Academic Council for International Programs (ACIP)	1
	Administrative Systems Sub-Committee	1
	Affinity Group Executive Committee	1
	Center for Community Engagement Advisory	1

Service Category	Service Activities	Points (per year of service)
University Level Committee and Taskforce - Tier 2 (Low to Moderate workload) (continued)	Center for Social Action Advisory	1
	Center on Global Engagement Advisory	1
	Commencement Committee	1
	Committee on Centers and Institutes	1
	Committee on Equity and Anti Racism	1
	Drug and Alcohol Advisory Committee	1
	Faculty Search Coordinating Committee	1
	Food Service Committee	1
	Materials, Services, Facilities & Technology Committee	1
	Operations (Administrative) Effectiveness Committee	1
	Physical Master Plan Committee	1
	Professional Leave Committee (tenured)	1
	Student Fee Advisory Committee	1
	Transportation Sub-Committee	1
	University Accessibility Committee	1
	University Safety Committee	1
	Veterans Success Advisory Committee	1
	Administrator Evaluation Committee	1

Service Category	Service Activities	Points (per year of service)
University Level Committee and Taskforce - Tier 2 (Low to Moderate workload) (continued)	Faculty Development Advisory Committee	1
	Foundation Board	1
	Statewide Faculty Senate	1
	Student Academic Policies & Procedures	1
	University Art Review Committee	1
	University Police Advisory Council	1
	Other Tier 2 (as created)	TBD
University Level Committee and Taskforce - Ad Hoc (Workload to be determined by Dean, Chair, and faculty together)	Business and Continuity Planning Taskforce	1
	Sustainability Working Group	1
	Other (as created)	TBD

MVS PPS Metric for Service - MVS, Professional, and Community

Service Category	Service Activities	Points (per year of service)
MVS Level Committee, Task Force, and Ad Hoc Projects	Business Program Personnel Committee	2
	Econ Program Personnel Committee	2
	MVS Institutional Work Committee (ad hoc) [e.g., bylaws, major realignment initiative, etc.]	2
	Tenure-Track Disciplinary Search Committee (Chair or Co-Chair)	3
	Tenure-Track Disciplinary Search Committee (member)	2
	MVS Lecturer Peer Evaluation	1
	MVS Lecture Review Committee	2

Service Category	Service Activities	Points (per year of service)
MVS Level Committee, Task Force, and Ad Hoc Projects (continued)	Ongoing advising & mentoring (e.g., MVS Scholar or CI Solutions Mentor, Learning Community Coordinator)	1
	Individual Event Participation (e.g., Major Fair, Admitted Dolphin Day)	0.5
Advisor-Chair-Institute Director	Chair Business	5
	Chair Econ (also advisor)	3
	Faculty Advisor, Business	3
	Director, Institute Global Economic Research	2
	Director, Entrepreneurship & Small Business Institute	2
	Assessment Coordinator	2
	High Workload Leadership Role in an External Professional Organization such as Board Member, Track Chair, etc	3
Professional Services	Reviewer for a Peer-Reviewed Journal/Book	1
	Public Talk or Presentation	1
	Textbook Reviewer	1
	Low to Moderate Workload Leadership Role in an External Professional Organization	1
	Conference Panel Discussant/Moderator	1
	Others	TBD
Community Services	Serving on the Board of Director as a Martin V. Smith School representative in non-for-profit organizations	1
	Others	TBD

Notes:

1. It is recommended that probationary faculty participate in services from at least 3 of the five categories besides Professional and Community Services. Also, it is recommended that probationary faculty in their first two years focus on MVS-level service and only later add University-level service.
2. The combined point total from Professional and Community Services shall not exceed 4 during the probationary period.
3. Candidates who chair a Tier 2 committee receive an extra point per year of chairing.
4. The PPC will track all point determinations for service not explicitly listed above (all TBD categories as well as those not anticipated by this table) and add this determination in written form to the faculty's WPAF and share it with the Dean.

Appendix 1: MVS Peer Review of Teaching Form

Channel Islands CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

California State University | Martin V. Smith SCHOOL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS CHANNEL ISLANDS

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Professor:
Class:

Date:

Day/Time:

Structure and Goals	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	NA
Was fully prepared for class						
Provides an overview of what is planned for the class period						
Effectively organized the class session						
Provides periodic summaries of what has been covered or discussed						
Uses class time efficiently						
Comments:						

Teaching Behaviors	Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Frequently	Consistently	NA
Asks questions that encourage students to think about the subject						
Leaves enough wait time after asking questions for students to think of a response						
Uses eye contact effectively						
Provides clear and comprehensive explanations when required						
Comments:						

Instructor-Student Rapport	Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Frequently	Consistently	NA
Encourages students to ask questions and express their opinions						
Gives clear and understandable response to students' learning						
Is able to involve everyone in class						
Listens carefully to student questions and comments						
Holds student's attention						
Comments:						

Appendix 1: MVS Peer Review of Teaching Form (continued)

Subject Matter and Instruction	Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Frequently	Consistently	NA
Relates topics of the course to each other						
Uses real-life anecdotes and examples to illustrate abstract ideas						
Seems enthusiastic about teaching the material						
Makes effective use of props, visual aids, illustrations and examples						
Demonstrates command of the subject matter						
Comments:						

Overall Comments:

Evaluator: _ Date: __