

Adopted May, 2006

**Accounting Program
Annual Evaluation Process
(For Tenured Professors)**

General Purpose

The University recognizes three areas of professional contribution: teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service (III.E.2.b, p. 35). The procedures and criteria described in this document describe the annual evaluation process in the School of Accounting **for tenured professors (untenured, tenure-track faculty annual evaluations are governed by the Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures document)**. The annual evaluation process is used in making personnel decisions, including allocation of merit pay, continuation of employment, and initiation of post-tenure review (III.E, p. 33).

Renewable Term Agreement Faculty

Until such time as the College of Business and the University establish annual evaluation guidelines for Renewable Term Agreements (RTA) faculty, the Director of the School of Accounting will develop and communicate to RTA faculty the basis for their annual evaluation.

Relation to Promotion and Tenure Process

The annual evaluation process is separate from the promotion and tenure evaluation process. A succession of satisfactory or exceptional annual evaluations in teaching, scholarship or service is not conclusive evidence that the faculty member's work is satisfactory or exceptional for purposes of tenure or promotion. The process and criteria for tenure and promotion are presented in a separate document (III.E.1.f, p. 34).

Process

The academic unit head evaluates each faculty member on an annual basis. No later than the start of an academic year, each faculty member and his/her academic unit head shall agree on a personal set of relative weights to be applied to the three performance areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service for the evaluation process. This agreement may be amended by mutual consent during the academic year (III.J.2.d.1, p. 61).

Policies and Procedures

The following policies and procedures apply to the annual evaluation (III.E.4, p. 37):

Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan

Faculty members shall submit a description of anticipated activities for the coming year to the academic unit head. The relative weights of the three performance areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service for an individual faculty member shall be determined by the faculty member and the academic unit head prior to the start of the academic year. The agreement on weights may be renegotiated during the year.

Summary of Activities

At the conclusion of the academic year, the faculty member shall submit a summary of activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service to the academic unit head for review and evaluation purposes.

Preliminary Evaluation

A preliminary written evaluation is to be given to each faculty member by the academic unit head prior to an evaluation conference. The preliminary evaluation shall be given to the faculty member at least one day prior to the conference.

Conference

The evaluation conference must provide an opportunity to discuss the faculty member's performance, professional contributions and needs as perceived by both the faculty member and academic unit head.

Post-Conference Activity

The official written evaluation shall not be made until after the evaluation conference. The academic unit head shall provide the official written evaluation to the faculty member by October 1. Further processes, such as an appeals process, are described starting at Page 37 of the Faculty Handbook.

Method of Academic Unit Allocation

The allocation of merit pay adjustments to individual faculty member salaries will be based on the annual evaluation ratings awarded to the faculty member in each of the three performance areas (i.e., teaching, scholarly achievement and service) after taking into account the relative weights applied to the three areas (III.J.2.d.) See Exhibit 1 for an

example of a weighting process. In accordance with Section III.E.1.b of the Faculty Handbook, procedures “shall be applied equally to all similarly situated faculty members in the academic unit.” The academic unit head shall group faculty into merit pay pools. Faculty with similar evaluation ratings will be placed in the same merit pay pool. The academic unit head shall allocate substantially identical percentage adjustments to each member of the merit pay pool.

Criteria

The following criteria will be used to evaluate the three areas of contribution:

1. Teaching

Teaching is a multifaceted activity that includes course design and delivery, curriculum development, and interaction with students. Therefore, the evaluation process should be characterized by multiple sources of information and a broad view of the activities that constitute effective teaching.

There are many paths to the achievement of exceptional performance in teaching. None of these indicators is either necessary or sufficient evidence of exceptional teaching performance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member being evaluated to provide information that documents and demonstrates his/her exceptional teaching.

Satisfactory Teaching: Satisfactory teaching is defined as effectively performing the following activities:

Learning/value added

- Providing instruction at a rigorous and challenging level.
- Stimulating learning and interest in the subject matter.

Organization

- Being well prepared for class.
- Informing students of course objectives, assignments, and examination procedures.
- Conducting the class in a well-organized manner.
- Communicating the subject matter clearly.

Interaction with students

- Maintaining scheduled office hours.
- Treating students with courtesy and respect.
- Providing career advising to students.

Evaluation

- Maintaining fair and impartial grading standards.
- Providing timely feedback on progress.

Curriculum and course content

- Staying current with the subject matter.
- Participating in program activities to assess and update the curriculum.

These activities are considered essential to good teaching, and thus are necessary for a rating of satisfactory in the area of teaching.

Exceptional Teaching: For an exceptional rating in teaching, *the* criteria for satisfactory teaching performance **must be fulfilled** in an exemplary manner. In

addition, evidence of a strong, sustained commitment to teaching is expected. Additional examples of possible indicators of exceptional teaching include:

- Publication of widely-adopted and/or acclaimed instructional materials.
- Development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials.
- Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses.
- Teaching awards.
- Outstanding student evaluations.
- Outstanding teaching in the MSA program and satisfying the AACSB graduate-qualified criteria.
- **Supervision of independent studies/honor theses could also be an indicator.**

There are many paths to the achievement of an exceptional rating in teaching. None of these indicators, in and of themselves, is either necessary or sufficient evidence of exceptional teaching performance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide information that demonstrates his/her exceptional teaching.

2. Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

A fundamental consideration in the annual evaluation of a faculty member is the determination of whether the faculty member has engaged in a standard of behavior that is judged to be a satisfactory effort to sustain the program's mission of accreditation with AACSB. Accreditation requires that each faculty maintain a certain level of scholarly qualification (academic or professional) that is a function of the faculty member's degree status and teaching responsibility.

Satisfactory performance - Semester Teaching Schedule

Less than or equal to **9 hours**/semester

- Remain Academically Qualified

More than **9 hours**/semester

- Remain Professionally Qualified

and evidence of research process activity, such as working paper draft, participation in local/regional conference; submissions for publication at least once every three years

Excellent performance - Semester Teaching Schedule

Less than or equal to **9 hours**/semester

- A minimum of two peer-reviewed publications from the program's **A or B** list every three years, plus evidence of on-going inputs to the research process

More than 9 hours/semester

- A minimum of one peer-reviewed publication every three years

See Attachment 1 for a list of A, B, and C scholarly activity.

3. Professional Service Activities

Levels of service (1, 2, and 3) have been previously defined in the promotion and tenure criteria document.

A standard of satisfactory performance in service is defined as professionally, effectively, and reliably assuming one's fair share of the tasks required to support the operation of a large university and a reasonably steady stream of service activity consisting of a) one level 1 activity plus a representative mixture of level 3 activities or b) three level 2 activities plus a representative mixture of level 3 activities. At least one of the level 2 activities must be service that is internal to the university. Service that is external to the university is not required. Service that is compensated should be partially or fully discounted.

Exceptional performance is achieved by performing significantly more than one's fair share of the tasks required, defined as a reasonable steady stream of service activity consisting of a) one level 1 activity plus two level 2 activities plus a representative mixture of level 3 activities, or b) five level 2 activities plus a representative mixture of level 3 activities. At least two of these activities must be service that is internal to the university. Service that is external to the university is not required. Service that is compensated should be partially or fully discounted.

Service Criteria (as presented in P&T Document)

Definition of Level 3 Service: Level 3 service is defined as participation in program, college, and university events for which faculty visibility is important. Generally, such participation does not require additional efforts either before or afterwards.

Examples of Level 3 service include:

- having lunch with potential employers of COB students or freshmen parents
- attending graduation ceremonies, COB Parent's Day Open House, COB awards ceremonies, program meetings or program seminars
- participating in faculty recruiting (meeting with candidates, attending candidate seminars)

Definition of Level 2 Service: Level 2 service is defined as important activities in support of one's program, the college, the university, or the profession that involve a moderate to significant time commitment. It is anticipated that the bulk of one's service activities will fall into this category.

Examples of Level 2 service activities include:

- member of program, college, or university committees, or Faculty Senate
- proceedings editor for a regional conference, book review editor for a journal or program/track chair for a regional conference
- active participation in curriculum development
- participation in university-sponsored programs, such as the minority mentor program and athletic recruiting

Definition of Level 1 Service: Level 1 service is defined primarily as activities that involve a very significant time commitment. Secondary indicators of Level 1 service are 1) a high level of personal responsibility; 2) involvement in activities that are critical to the mission of the program, college, university, or professional organization; 3) distinguishing oneself in a leadership role, whether elected or appointed; 4) serving, with distinction, one's profession and/or the external community in a role that exploits one's professional knowledge, skills, and talents; 5) "making a difference" in those areas in which one has chosen to serve; and 6) being widely recognized as one who has an exemplary attitude towards service commitments and who serves as a role model for other faculty. Level 1 service should not be interpreted as requiring the presence of each and every secondary indicator of exceptional performance. In particular, Level 1 service does not require a leadership role (e.g., chair of a major committee). However, in all cases there should be evidence of a substantial contribution and an active role.

Examples of Level 1 service include:

- chair of an important recruiting committee
- major responsibility for significant curriculum reform
- Speaker of Faculty Senate
- Chair of AACSB or SACS re-accreditation efforts or other important university committee
- faculty advisor to an active, successful student organization
- high level office in a prestigious regional or national organization involving a significant time commitment

**EXHIBIT 1. AN EXAMPLE OF A WEIGHTING PROCESS FOR
ACADEMIC UNIT ALLOCATION**

**Step 1. Allocate points to each of the three performance areas:
Teaching, Scholarly Achievement*, and Professional Service.**

Performance Area	Points
Rating	Allocated
Excellent	3
Satisfactory	2
Unsatisfactory	1

Step 2. Weight.

Sample Ratings	Exc	Exc	Exc	Overall
Rating Points	3	3	3	
	Note: Weights do not impact overall rating when all areas are excellent.			3

	Exc	Sat	Exc	Overall	Exc	Sat	Sat	Overall
Rating Points	3	2	3		3	2	2	
Weighting %	0.5	0.3	0.2		0.5	0.3	0.2	
Weighted Points	1.5	0.6	0.6	2.7	1.5	0.6	0.4	2.5
Weighting %	0.5	0.2	0.3		0.5	0.2	0.3	
Weighted Points	1.5	0.4	0.9	2.8	1.5	0.4	0.6	2.5

Step 3. Assign faculty members to merit pools.

The values generated in the spreadsheet will be used by the Academic Unit Head to place individual faculty into merit pools.

*In the area of Scholarly Achievement, a three-year rolling average is used.

ATTACHMENT 1
SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTING
PUBLICATION CATEGORIES
Revised: October 2006, November 2008

Category A Publications

1. The overriding criteria for placing a publication in this category are whether the article
 - a. Adds significant new knowledge to the existing body of knowledge to which it relates;
 - b. Brings significant prestige to the School of Accounting and/or College of Business;
 - c. Is published in a prestigious, refereed journal

The greater the extent to which a publication meets all three of the above criteria, the greater is the evidence that it should be classified as Category A. In the absence of contrary evidence (provided by the author, PAC members or others), it will be assumed that articles appearing in the following journals will be considered Category A publications.

Accounting Horizons
Accounting, Organizations and Society
Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory
Behavioral Research in Accounting
Contemporary Accounting Research
Issues in Accounting Education (Scholarly articles)
Journal of Accounting and Economics
Journal of Accounting Research
Journal of Accounting Auditing and Finance
Journal of the American Taxation Association
Journal of Business Finance and Accounting
Journal of Information Systems
Journal of Management Accounting Research
National Tax Journal
Review of Accounting Studies
The Accounting Review

2. In addition to publications in journals in the above list, a publication in a prestigious refereed journal may be considered a Category A publication. Prestigious journals include those that are
 - a. Ranked highly by objective outside observers (such as business school rankings lists),
 - b. Consistently ranked highly by national surveys of accounting and other business faculty; and/or
 - c. Very selective.

We recognize that those journals used by the Financial Times to compile their list of top business schools are of excellent quality and are incorporated by reference.

3. If a very strong case is provided, a publication in a highly regarded journal (not listed above) or a research monograph may be considered a Category A level publication. Evidence may include:
 - a. The work is widely cited or has been cited by leading authorities in the field;
 - b. The work was supported by a major grant;
 - c. The work received a national award;
 - d. The work significantly impacted policy of accounting regulators or professional bodies.
4. One Category A publication is the equivalent of two Category B publications.

Category B Publications

1. The overriding criteria for placing an item in this category are whether it
 - a. Adds something new to, or disseminates something from, the existing body of knowledge in the area to which it relates;
 - b. Brings prestige to the JMU Accounting Program and/or College of Business;
 - c. Is published in a well-regarded peer-reviewed journal.

The greater the extent to which a publication meets all three of the above criteria, the greater is the evidence that it should be classified as Category B. In the absence of contrary evidence (by the author, PAC members or others), it will be assumed that articles appearing in the following journals will be considered as Category B publications:

Abacus

Accounting & Business Research

Accounting and Finance

Accounting Business and Financial History

Accounting Education: An International Journal

Accounting Educators' Journal

Accounting Historian's Journal

Accounting and the Public Interest

Accounting, Auditing and Accountability

Advances in Accounting

Advances in Accounting Information Systems

Advances in Behavioral Research in Accounting

Advances in International Accounting

Advances in Management Accounting

Advances in Public Interest Accounting

Advances in Taxation

AIS Educator Journal

Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory

Australian Accounting Review

Behavioral Research in Accounting

British Accounting Review

CA Magazine

Cost Management

CPA Journal

Critical Perspectives in Accounting

Current Issues in Auditing

Financial Accountability and Management

Financial Analysts Journal

Financial Executive

Fraud Magazine

Government Finance Review

Internal Auditing

Internal Auditor

International Journal of Accounting

International Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Performance Evaluation

International Journal of Intelligent Systems in Accounting, Finance, and Management

Issues in Accounting Education (Cases and Instructional Materials)

Journal of Accountancy

Journal of Accounting and Public Policy

Journal of Accounting Education

Journal of Accounting Literature

Journal of American Taxation Association
 Journal of Applied Business Research
 Journal of Business Disciplines
 Journal of Cost Analysis
 Journal of Emerging Technologies in Accounting
 Journal of Forensic Accounting
 Journal of Information Systems
 Journal of International Accounting Research
 Journal of International Accounting, Auditing, and Taxation
 Journal of International Financial Management and Accounting
 Journal of Legal Tax Research
 Journal of Management Accounting Research
 Journal of Small Business Management and Entrepreneurship
 Journal of Taxation
 Journal of Teaching in International Business
 Management Accounting Quarterly
 Management Accounting Research
 Practical Tax Strategies
 Research in Accounting Regulation
 Research in Government and Nonprofit Accounting
 Research on Professional Responsibility and Ethics in Accounting
 Review of Business Information Systems
 Southern Business and Economic Journal
 Strategic Finance
 Tax Adviser
 Tax Notes
 Taxes - The Tax Magazine

2. In addition to publications in journals in the above list, a publication in a well-regarded, peer-reviewed journal may be considered a Category B publication. Well-regarded peer-reviewed journals are
 - a. Consistently ranked moderately high to high by surveys of accounting faculty;
 - b. Selective and/or highly circulating;
 - c. Published by well-respected institutions.

The greater the extent to which a journal meets all three of the above criteria, the greater is the evidence that the publication should be classified as Category B.

3. If a strong case is provided by the author, a publication may be considered a Category B level publication. Evidence may include:
 - a. The work is cited or has been cited by leading authorities in the field;
 - b. The work was supported by a grant;
 - c. The work received an award;
 - d. The work has impacted the accounting regulators or professional bodies.
4. "Category B equivalency items" do not meet the definition of the B category outright, but are allowed in limited numbers as substitutions. Such items may include:
 - a. Co-editorship of a peer-reviewed anthology or other peer reviewed work published by a nationally or internationally recognized publisher
 - b. Peer-reviewed monographs or chapters in books published by a nationally or internationally recognized publisher
 - c. Presentations included at a selective, peer-reviewed national level conference where the content is written in manuscript format and publicly distributed (such as in a proceedings), assuming the content adheres to criteria for Category B publications
 - d. Three "C" Publications.
 - e. Obtaining a professional certification (such as CPA, CMA, etc.) with prior approval by the School of Accounting PAC.

5. Consistent with the mission of the JMU COB and School of Accounting, if a case is provided by the author that an item of instructional development makes a significant contribution to accounting education, the item may be considered a “Category B equivalency item.” Evidence may include:
 - a. The teaching materials/case/method is used at several universities
 - b. The article/monograph is cited in major text books
 - c. The article/monograph is assigned reading at several universities.

Category C Publications

1. The overriding criterion for placing an item in this category is that it involves scholarly effort. The publication should bring recognition to JMU’s Accounting Program and the College of Business. A few examples of journals that historically have published “C”-level articles include:

Accounting Today
Datamation
New Accountant
Practical Accountant

2. Three Category C publications substitute for a “Category B equivalency item,” not a Category B publication.

Other Guidance

1. Simply because a journal is not listed in a category’s representative list does not mean a particular article cannot be counted in that category. Articles published in journals not listed in one of the above representative lists will be considered on a case by case basis by the Promotion Action Committee by applying criteria for each category. Candidates should play an active role in providing information for this decision.
2. The representative lists may be revised from time to time to remain current with changing journal standings.
3. In the case of a conflict between information in the guidelines and this supporting document, the guidelines should prevail.
4. Continuous, on-going publication is an important dimension of all promotion decisions.

The School of Accounting annual evaluation document provides for a rating of 1, 2 or 3 in each of the following areas: Teaching, Intellectual Contribution, and Service. The scores assigned to each area are multiplied by percentages representing the proportion of faculty time spent in each. These proportions vary between RTA, untenured assistant professor, tenured faculty, and faculty on endowed professorship. However, the percentages are uniform within each of these four categories. The resulting product is an overall score.

The annual evaluation document indicates that faculty receiving equivalent scores receive equivalent raises. This is accomplished mathematically by mean adjusting individual overall scores and multiplying this by the average raise (\$ not %) computed from the merit raise pool provided by the Dean's office. This is done separately for RTA and Tenure-track faculty. Adjustments are made to provide rounded amounts but the result is a very high correlation (approximating 1.0) between overall score and raises.

Adopted: May, 2006 (Pub. List revised Nov.2008)

**PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES
SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTING
James Madison University**

PART I: PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES

A. Responsibilities of the Candidate

Each member of the faculty is expected to contribute to the achievement of the School of Accounting's mission through his or her teaching and academic advising; research and/or scholarly achievement; and service. Faculty who are candidates for promotion and/or tenure are expected to submit a summary of activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service to the School of Accounting Director and PAC Chairman by October 1.

B. Responsibilities of the School of Accounting Director and PAC

The Program Director and PAC shall make independent evaluations of the facts and make independent recommendations for promotion and/or tenure based on the criteria outlined in this document. The written recommendations of the Program Director and PAC shall include a justification of their conclusions. The recommendations shall be submitted to the COB Dean by November 15 and a copy of both recommendations shall concurrently be provided to the faculty member.

PART II: PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA

A. Overview

The James Madison University Faculty Handbook states that promotion to Associate Professor requires that a candidate's performance be evaluated as exceptional in at least one of the three functional areas (i.e., teaching, research, and service) and at least satisfactory in the other two areas. The Handbook also states that Promotion to Professor requires that a candidate's performance be evaluated as exceptional in at least two of the functional areas and at least satisfactory in the third area.

B. Teaching Criteria

Teaching is a multifaceted activity that includes course design and delivery, curriculum development, and interaction with students. Therefore, the evaluation process should be characterized by multiple sources of information and a broad view of the activities that constitute effective teaching.

Satisfactory Teaching: Satisfactory teaching is defined as effectively performing the following activities:

Learning/value added

- Providing instruction at a rigorous and challenging level.
- Stimulating learning and interest in the subject matter.

Organization

- Being well prepared for class.
- Informing students of course objectives, assignments, and examination procedures.
- Conducting the class in a well-organized manner.
- Communicating the subject matter clearly.

Interaction with students

- Maintaining scheduled office hours.
- Treating students with courtesy and respect.
- Providing career advising to students.

Evaluation

- Maintaining fair and impartial grading standards.
- Providing timely feedback on progress.

Curriculum and course content

- Staying current with the subject matter.
- Participating in program activities to assess and update the curriculum.

These activities are considered essential to good teaching, and thus are necessary for a rating of satisfactory in the area of teaching.

Exceptional Teaching: Fulfillment of the criteria for satisfactory teaching performance in an exemplary manner is required for an exceptional rating in teaching. In addition, evidence of a strong, sustained commitment to teaching is expected. Additional examples of possible indicators of exceptional teaching include:

- Publication of widely-adopted and/or acclaimed instructional materials.
- Development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials.
- Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses.
- Teaching awards.
- Outstanding student evaluations.
- Supervision of Independent Studies/Honor Theses

There are many paths to the achievement of an exceptional rating in teaching. None of these indicators, in and of themselves, is either necessary or sufficient evidence of exceptional teaching performance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide information that documents and demonstrates his/her exceptional teaching.

C. Research and/or Scholarly Activity Criteria

The following paragraphs reflect the broad dimensions of research/scholarly accomplishments and intellectual contributions as defined by the AACSB.

1. “**Discipline-based scholarship** contributions add to the theory or knowledge base of the faculty member’s field. Published research results and theoretical innovation qualify as Discipline-based scholarship contributions.”

Outputs from Discipline-based scholarship activities may include publication in refereed journals, research monographs, scholarly books, chapters in scholarly books, proceedings from scholarly meetings, papers presented at academic meetings, publicly available research working papers, and papers presented at faculty research seminars.

2. “**Contributions to practice** influence professional practice in the faculty member’s field. Articles in practice-oriented journals, creation and delivery of executive education courses, development of discipline-based practice tools, and published reports on consulting all qualify as Contributions to practice.”

Outputs from Contributions to practice activities may include publication in professional journals, public/trade journals, in-house journals, professional presentations, book reviews, and papers presented at faculty workshops.

3. “**Learning and pedagogical research** contributions influence the teaching-learning activities of the school. Preparation of new materials for use in courses, creation of teaching aids, and research on pedagogy all qualify as Learning and pedagogical research contributions.”

Outputs from Learning and pedagogical research activities may include textbooks, publications in pedagogical journals, published cases with instructional materials, instructional software, and publicly available materials describing the design and implementation of new courses.

NOTE: There are additional activities and accomplishments that do not fall neatly into one of the three categories listed above. These include, but are not limited to, research grants, membership on editorial boards, ad hoc reviews, participation as a discussant at professional meetings, professional certification, and other professional awards. In addition, these three areas of contribution are not synonymous with the publications categories designated A or B or B equivalency elsewhere in this document (e.g. it is possible to have a Level B achievement in Discipline-base scholarship, Contributions to practice, or Learning and pedagogical research).

At their discretion, candidates for tenure and/or promotion may submit their scholarly contributions, along with supporting documentation, for review by the academic programs they believe most qualified to judge that contribution. For example, a publication in an interdisciplinary journal may be submitted for evaluation by faculty in

the BBA Core, MBA Program, International Program, or a Program outside of Accounting.

Faculty members advancing from the rank of Associate Professor to Professor will be evaluated on the basis of their research/scholarly accomplishments since their prior promotion to the rank of Associate Professor as well as their overall record of research/scholarly accomplishments.

Satisfactory Research: The *minimum* requirement for a satisfactory evaluation in the area of research/scholarly accomplishments for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or the granting of tenure in the College of Business is the following:

A minimum of four peer-reviewed publications **listing the author (candidate) as a JMU faculty member** from the program's B list plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort.

Each candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or the granting of tenure may substitute one item from the program's B equivalency list for one of the four peer reviewed publications.

Note: Notwithstanding AND IN ADDITION TO the above minimum publication guidelines, each candidate must be AACSB "graduate qualified" to be eligible for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or tenure (candidates must meet both sets of requirements).

The *minimum* requirement for a satisfactory evaluation in the area of research/scholarly accomplishments for promotion to the rank of Professor is the following:

A minimum of seven (i.e., three beyond those required for promotion to Associate Professor) peer-reviewed publications from the program's B list plus evidence of a sustained record of accomplishment while holding the position of Associate Professor and ongoing scholarly effort.

Each candidate seeking promotion to rank of Professor may substitute two items from the program's B equivalency list for two of the seven peer-reviewed publications. In addition, at least two of these peer-reviewed publications must have occurred since the promotion to Associate Professor.

Note: Notwithstanding AND IN ADDITION TO the above minimum publication guidelines, each candidate must be AACSB "graduate qualified" to be eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor (candidates must meet both sets of requirements).

Exceptional Research: The *minimum* requirement for an exceptional evaluation in the area of research/scholarly accomplishments for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or the granting of tenure in the College of Business is the following:

A minimum of six peer-reviewed publications **listing the author (candidate) as a JMU faculty member** from the program's B list plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort.

Each candidate seeking promotion to rank of associate professor and/or tenure may substitute one item from the program's B equivalency list for one of the six peer-reviewed publications.

The *minimum* requirement for an exceptional evaluation in the area of research/scholarly accomplishments for promotion to the rank of Professor is the following:

A minimum of eleven (i.e., five beyond those required for promotion to Associate Professor with an exceptional rating in scholarly achievement) peer-reviewed publications from the program's B list plus evidence of a sustained record of accomplishment while holding the position of Associate Professor and ongoing scholarly effort.

Each candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Professor may substitute two items from the Program's B equivalency list for two of the eleven peer-reviewed publications. In addition, at least four of these peer-reviewed publications must have occurred since promotion to Associate Professor.

None of these requirements, in and of themselves, are evidence of satisfactory or exceptional research. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide information that documents and demonstrates his/her satisfactory or exceptional research.

The School of Accounting's current list of A, B and C publications and equivalency's is attached as Exhibit 1.

D. Service Criteria

Definition of Level 3 Service: Level 3 service is defined as participation in program, college, and university events for which faculty visibility is important.

Examples of Level 3 service include:

- having lunch with potential employers of COB students or freshmen parents
- attending graduation ceremonies, COB Parent's Day Open House, COB awards ceremonies, program meetings or program seminars
- participating in faculty recruiting (meeting with candidates, attending candidate seminars)

Definition of Level 2 Service: Level 2 service is defined as important activities in support of one's program, the college, the university, or the profession that involve a

moderate to significant time commitment. It is anticipated that the bulk of one's service activities will fall into this category.

Examples of Level 2 service activities include:

- contributing member of program, college, or university committees, or Faculty Senate
- proceedings editor for a regional conference, book review editor for a journal or program/track chair for a regional conference
- active participation in curriculum development
- active participation in university-sponsored programs, such as the minority mentor program and athletic recruiting

Definition of Level 1 Service: Level 1 service is defined primarily as activities that involve a very significant time commitment. Secondary indicators of Level 1 service are 1) a high level of personal responsibility; 2) involvement in activities that are critical to the mission of the program, college, university, or professional organization; 3) distinguishing oneself in a leadership role, whether elected or appointed; 4) serving, with distinction, one's profession and/or the external community in a role that exploits one's professional knowledge, skills, and talents; 5) "making a difference" in those areas in which one has chosen to serve; and 6) being widely recognized as one who has an exemplary attitude towards service commitments and who serves as a role model for other faculty. Level 1 service should not be interpreted as requiring the presence of each and every secondary indicator of exceptional performance. In particular, Level 1 service does not require a leadership role (e.g., chair of a major committee). However, in all cases there should be evidence of a substantial contribution and an active role.

Examples of Level 1 service include:

- chair of an important recruiting committee
- major responsibility for significant curriculum reform
- Speaker of Faculty Senate
- Chair of AACSB or SACS re-accreditation efforts or other important university committee
- faculty advisor to an active, successful student organization
- high level office in a prestigious regional or national organization involving a significant time commitment

Satisfactory Service: A necessary, but not sufficient, condition for an evaluation of satisfactory in the area of service is participation in activities that are basic to the responsibilities of a faculty member. These are defined as activities in which faculty members are expected to participate without having been specifically assigned, or designated, to do so. Examples of such service activities include 1) attending Spring commencement exercises; 2) attending program meetings; and 3) participating in peer evaluation of faculty in one's program. Beyond this, there are many, equally acceptable paths to the achievement of a satisfactory evaluation in the area of service. In general,

satisfactory service is defined as professionally, effectively, and reliably assuming one's "fair share" of the tasks required to support the operation of a large university and, where appropriate, contributing to one's profession and/or the external community. A "fair share" is defined as a reasonably steady stream of service activity consisting of A) a yearly average of one Level 1 activity plus a representative mixture of Level 3 activities or B) a yearly average of three Level 2 activities plus a representative mixture of Level 3 activities. At least one of these Level 2 activities must be service that is internal to the Accounting Program. Service that is external to the university is not required. Service for which a faculty member is compensated, either by dollar payment or reduced teaching load, should be at least partially discounted. In cases of significant compensation, such activities may be fully discounted.

In all cases it is expected that a faculty member will 1) seek out opportunities to serve rather than expect others to identify those opportunities; 2) take an active role in committees and programmatic efforts, participate in college and university events where faculty visibility is important, support one's profession in various ways, and provide timely delivery of required commitments; 3) demonstrate an attitude that encourages others to seek one's assistance on important projects; and 4) describe and document one's efforts and contributions (as opposed to simply listing the committees on which one has served). Satisfactory performance requires evidence of a contribution over and above satisfying the numerical quota of service activities at the various levels. One way to demonstrate a contribution would be to provide evidence that one's service activities incorporate one or more of the secondary indicators that define the level of service. It is expected that the mix of activities will vary from year to year and over one's career.

Exceptional Service: There are many, equally acceptable paths to the achievement of an exceptional evaluation in the area of service. In general, exceptional service is defined as professionally, effectively, and reliably assuming, over a sustained period of time, "significantly more than one's fair share" of the tasks required to support the operation of a large university and, where appropriate, making a sustained and significant contribution to one's profession and/or the external community. "Significantly more than one's fair share" of service activities is defined as a reasonably steady stream of service activity consisting of A) a yearly average of one Level 1 activity plus two Level 2 activities plus a representative mixture of Level 3 activities or B) a yearly average of five Level 2 activities plus a representative mixture of Level 3 activities. At least two of these activities must be service that is internal to the university of which one must be internal to the Accounting Program. Service that is external to the university is not required. Service for which a faculty member is compensated, either by dollar payment or reduced teaching load, should be at least partially discounted. In cases of significant compensation, such activities may be fully discounted.

In all cases it is expected that a faculty member will 1) seek out opportunities to serve rather than expect others to identify those opportunities; 2) take an active role in committees and programmatic efforts, participate in college and university events where faculty visibility is important, support one's profession in various ways, and provide timely delivery of required commitments; 3) demonstrate an attitude that encourages

others to seek one's assistance on important projects; and 4) describe and document one's efforts and contributions (as opposed to simply listing the committees on which one has served). In addition, exceptional performance requires some evidence of a significant contribution over and above satisfying the numerical quota of service activities at the various levels. One way to demonstrate a significant contribution would be to provide evidence that one's service activities incorporate one or more of the secondary indicators that define Level 1 service. Finally, it is to be expected that the mix of activities will vary from year to year and over one's career.

Evaluating Service Contributions: It is the responsibility of the faculty member being evaluated to provide information that documents and demonstrates Level 1, 2, or 3 service. The faculty member will classify service contributions and provide substantiation for the classification.

PART III: INTERIM EVALUATION PROCEDURES

All tenure-track faculty will submit a summary of their activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service by April 1 of their third academic year for consideration by the School of Accounting PAC. The summary should include a two-to-three page document highlighting his/her activities and accomplishments during the three-year period plus documentation supporting the summary (i.e., teaching evaluation summaries, copies of published articles and working papers, and letters of appointment to university or professional organization committees). The PAC may request additional documentation necessary to evaluate the faculty member. No later than May 15, the SOA PAC will provide each faculty in the third year of his or her evaluation period with an evaluation, in writing, of their progress, or lack thereof, towards promotion and tenure based on the criteria described in section II. The evaluation will include suggestions for improvement.

ATTACHMENT 1
SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTING
PUBLICATION CATEGORIES
Revised: October 2006, November 2008

Category A Publications

1. The overriding criteria for placing a publication in this category are whether the article
 - a. Adds significant new knowledge to the existing body of knowledge to which it relates;
 - b. Brings significant prestige to the School of Accounting and/or College of Business;
 - c. Is published in a prestigious, refereed journal

The greater the extent to which a publication meets all three of the above criteria, the greater is the evidence that it should be classified as Category A. In the absence of contrary evidence (provided by the author, PAC members or others), it will be assumed that articles appearing in the following journals will be considered Category A publications.

Accounting Horizons
Accounting, Organizations and Society
Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory
Behavioral Research in Accounting
Contemporary Accounting Research
Issues in Accounting Education (Scholarly articles)
Journal of Accounting and Economics
Journal of Accounting Research
Journal of Accounting Auditing and Finance
Journal of the American Taxation Association
Journal of Business Finance and Accounting
Journal of Information Systems
Journal of Management Accounting Research
National Tax Journal
Review of Accounting Studies
The Accounting Review

2. In addition to publications in journals in the above list, a publication in a prestigious refereed journal may be considered a Category A publication. Prestigious journals include those that are
 - a. Ranked highly by objective outside observers (such as business school rankings lists),
 - b. Consistently ranked highly by national surveys of accounting and other business faculty; and/or
 - c. Very selective.

We recognize that those journals used by the Financial Times to compile their list of top business schools are of excellent quality and are incorporated by reference.

3. If a very strong case is provided, a publication in a highly regarded journal (not listed above) or a research monograph may be considered a Category A level publication. Evidence may include:
 - a. The work is widely cited or has been cited by leading authorities in the field;
 - b. The work was supported by a major grant;
 - c. The work received a national award;
 - d. The work significantly impacted policy of accounting regulators or professional bodies.
4. One Category A publication is the equivalent of two Category B publications.

Category B Publications

1. The overriding criteria for placing an item in this category are whether it
 - a. Adds something new to, or disseminates something from, the existing body of knowledge in the area to which it relates;
 - b. Brings prestige to the JMU Accounting Program and/or College of Business;
 - c. Is published in a well-regarded peer-reviewed journal.

The greater the extent to which a publication meets all three of the above criteria, the greater is the evidence that it should be classified as Category B. In the absence of contrary evidence (by the author, PAC members or others), it will be assumed that articles appearing in the following journals will be considered as Category B publications:

Abacus

Accounting & Business Research

Accounting and Finance

Accounting Business and Financial History

Accounting Education: An International Journal

Accounting Educators' Journal

Accounting Historian's Journal

Accounting and the Public Interest

Accounting, Auditing and Accountability

Advances in Accounting

Advances in Accounting Information Systems

Advances in Behavioral Research in Accounting

Advances in International Accounting

Advances in Management Accounting

Advances in Public Interest Accounting

Advances in Taxation

AIS Educator Journal

Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory

Australian Accounting Review

Behavioral Research in Accounting

British Accounting Review

CA Magazine

Cost Management

CPA Journal

Critical Perspectives in Accounting

Current Issues in Auditing

Financial Accountability and Management

Financial Analysts Journal

Financial Executive

Fraud Magazine

Government Finance Review

Internal Auditing

Internal Auditor

International Journal of Accounting

International Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Performance Evaluation

International Journal of Intelligent Systems in Accounting, Finance, and Management

Issues in Accounting Education (Cases and Instructional Materials)

Journal of Accountancy

Journal of Accounting and Public Policy

Journal of Accounting Education

Journal of Accounting Literature

Journal of American Taxation Association
 Journal of Applied Business Research
 Journal of Business Disciplines
 Journal of Cost Analysis
 Journal of Emerging Technologies in Accounting
 Journal of Forensic Accounting
 Journal of Information Systems
 Journal of International Accounting Research
 Journal of International Accounting, Auditing, and Taxation
 Journal of International Financial Management and Accounting
 Journal of Legal Tax Research
 Journal of Management Accounting Research
 Journal of Small Business Management and Entrepreneurship
 Journal of Taxation
 Journal of Teaching in International Business
 Management Accounting Quarterly
 Management Accounting Research
 Practical Tax Strategies
 Research in Accounting Regulation
 Research in Government and Nonprofit Accounting
 Research on Professional Responsibility and Ethics in Accounting
 Review of Business Information Systems
 Southern Business and Economic Journal
 Strategic Finance
 Tax Adviser
 Tax Notes
 Taxes - The Tax Magazine

2. In addition to publications in journals in the above list, a publication in a well-regarded, peer-reviewed journal may be considered a Category B publication. Well-regarded peer-reviewed journals are
 - a. Consistently ranked moderately high to high by surveys of accounting faculty;
 - b. Selective and/or highly circulating;
 - c. Published by well-respected institutions.

The greater the extent to which a journal meets all three of the above criteria, the greater is the evidence that the publication should be classified as Category B.

3. If a strong case is provided by the author, a publication may be considered a Category B level publication. Evidence may include:
 - a. The work is cited or has been cited by leading authorities in the field;
 - b. The work was supported by a grant;
 - c. The work received an award;
 - d. The work has impacted the accounting regulators or professional bodies.
4. "Category B equivalency items" do not meet the definition of the B category outright, but are allowed in limited numbers as substitutions. Such items may include:
 - a. Co-editorship of a peer-reviewed anthology or other peer reviewed work published by a nationally or internationally recognized publisher
 - b. Peer-reviewed monographs or chapters in books published by a nationally or internationally recognized publisher
 - c. Presentations included at a selective, peer-reviewed national level conference where the content is written in manuscript format and publicly distributed (such as in a proceedings), assuming the content adheres to criteria for Category B publications
 - d. Three "C" Publications.
 - e. Obtaining a professional certification (such as CPA, CMA, etc.) with prior approval by the School of Accounting PAC.

5. Consistent with the mission of the JMU COB and School of Accounting, if a case is provided by the author that an item of instructional development makes a significant contribution to accounting education, the item may be considered a "Category B equivalency item." Evidence may include:
 - a. The teaching materials/case/method is used at several universities
 - b. The article/monograph is cited in major text books
 - c. The article/monograph is assigned reading at several universities.

Category C Publications

1. The overriding criterion for placing an item in this category is that it involves scholarly effort. The publication should bring recognition to JMU's Accounting Program and the College of Business. A few examples of journals that historically have published "C"-level articles include:

Accounting Today
Datamation
New Accountant
Practical Accountant

2. Three Category C publications substitute for a "Category B equivalency item," not a Category B publication.

Other Guidance

1. Simply because a journal is not listed in a category's representative list does not mean a particular article cannot be counted in that category. Articles published in journals not listed in one of the above representative lists will be considered on a case by case basis by the Promotion Action Committee by applying criteria for each category. Candidates should play an active role in providing information for this decision.
2. The representative lists may be revised from time to time to remain current with changing journal standings.
3. In the case of a conflict between information in the guidelines and this supporting document, the guidelines should prevail.
4. Continuous, on-going publication is an important dimension of all promotion decisions.

CIS & MS

Short narrative about converting annual evaluations into salary increase allocations

Step 1: Annual Evaluation for each faculty member is determined by the department head using the criteria specified in the Department of Computer Information Systems and Management Science's 'PAC' document: "EVALUATION, PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES". More specifically, a numeric nine-point scale is used to compute faculty performance in each category (teaching, research and service).

Excellent:	7-9 points
Satisfactory:	4-6 points
Unsatisfactory:	1-3 points

The criteria used to evaluate faculty in each category are specified in "PART II: CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION, PROMOTION AND TENURE" of the CIS & MS Department's PAC document.

Step 2: An overall performance score is calculated for each faculty member based on the following weights in each area:

Teaching:	50%
Research:	30%
Service:	20%

Example:

Professor X

Teaching	0.50	*	8 (excellent) =	4.0
Research	0.30	*	5 (satisfactory) =	1.5
Service	0.20	*	8 (excellent) =	1.6
Total (Professor X)				7.1 (excellent)

Note 1: tenured faculty may adjust weights in the research and service categories to: research 20% and service 30%.

Note 2: RTA's are evaluated using the following weights:

Teaching:	80%
Research/Intellectual Contributions:	10%
Service:	10%

Step 3: A 'merit pool' sum and an average pay raise percentage is assigned to the Department of CIS & MS by the COB Dean's Office.

Step 4: Using the overall performance score calculated for each faculty member (Step 2) and the average pay raise percentage assigned by the COB Dean's Office (Step 3), a pay raise percentage is directly calculated for each faculty member.

Note 1: a faculty member with an overall performance score that is equal to the average overall performance score for the Department of CIS & MS will receive the average pay raise percentage (as assigned by the COB Dean's Office).

Note 2: a faculty member with an overall performance score that is greater than the average performance score for the Department of CIS & MS will receive a pay raise percentage proportionally higher than the average.

Note 3: a faculty member with an overall performance score that is less than the average performance score for the Department of CIS & MS will receive a pay raise percentage proportionally less than the average.

Step 5: the department head double checks to make sure that the pay raise total, as calculated by totaling the pay raises assigned to each individual faculty member in Step 4, is equal to the merit pool total assigned by the COB Dean's Office in Step 3.

1 **EVALUATION, PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES**

2
3 Department of Computer Information Systems and Management Science

4 James Madison University

5 *Document Date: October 29, 2007*

6
7
8 **PART I: RESPONSIBILITIES**

9
10 **A. Responsibilities of the Candidate**

11
12 Tenure-track faculty will be evaluated by the Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC)
13 during their first and third years (or as specified in their contracts) and when they go up
14 for promotion and/or tenure (P&T). Revolving-term appointment (RTA) faculty will be
15 evaluated during their third year and every fifth year after that. Each member of the
16 faculty is expected to contribute to the achievement of the University's mission through
17 his or her teaching and academic advising; research and/or scholarly achievement; and
18 service. Faculty who are candidates for review or promotion and/or tenure are expected to
19 document these contributions by compiling and submitting a dossier according to the
20 guidelines specified in Part III of this document to the CIS & MS Program Director and
21 to the PAC. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure are expected to submit the dossier by
22 October 1 or other date as specified by the JMU Faculty Handbook. Deadlines for all
23 other types of review are given in Part IV of this document.

24
25 **B. Responsibilities of the Personnel Advisory Committee**

26
27 The PAC is expected to provide the Dean with a written evaluation of the candidate's
28 teaching, research, and service performance over his or her evaluation period. This
29 evaluation should include a discussion of trends in performance (if any); a
30 recommendation as to whether the candidate's performance in each of these areas should
31 be rated excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory; and statements supporting each rating.
32 Adhering to the criteria described in Part II and the procedures described in Part IV, the
33 PAC will carefully consider each candidate for tenure and/or promotion and render a
34 recommendation to the Dean of the COB as to whether that candidate should be tenured
35 and/or promoted. A copy of the letter must be provided to the candidate at that time. For
36 all other reviews, a letter from the PAC will be provided to the candidate and a copy will
37 be given to the Program Director.

38
39 **C. Responsibilities of the CIS & MS Program Director**

40
41 The CIS & MS Program Director will contact the Associate Dean of Human Resources
42 before the end of the spring semester to identify individuals who will be evaluated during
43 the next academic year. He/she will then inform individuals concerned and the chair of
44 the Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC) before the end of the spring semester. The CIS
45 & MS Program Director will also provide new faculty with a copy of this document and
46 inform them that they will have to undergo an evaluation during their second semester.

47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92

PART II: CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION, PROMOTION AND TENURE

A. Overview

The James Madison University Faculty Handbook (03/20/02) states that promotion to Associate Professor requires that a candidate's performance be evaluated as excellent in at least one of the three functional areas (i.e., teaching, research, or service) and at least satisfactory in the other two areas. The Handbook also states that Promotion to Professor requires that a candidate's performance be evaluated as excellent in at least two of the functional areas and at least satisfactory in the third area. At a minimum, a candidate must meet the responsibilities of a faculty as defined by the JMU Faculty Handbook (03/20/02) Sections III.A.2 and III.A.3.

In addition, the Faculty Handbook states “Normally, a faculty member should have completed five years in rank at James Madison University before being reviewed for promotion”. Unless otherwise specified in a faculty member’s Instructional Faculty Contract, any faculty member applying for promotion prior to the five years in rank at JMU will be considered as applying for early promotion. Early promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires that the candidate’s performance be evaluated as excellent in at least two of the functional areas (i.e. teaching, research, and service) and at least satisfactory in the third area. Early promotion to the rank of Professor requires that the candidate’s performance be evaluated as excellent in all three functional areas.

B. Teaching Criteria

Teaching is a multifaceted activity that includes course design and delivery, curriculum development, and interaction with students. Therefore, the evaluation process should be characterized by multiple sources of information and a broad view of the activities that constitute effective teaching.

Satisfactory Teaching: Satisfactory teaching is defined as effectively performing the following activities:

Learning/value added

- Providing instruction at a rigorous and challenging level.
- Stimulating learning and interest in the subject matter.

Organization

- Being well prepared for class.
- Informing students of course objectives, assignments, and examination procedures.
- Conducting the class in a well-organized manner.
- Communicating the subject matter clearly.

Interaction with students

- Maintaining scheduled office hours.

- 93 • Treating students with courtesy and respect.
- 94 • Providing career advising to students.
- 95 Evaluation
- 96 • Maintaining fair and impartial grading standards.
- 97 • Providing timely feedback on progress.
- 98 • Assessing students' mastery of subject matter with appropriate tools.
- 99 Curriculum and course content
- 100 • Staying current with the subject matter.
- 101 • Participating in program activities to assess and update the curriculum.
- 102

103 These activities are considered essential to good teaching, and thus are necessary for a
 104 rating of satisfactory in the area of teaching.

105
 106 **Excellent Teaching:** Fulfillment of the criteria for satisfactory teaching performance in
 107 an exemplary manner is required for an excellent rating in teaching. In addition,
 108 evidence of a strong, sustained commitment to teaching is expected. Additional
 109 examples of possible indicators of excellent teaching include:

- 110
- 111 • Publication of widely-adopted and/or acclaimed instructional materials.
- 112 • Development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials.
- 113 • Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses.
- 114 • Publication in refereed education journals.
- 115 • Teaching awards.
- 116 • Outstanding student evaluations.
- 117

118 There are many paths to the achievement of an excellent rating in teaching. None of
 119 these indicators, in and of itself, is either necessary or sufficient evidence of excellent
 120 teaching performance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide
 121 information that documents and demonstrates his/her excellent teaching.

122 **C. Research and/or Scholarly Activity Criteria**

123 **C.1. Definition by Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)**

124
 125 The following paragraphs reflect the broad dimensions of research/scholarly
 126 accomplishments and intellectual contributions as defined by the AACSB.

- 127
- 128
- 129
- 130 1. **Basic Scholarship:** The creation of new knowledge.
- 131

132 Outputs from basic scholarship activities may include publication in refereed journals,
 133 research monographs, scholarly books, chapters in scholarly books, proceedings from
 134 scholarly meetings, papers presented at academic meetings, publicly available research
 135 working papers, and papers presented at faculty research seminars.

- 136
- 137 2. **Applied Scholarship:** The application, transfer and interpretation of knowledge
 138 to improve management practice and teaching.

139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184

Outputs from applied scholarship activities may include publication in professional journals, public/trade journals, in-house journals, professional presentations, book reviews, and papers presented at faculty workshops.

3. **Instructional Development:** The enhancement of the educational value of instructional efforts of the institution or discipline.

Outputs from instructional development activities may include textbooks, publications in pedagogical journals, written cases with instructional materials, instructional software, and publicly available materials describing the design and implementation of new courses.

NOTE: There are additional activities and accomplishment that do not fall neatly into one of the three categories listed above. These include, but are not limited to, research grants, membership on editorial boards, ad hoc reviews, participation as a discussant at professional meetings, professional certification, and other professional awards. In addition, these three areas of contribution are not synonymous with the publications categories designated A or B or B equivalency by the program (e.g.. it is possible to have a Level B achievement in basic research, applied research, or instructional development).

C.2. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

Faculty members advancing from the rank of Associate Professor to Professor will be evaluated on the basis of their research/scholarly accomplishments since their prior promotion to the rank of Associate Professor as well as their overall record of research/scholarly accomplishments. Candidates who publish in journals not rated by the CIS & MS Program must provide justification for the rating of the journals concerned.

Satisfactory Research: The *minimum* requirement for a satisfactory evaluation in the area of research/scholarly accomplishments for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or the granting of tenure in the CIS & MS Program is the following:

A minimum of four peer-reviewed journal articles in the A or B category plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort.

Each candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or the granting of tenure may substitute one item qualifying as B equivalency for one of the four peer-reviewed journal articles.

The *minimum* requirement for a satisfactory evaluation in the area of research/scholarly accomplishments for promotion to the rank of Professor is the following:

A minimum of seven (i.e., three beyond the minimum required for promotion to Associate Professor with a satisfactory rating in scholarly achievement) peer-reviewed journal articles in the A or B category plus evidence of a sustained

185 record of accomplishment while holding the position of Associate Professor and
186 ongoing scholarly effort.

187

188 Each candidate seeking promotion to rank of Professor may substitute two B equivalency
189 items for two of the seven peer-reviewed journal articles. In addition, at least three of
190 these peer-reviewed journal articles must have occurred since the promotion to Associate
191 Professor.

192

193 **Excellent Research:** The *minimum* requirement for an excellent evaluation in the area of
194 research/scholarly accomplishments for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor
195 and/or the granting of tenure in the CIS & MS Program is the following:

196

197 A minimum of six peer-reviewed journal articles in the A or B category plus
198 evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort.

199

200 Each candidate seeking promotion to rank of associate professor and/or tenure may
201 substitute one B equivalency item for one of the six peer-reviewed journal articles.

202

203 The *minimum* requirement for an excellent evaluation in the area of research/scholarly
204 accomplishments for promotion to the rank of Professor is the following:

205

206 A minimum of eleven (i.e., five beyond the minimum required for promotion to
207 Associate Professor with an excellent rating in scholarly achievement) peer-
208 reviewed journal articles in the A or B category plus evidence of a sustained
209 record of accomplishment while holding the position of Associate Professor and
210 ongoing scholarly effort.

211

212 Each candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Professor may substitute two B
213 equivalency items for two of the eleven peer-reviewed journal articles. In addition, at
214 least four of these peer-reviewed journal articles must have occurred since promotion to
215 Associate Professor.

216

217 **D. Service Criteria**

218

219 **Definition of Level 3 Service:** Level 3 service is defined as participation in program,
220 college, and university events for which faculty visibility is important. Generally, such
221 participation does not require additional efforts either before or afterwards.

222

223 Some examples of Level 3 service activities:

224

- 225 • having lunch with potential employers of COB students or freshmen parents
- 226 • COB Parent's Day Open House, COB awards ceremonies, program meetings or
227 program seminars
- 228 • participating in faculty recruiting (meeting with candidates, attending candidate
229 seminars)

230

231 **Definition of Level 2 Service:** Level 2 service is defined as important activities in
232 support of one's program, the college, the university, the profession and/or the external
233 community in a role that uses one's professional knowledge, skills, and talents. Such
234 activities involve a moderate to significant time commitment. It is anticipated that the
235 bulk of one's service activities will fall into this category.

236

237 Some examples of Level 2 service activities:

238

- 239 • member of program, college, or university committees, or Faculty Senate
- 240 • proceedings editor for a regional conference, book review editor for a journal
241 or program/track chair for a regional conference
- 242 • active participation in curriculum development
- 243 • participation in university-sponsored programs, such as the minority mentor program
244 and athletic recruiting

245

246 **Definition of Level 1 Service:** Level 1 service is defined primarily as activities that
247 involve a very significant time commitment. Secondary indicators of Level 1 service are
248 1) a high level of personal responsibility; 2) involvement in activities that are critical to
249 the mission of the program, college, university, or professional organization; 3)
250 distinguishing oneself in a leadership role, whether elected or appointed; 4) serving, with
251 distinction, one's profession and/or the external community in a role that uses one's
252 professional knowledge, skills, and talents; 5) "making a difference" in those areas in
253 which one has chosen to serve; 6) being widely recognized as one who has an exemplary
254 attitude towards service commitments and who serves as a role model for other faculty;
255 and 7) receiving a professional service award. Level 1 service should not be interpreted
256 as requiring the presence of each and every secondary indicator of excellent performance.
257 In particular, Level 1 service does not require a leadership role (e.g., chair of a major
258 committee). However, in all cases there should be evidence of a substantial contribution
259 and an active role.

260

261 Some examples of Level 1 service activities:

262

- 263 • chair of an important recruiting committee
- 264 • major responsibility for significant curriculum reform
- 265 • speaker of Faculty Senate
- 266 • major contributor to AACSB or SACS re-accreditation efforts or other important
267 university committee
- 268 • faculty advisor to an active, successful student organization
- 269 • high level office in a prestigious regional or national organization involving a
270 significant time commitment

271

272 **Satisfactory Service:** A necessary, but not sufficient, condition for an evaluation of
273 satisfactory in the area of service is participation in activities that are basic to the
274 responsibilities of a faculty member. These are defined as activities in which faculty
275 members are expected to participate without having been specifically assigned, or
276 designated, to do so. Examples of such service activities include 1) attending Spring

277 commencement exercises; 2) attending program meetings; and 3) participating in peer
278 evaluation of faculty in one's program. Beyond this, there are many, equally acceptable
279 paths to the achievement of a satisfactory evaluation in the area of service.

280

281 In general, satisfactory service is defined as professionally, effectively, and reliably
282 assuming one's "fair share" of the tasks required to support the operation of a large
283 university and, where appropriate, contributing to one's profession and/or the external
284 community. A "fair share" is defined as a reasonably steady stream of service activity,
285 such as

- 286 • a yearly average of one Level 1 activity plus a representative mixture of Level 3
287 activities
- 288 • a yearly average of three Level 2 activities plus a representative mixture of Level 3
289 activities. At least one of these Level 2 activities must be service that is internal to
290 the university. Service that is external to the university is not required.

291

292 Service for which a faculty member is compensated, either by dollar payment or reduced
293 teaching load, should be at least partially discounted. In cases of significant
294 compensation, such activities may be fully discounted.

295

296 In all cases it is expected that a faculty member will 1) seek out opportunities to serve
297 rather than expect others to identify those opportunities; 2) take an active role in
298 committees and programmatic efforts, participate in college and university events where
299 faculty visibility is important, support one's profession in various ways, and provide
300 timely delivery of required commitments; 3) demonstrate an attitude that encourages
301 others to seek one's assistance on important projects; and 4) describe and document one's
302 efforts and contributions (as opposed to simply listing the committees on which one has
303 served). It is also to be expected that the mix of activities will vary from year to year and
304 over one's career.

305

306 **Excellent Service:** There are many, equally acceptable paths to the achievement of an
307 excellent evaluation in the area of service. In general, excellent service is defined as
308 professionally, effectively, and reliably assuming, over a sustained period of time,
309 "significantly more than one's fair share" of the tasks required to support the operation of
310 a large university and, where appropriate, making a sustained and significant contribution
311 to one's profession and/or the external community. "Significantly more than one's fair
312 share" of service activities is defined as a reasonably steady stream of service activity.

313 Some examples of excellent service are:

- 314 ■ A yearly average of one Level 1 activity plus two Level 2 activities plus a
315 representative mixture of Level 3 activities
- 316 ■ A yearly average of five Level 2 activities plus a representative mixture of Level
317 3 activities.

318 At least two of these activities must be service that is internal to the university. Service
319 that is external to the university is required. Service for which a faculty member is
320 compensated, either by dollar payment or reduced teaching load, should be at least
321 partially discounted. In cases of significant compensation, such activities may be fully
322 discounted.

323

324 In addition, excellent performance requires some evidence of a significant contribution
325 over and above satisfying the numerical quota of service activities at the various levels.
326 One way to demonstrate a significant contribution would be to provide evidence that
327 one's service activities incorporate one or more of the secondary indicators that define
328 Level 1 service. Finally, it is to be expected that the mix of activities will vary from year
329 to year and over one's career.

330

331 There are many paths to the achievement of an excellent rating in service. None of these
332 indicators, in and of itself, is either necessary or sufficient evidence of excellent service
333 performance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide information that
334 documents and demonstrates his/her excellent service.

335

336

337 **PART III: GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING THE EVALUATION DOSSIER**

338

339 **A. Overview**

340

341 The candidate should prepare a summary document, not to exceed 25 pages, describing
342 his or her accomplishments in each of the three functional areas over the evaluation
343 period. Two copies of this summary document should be provided by October 1 or other
344 date as specified by the JMU Faculty Handbook, one to the Program Director and one to
345 the PAC chair. In addition to this summary document, supplementary materials as
346 requested in Sections B, C, and D of Part III (e.g., student evaluations, copies of
347 publications, course materials, letters from committee chairs describing service
348 performance, etc.) should be provided separately. The supplementary material should
349 have a table of contents. Two copies of all supplementary materials need to be provided.

350

351 **B. Teaching**

352

353 The Promotion and Tenure dossier should provide a comprehensive self-evaluation of the
354 faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher. The summary document must include the
355 following information:

356

357 1. A brief statement describing the candidate's teaching philosophy. This statement
358 should include a description of teaching philosophy and its underlying assumptions
359 regarding what students need to know and how they learn, and how this philosophy is
360 translated into specific course objectives and the methods used to achieve these
361 objectives. State the philosophy and methodology used to measure a student's success
362 at mastering the objectives of the course. Identify the contributions made to education
363 (e.g., curriculum changes, new course development, teaching innovation award),
364 assess effectiveness as a teacher, describe what is being done to improve teaching
365 performance, and include a discussion of overall student evaluations.

366

367 2. For each semester of the evaluation period, provide a completed table with the
368 headings as shown below.

369

Semester/ Year	Course Number/ Section Number	New prep.? Y/N	Ending Enrollment	Class Grade Distribution (%)

370 Supplementary material must include:

371

372 1. For each course taught during the evaluation period, submit a complete set of the
373 following from a recent semester:

- 374
- 375 • syllabus
 - 376 • examinations, tests, and quizzes
 - 377 • assignments
 - 378 • in-class exercises
 - 379 • handouts
 - 380 • other items specific to the course such as list of outside readings

381 The material provided should be organized by course (only one set per course) and
382 identified by semester and year.

383 2. Student evaluations

- 384 a. Provide a copy of the student evaluation form used.
- 385 b. For all sections of all courses in the last two academic years (excluding summers),
386 provide the following:
- 387 • copy of the summary sheet for numerical student evaluations
 - 388 • grade distribution
 - 389 • original handwritten comments on all student evaluations

390 The material provided should be organized and tabbed by course, section, semester
391 and year in the same order as presented in the summary document.

392

393 3. Optionally, other evidential information may be included, as appropriate. Examples
394 of additional evidence might include the following:

- 395
- 396 • new courses developed
 - 397 • development of instructional materials
 - 398 • interdisciplinary and team teaching projects
 - 399 • publications in teaching journals
 - 400 • active participation in conference presentations and workshops devoted to the
enhancement of teaching
 - 401 • involvement in teaching continuing education courses
 - 402 • reviews of textbook chapters
 - 403 • independent studies and/or honor theses supervised/read
 - 404 • other documentation to support teaching effectiveness

405

406 **C. Research and Scholarly Activity**

407

408 Provide an overview of research and scholarly activity. Explain what has been done and
409 why it is significant. List all research and scholarly activity by category or type in the
410 summary document in the following order:

411

- 412 1. Refereed journal articles
- 413 2. Refereed book chapters/ books/cases
- 414 3. Refereed journal articles under review
- 415 4. Refereed proceedings articles
- 416 5. Refereed proceedings articles under review
- 417 6. Presentations at professional meetings not included in proceedings
- 418 7. Non-refereed publications
- 419 8. Work In Progress
- 420 9. Competitive grants received
- 421 10. Honors and Awards
- 422 11. Professional contributions
- 423 12. Professional development activities
- 424 13. Paid Outside consulting

425

426 For items 1 through 8, provide (where applicable), the names of authors (in order on
427 publication), title, name of journal/publisher/organization, volume/number, year, page
428 numbers.

429

430 For items 9 and 10, provide (where applicable), the names of authors (in order), title,
431 name of awarding agency, year, grant amount.

432

433 For item 11, provide the type of contribution (such as reviewer, discussant, etc.), number
434 of papers reviewed/discussed, organization, location, year.

435

436 For item 12, provide a description of activity, sponsoring organization, length of activity,
437 date(s), certification/training program/other(specify).

438

439 For item 13, provide a description of activity, organization, approximate beginning and
440 ending dates, estimate of time spent (total hours).

441

442 Supplementary material must be in the same order as items listed in the summary
443 document and include the following:

444

- 445 1. Copies of
 - 446 • articles published in refereed journals
 - 447 • chapters in books or research volumes
 - 448 • books published (scholarly, textbook)
 - 449 • published cases
 - 450 • research monographs
 - 451 • instructional software development
 - 452 • ancillaries (e.g. instructor's guides) published
 - 453 • articles published in refereed proceedings

- 454 • articles published in non-refereed journals
- 455 • drafts of work in progress
- 456
- 457 2. Supporting documentation such as letters of acceptance, contract letters, etc. for
- 458 • articles accepted for publication
- 459 • books under contract
- 460 • research grants received
- 461 • research grants applied but not received
- 462 • professional honors or awards
- 463 • membership on editorial board of a journal
- 464 • ad hoc reviewer for professional journals
- 465 • books reviewer
- 466 • reviewer of manuscripts/submissions for professional meetings
- 467 • participation as discussant at professional meetings
- 468 • external reviews of professional presentations
- 469 • professional development activities
- 470

471 **D. Service**

472

473 Provide the following information in the summary document:

474

- 475 1. An overview of the various service activities. Give an assessment of both the quantity
- 476 and quality of efforts, and describe plans for continuing service contributions.
- 477
- 478 2. For each academic year, list of service activities in each of the following areas:
- 479
- 480 a. JMU service, grouped by
- 481 • University
- 482 • College of Business
- 483 • Program(s)
- 484 • Student organizations
- 485
- 486 b. Service to professional organizations
- 487
- 488 c. Community service (if applicable)
- 489

490 For each activity, indicate role or position, the dates of service, and indicate if the

491 service was compensated by reduced teaching load or other compensation. Briefly

492 outline the scope and purpose of each service activity, and give a description of

493 specific responsibilities or contributions.

494

495 Supplementary materials should include supporting documentation (if available) of the

496 service activities listed in the summary document. The supporting documents should be

497 in the same order as in summary document. Examples of supporting documentation

498 include thank you notes, appointment memos, letters of acknowledgement, copies of
499 citations/awards, and excerpts from written reports.

500

501

502

PART IV: PAC PROCEDURES

503

504 A. The PAC will consist of all full-time CIS & MS Program faculty tenured at JMU.

505 Each untenured faculty will be invited to observe the PAC's deliberations on a
506 promotion and/or tenure decision, providing an opportunity exists. Faculty cannot
507 discuss or vote on applications for promotion to rank higher than the one they hold.

508

509 B. All PAC promotion and tenure recommendations and all other issues will be decided
510 by majority vote (except as noted below). The PAC chairperson is a voting member.

511

512 C. A member of the PAC will be elected to chair the committee for the academic year. If
513 the PAC chair is not a full professor, a full professor will serve as the chair for the
514 review of candidates for promotion to full. The role of the chairperson will be to:

515

516 ▪ Invite untenured faculty to observe when appropriate

517 ▪ Convene PAC meetings

518 ▪ Prepare an agenda for each meeting

519 ▪ Conduct each meeting in a professional manner

520 ▪ Capture the salient features of discussions

521 ▪ Write letters that include the salient points and, for P&T matters,

522 ○ Circulate the letters to voting members of the PAC for feedback in a
523 timely manner

524 ○ If necessary, convene additional meetings

525 ○ Deliver the letters to the appropriate individuals in person

526 ▪ Draft changes to this document.

527

528 D. A candidate will be able to choose the guidelines under which his/her application for
529 promotion and tenure should be evaluated. A candidate who has not yet been

530 promoted may choose to be evaluated for tenure and promotion by the guidelines in

531 place at the time of his or her hiring, or any later guidelines. A candidate who has

532 been promoted may choose to be evaluated for future promotions by the guidelines in

533 place at the time of his or her most recent promotion or any later guidelines. The

534 cover letter submitted by the candidate must indicate the guidelines chosen by the

535 individual.

536

537 E. The members of the PAC will discuss a candidate's performance, as defined by the
538 guidelines chosen by the candidate. Points raised during this discussion should be

539 noted for use as justification for the candidate's overall evaluation and should also be

540 included in the evaluation letter.

541

- 542 F. PAC members will vote by secret ballot on the candidate's performance in the areas
543 of teaching, research, and service. A PAC member unable to attend must provide a
544 ballot to the PAC chair prior to the voting.
545
- 546 G. The ballot will be in three separate sheets - for teaching, research, and service,
547 respectively. On each sheet, PAC members will be able to indicate their evaluations
548 of the candidate in terms of Excellent, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Abstention.
549
- 550 H. When all the ballots have been received, the ballots will be counted by the
551 chairperson and one other member of the PAC, in the presence of the other members.
552
- 553 I. For each area, the majority vote will be determined and the resulting rating will be
554 incorporated into the letter by the PAC chairperson, along with the appropriate
555 justification.
556
- 557 J. In case of the absence of a majority vote in any area, a PAC member can ask for a
558 second discussion and a second ballot, which will include all three areas. The same
559 process will apply as before. There can be no more than two discussions or two
560 ballots.
561
- 562 If there is no majority and the number of Satisfactory or higher ratings matches or
563 outnumbers the number of Unsatisfactory ratings, the candidate will receive a
564 Satisfactory rating.
565
- 566 K. First Year Evaluations: All new tenure-track faculty will submit their complete
567 dossiers for consideration by the PAC by the first Wednesday of their second
568 academic semester at JMU. These dossiers must be compiled according to the
569 guidelines described in part III of this document. No later than 4 weeks of the
570 faculty's second semester, the PAC will provide him/her with an evaluation, in
571 writing, of their first year's performance based on the criteria described in part II.
572 The evaluation will be limited to feedback regarding teaching, research, and service.
573 A copy of the letter will be given to the program director.
574
- 575 L. Interim Evaluations: All tenure-track faculty will submit their complete dossiers by
576 March 15 of their third academic year for consideration by the PAC. These dossiers
577 must be compiled according to the guidelines described in part VI of this document.
578 No later than April 25, the PAC will provide each faculty in the third year of his or
579 her evaluation period with an evaluation, in writing, of their progress, or lack thereof,
580 towards promotion and tenure based on the criteria described in part II. The
581 evaluation will include suggestions for improvement. A copy of the letter will be
582 given to the program director.
583
- 584 M. All RTA faculty will submit their complete dossiers by March 15 of their third year
585 and every fifth year after that for consideration by the PAC. These dossiers must be
586 compiled according to the guidelines described in part VI of this document. No later
587 than April 25, the PAC will provide each faculty with an evaluation, in writing, of

588 their teaching, research, and service. The evaluation will include suggestions for
589 improvement. A copy of the letter will be given to the program chair.

- 590
591 N. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to be considered for promotion and/or
592 tenure in a given academic year to declare his/her intention in writing to the PAC
593 chair, and Program Director by September 1. They must submit their dossier, with
594 supporting documentation, to the PAC chair and Program Director by October 1 or
595 other date as specified by the JMU Faculty Handbook. These dossiers must be
596 compiled according to the guidelines described in part III. The PAC and Program
597 Director will carefully examine the record of each candidate according to the criteria
598 described in part II and will make a recommendation to the Dean no later than
599 November 15. A copy of the letter must be provided to the candidate by the same
600 date.

601
602 The letter of recommendation will rate the candidate as excellent, satisfactory, or
603 unsatisfactory in each of the three evaluation areas (teaching, research, and service)
604 and will include justification for each rating. The letter will also include an overall
605 recommendation, whether positive or negative. A positive recommendation for
606 tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor requires an evaluation of excellent in
607 at least one area and evaluations of satisfactory in the remaining areas. A positive
608 recommendation for promotion to Professor requires an evaluation of excellent in at
609 least two areas and an evaluation of at least satisfactory in the remaining area.

- 610
611 O. Revisions to this document, including changes in the criteria for promotion and/or
612 tenure, may be made at any time if approved by majority of the full-time tenured,
613 tenure-track, or RTA CIS & MS faculty. All proposed revisions must first be
614 distributed to faculty and program director, and three full weeks of the regular
615 academic year must be allowed for discussions and suggestions. The amended
616 document must be distributed to all faculty and two full weeks must be allowed
617 before the full-time faculty vote on the proposal. All approved revisions are to be
618 effective as of the beginning of the next academic year.

619 620 621 **PART V: ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS**

622
623 All annual evaluations should include three sections. The first section provides the
624 evaluation (excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory) and the justification for that
625 evaluation in the area of teaching. The second section addresses research, and the third
626 service. When performance in an area is less than excellent, suggestions for
627 improvement should be given.

628
629 The annual evaluations are conducted by the Program Director while promotion and
630 tenure decisions, as well as first and third year reviews are conducted by the PAC and
631 therefore these are independent evaluations. A well-designed and well-administered
632 annual evaluation process will result in promotion and tenure decisions that are
633 reasonably well anticipated by the candidate. While one cannot expect to completely

634 eliminate the element of surprise from the P&T process, the objective should be to keep
635 this element as small as practicable. To achieve this, annual faculty evaluations will be
636 based on the criteria described in Part II of this document, and these criteria will be
637 applied consistently and uniformly across ranks and from year to year. For example, a
638 faculty member who satisfactorily performs three level-two plus requisite level-three
639 service activities in one year should receive a satisfactory overall rating in service for that
640 year. A faculty member who exhibits all of the indicators for satisfactory teaching
641 performance and a reasonable number of the indicators for excellent teaching
642 performance should receive an excellent overall rating in teaching for that year.

643
644 In addition, a string of annual evaluations specifying a certain performance level should,
645 if the annual evaluation process is conducted in a manner consistent with this document,
646 add up to that same evaluation for purposes of the P&T decision. It is impossible,
647 however, to eliminate all uncertainty from the P&T process. It is these gray areas that
648 must necessarily require the professional judgment of members of the PAC.

649
650 Research necessarily involves a substantial and highly unpredictable time lag between the
651 inputs to the research process (e.g., drafts of working papers, submissions to journals,
652 conference presentations) and the outputs of the research process (e.g., papers accepted
653 for publication in ranked journals). For this reason, the annual evaluation of scholarly
654 activity will be based on the current year and the previous two years. It is quite possible,
655 therefore, that a faculty member who has a sufficient number of research inputs may be
656 rated satisfactory (or, in some cases, excellent) on an annual basis. However, a positive
657 recommendation for tenure and/or promotion requires demonstrated research output as
658 defined in the research criteria.

659
660 CIS & MS DEPARTMENT PAC DOCUMENT
661 EXHIBIT 1
662 PUBLICATION LEVELS

663
664 **A-Level Journal Criteria**

665
666 In order for a journal article to be considered A-level, it must meet all of the
667 following criteria.

- 668 1. Is research oriented (as opposed to an opinion piece, book review, etc.)
- 669 2. Brings prestige to the individual, department, or university by being published
670 in a journal recognized among professional peers as being of exceptionally
671 high quality and visibility.
- 672 3. Is published in a journal which scores highly in widely accepted, discipline
673 specific, published journal rankings which are based on journal quality,
674 reputation, and visibility
 - 675 a. CIS A-level journals must be highly ranked within published surveys
676 of journal quality, reputation, and visibility or be among the top
677 journals cited by several of the articles listed in the 'MIS Journal
678 Rankings' compiled by IS World.

679 b. MS and OM A-level journals must be highly ranked within published
680 surveys of journal quality, reputation, and visibility.
681

682 When publishing in a journal not currently on the CIS & MS Department A-level
683 journal lists or in a journal in an area outside of CIS, MS, or OM, a faculty member
684 may ask the PAC to make a determination as to whether that journal will be
685 considered A-level. The faculty member must provide evidence that the journal
686 meets standards comparable to those given above. In particular, if widely accepted,
687 discipline specific, published journal rankings based on journal quality, reputation,
688 and/or visibility exist in the other discipline, they must be provided.
689

690 **A-Level Journals**

691
692 Based on the above criteria, the following are alphabetical lists of A-level journals in
693 the CIS & MS Department.
694

695 CIS A-Level Journals

696 Communications of the ACM
697 Communications of the Association for Information Science
698 DATA BASE
699 Decision Sciences
700 Decision Support Systems and Electronic Commerce
701 European Journal of Information Systems
702 Harvard Business Review
703 IEEE Transactions (all)
704 Information and Management
705 Information Systems Research
706 International Journal of Electronic Commerce
707 Journal of the Association for Information Systems
708 Journal of Management Information Systems
709 Management Science
710 MIS Quarterly
711

712 MS and OM A-Level Journals

713 Decision Sciences
714 European Journal of Operational Research
715 IEEE Transactions (all)
716 IIE Transactions
717 Interfaces (Articles section only)
718 Journal of the American Statistical Association
719 Journal of Operations Management
720 Management Science
721 Manufacturing & Service Operations Management
722 Mathematical Programming
723 Mathematics of Operations Research
724 Naval Research Logistics

725 Operations Research
726 Production and Operations Management
727 Transportation Science
728

B-Level Journal Criteria

730

731 A journal article is considered to be published in a B-level journal if the journal
732 article meets all of the following criteria.

- 733 1. Is in a peer reviewed journal
734 2. Is related to the faculty member's professional activity
735 3. Is published in a journal that brings recognition to the individual, department,
736 or university. Factors that would be considered to determine if a journal
737 publication brings recognition would include, but not be limited to, the
738 following:
739 i. is listed in Cabell's, Ulrich's, or sponsored by a professional organization
740 ii. has moderately low acceptance rates
741 iii. has moderately high citation rates
742

743 When publishing in a journal that is not currently on the CIS & MS Department B-
744 level journal lists or in a journal in an area outside of CIS, MS, or OM, a faculty
745 member must provide justification that the journal meets our department's criteria for
746 B-level journals. If widely accepted, discipline specific, published journal rankings
747 based on journal quality, reputation, and/or visibility exists in the other discipline,
748 they must be provided.
749

B-Level Journals

750

751 Based on the above criteria, the following are alphabetical lists of B-level journals in
752 the CIS & MS Department.
753

754

CIS B-Level Journals (include but are not limited to the following)

756 Behavior and Information Technology
757 Computers and Human Behavior
758 Expert Systems with Applications
759 Human-Computer Interactions
760 Information and Software Technology
761 Information Management and Computer Security
762 Information Resource Management Journal
763 Information Systems Frontiers
764 Information Systems Management
765 Information Technology and People
766 Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal
767 International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction
768 International Journal of Human-Computer Studies
769 International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education
770 International Journal of Innovation and Learning

771	International Journal of Mobile Communications
772	International Journal of Network Management
773	International Journal of Services and Standards
774	Journal of Computer Information Systems
775	Journal of Database Management
776	Journal of End User Computing
777	Journal of Global Information Technology Management
778	Journal of Information Technology
779	Journal of Information Systems Education
780	Journal of Information Technology Education
781	Journal of Information Technology Management
782	Journal of International Information Management
783	Journal of International Technology and Information Management
784	Journal of Organizational and End User Computing
785	Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce
786	Journal of Strategic Information Systems
787	Journal of Systems and Software
788	SIGCHI Bulletin
789	Telecommunications Policy
790	
791	<u>MS and OM B-Level Journals (include but are not limited to the following)</u>
792	Annals of Operations Research
793	Central European Journal of Operations Research
794	Computers and Industrial Engineering
795	Computers and Operations Research
796	Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education
797	Decision Support Systems and Electronic Commerce
798	INFORMS Transactions on Education
799	Interfaces
800	International Journal of Information Technology and Decision Making
801	International Journal of Operations and Production Management
802	International Journal of Production Economics
803	International Journal of Production Research
804	International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management
805	Journal of Business Logistics
806	Journal of Combinatorial Optimization
807	Journal of Global Optimization
808	Journal of Heuristics
809	Journal of Manufacturing and Operations Management
810	Journal of Manufacturing Systems
811	Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management
812	Journal of the Operational Research Society
813	Journal of Optimization Theory and Algorithms
814	Journal of Purchasing and Materials Management
815	Journal of Scheduling
816	Journal of Supply Chain Management

817 Journal on Computing
818 Journal of Transportation Engineering
819 Logistics and Transportation Review
820 Networks
821 Omega
822 Operations Research Letters
823 Production and Inventory Management Journal
824 Production, Planning and Control
825 Production Engineer
826 SIAM Journal of Applied Mathematics
827 SIAM Journal of Optimization
828 Socio-Economic Planning Sciences
829

B-Equivalent Publication Criteria

831
832 Some publications that do not meet the criteria for B-level journals may be
833 considered as B-equivalent publications and may substitute for a B-level journal
834 article. A limited number of such substitutions are allowed, as outlined in our
835 promotion and tenure document. The following publications may be considered as B-
836 equivalent.

- 837
- 838 1. A refereed book chapter or monograph published by a reputable publisher
 - 839 2. At least 3 peer reviewed international or national conference proceedings
840 papers
 - 841 3. At least 5 peer reviewed regional conference proceedings papers
 - 842 4. A textbook that goes through the editorial process, is published by a reputable
843 publisher, and is adopted by other schools
 - 844 5. At least 3 published cases
 - 845 6. Three or more C-level publications can count as a B-equivalent
 - 846 7. A publication that makes a significant contribution to education in our field
847 may be considered a B-equivalent. Evidence of significant contribution to
848 education may include:
 - 849 i. the teaching material is published and is used at several universities
 - 850 ii. the publication is cited in major text books
 - 851 iii. the publication is assigned reading at several universities

C-Level Publication Criteria

852
853
854 Publications that are not counted as A- or B-level journals are counted as C-level
855 publications.
856

C-Level Publications

857
858
859 The following are examples of CIS, MS, and OM C-level publications.
860

861 C-Level Publications (include but are not limited to the following)
862

863 BYTE Magazine
864 Coastal Business Journal
865 Computerworld
866 Datamation
867 Decision Line
868 Dr. Dobb's Journal
869 Information Week
870 Issues in Information Systems
871 OR/MS Today

872

Publications Category Process

874

875 The lists of A- and B- level journals may change over time. For purposes of
876 evaluating the level of an article by a faculty member, the journal's level will be taken
877 as either the level at the time of submission of the article or the journal's level at the
878 present time, whichever is higher. An article's level may be upwardly adjusted with
879 sufficient supportive evidence of impact (e.g., citation ratings), even if the journal did
880 not experience a rankings change.

881

Economics Department Steps from Annual Evaluation Letters to Merit Pay Allocation

Department of Economics met on March 13, 2002 and unanimously decided that the self-evaluation template (used in 2001-02 academic year) be used as a potential document for the merit pay determination. It was also decided that annual merit pay determination be based on a 3-year moving average of the points each individual faculty member receives in all three areas of evaluation namely, teaching, research and professional service. (This formal motion along with a copy of the self-evaluation template was submitted to the Dean of the College of Business for formal approval).

Faculty Evaluation Letters:

1. Faculty are evaluated in three areas with weights*
 - a. Teaching: 50%
 - b. Research: 30%
 - c. Service: 20%
2. The scores in each area range from 1-9
3. Distribution of Scores is the following:
 - a. Exceptional (designation will be changed to excellent in 2008): 7-9
 - b. Satisfactory: 4-6
 - c. Unsatisfactory: 0-3
4. Scores from all three areas are aggregated based on the weights for each area. (For example, if someone received a score of 9 in teaching, their weighted score will be $(9 \cdot .5 = 4.5)$).
5. Final weighted score for all three areas is reported (range is 1-9). The bottom of the letter reports three year moving average. The following years were used in July 2007 letters: 2004-5, 2005-6, 2006-7. (There was no merit pay awarded in 2008)

Merit Pay allocation for October 2007 was done on the following basis:

3-Year Moving Average	% Raise	No. of Faculty in each bracket
5.00-5.49	2.43	1
5.50-5.99		0
6.00-6.49	2.93	2
6.50-6.99	3.43	5
7.00-7.49	3.93	2
7.50-7.99	4.43	3
8.00-8.49		0
8.50-9.00	5.43	1
9.00+	5.94	1

*All faculty have 50% fixed weight for teaching. However, research-service weight combination might be changed somewhat for some faculty based on the arrangements made at least a year prior to the actual evaluation advance.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE DECISIONS
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY

Adopted Summer 1982

Amended May 1983, October 1983, April/May 1988,

May 1993, October 1996, May 2002, February 2009

I. INTRODUCTION

The following criteria are presented as sufficient conditions for promotion and tenure in the Department of Economics.

By stating that these criteria are sufficient conditions, the department means that any candidate satisfying the pertinent criteria shall receive positive recommendation of the P.A.C. for promotion and/or tenure without being required to produce additional evidence of performance beyond that described below. It is to be understood that a positive recommendation for the award of tenure shall be based on receipt of at least 1 rating of exceptional and 2 ratings of satisfactory in the three performance areas.

These criteria are explicitly not to be interpreted as necessary (minimum required) conditions for promotion and tenure decisions. Thus, a candidate who does not satisfy the criteria described below may still receive a positive recommendation of the P.A.C. for promotion and/or tenure. In such a circumstance, however, the candidate will be required to specify fully how and why her or his activities represent equivalent achievement which merits that positive recommendation.

It is the responsibility of the candidate for P.A.C. action to assemble and present data and supporting documentation for the use of the P.A.C. by September 20 (i.e., 30 days prior to the date by which the P.A.C. decision must be rendered, according to the J.M.U. Faculty Handbook).

For the purposes of this document, the following definitions apply.

1. BASE PERIOD = Time since:

(a) last promotion other than to Assistant Professor, or

(b) date of hiring if later than the date of last promotion other than to Assistant Professor or

(C) [as it pertains to research criteria for promotion to Full Professor], the day after the PAC last rendered a positive decision on promotion to Associate Professor and [as it pertains to teaching and service criteria for promotion to Full Professor], September 1 of the year that the PAC last rendered a positive decision on promotion to Associate Professor.

2. P.A.C. = The P.A.C. shall consist of those otherwise-eligible department members who agree in writing in advance to abide by the procedures detailed in this document. Such an agreement shall not be construed, however, as an abrogation of the individual's right to abstain on a particular vote as a member of the P.A.C. when the sufficient conditions have not been met. Non-tenured faculty members are excluded from voting on decisions regarding promotion to Full Professor, i.e., only tenured faculty members will vote on decisions regarding promotion to Full Professor. Also, non-tenured faculty members are excluded from voting on decisions regarding promotion to Associate Professor, i.e., only tenured faculty members will vote on decisions regarding promotion to Associate Professor.

II. AMENDMENT PROCEDURE

Any proposal to modify this document must be submitted to the departmental faculty at least two (2) weeks in advance of a meeting on that proposal. A proposal to amend will be approved when there are affirmative votes from at least two-thirds (2/3) of the full-time, tenure-track members of the department (excluding administrators and persons on leave). Friendly amendments to a written proposal to modify this document may be voted upon at the meeting to consider the proposal. Other amendments will be voted on no sooner than one week later. Absentee votes on written proposals will be accepted.

Any changes in the promotion and tenure standards for sufficient conditions for teaching, research and service shall take effect one year subsequent to their adoption.

All proposed changes to the "Attachment. . ." section of this document must fulfill the following set of requirements.

1. The proposal will be submitted, in writing, at least two weeks prior to the formal consideration by the Committee of the Whole to Revise the Promotion/Tenure Document.
2. The proposal must be signed by at least two full-time, tenure-track members of the Department of Economics.
3. A proposal is limited to one specific action item for a particular journal.
4. The proposal will be accompanied by a statement in writing that specifies the substantive basis for the proposed action.

III. TEACHING

Determination that a candidate for tenure or for promotion to Associate or Full Professor is either unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or exceptional, will be made by members of the PAC on the basis of their professional judgment and should be consideration of evidence drawn from the quality, appropriateness, thoroughness, and currentness of syllabi; outlines, exams, and other course materials; student evaluations, both written and numerical; grade point averages earned in courses; peer evaluations of classroom performance; performance of students on departmental or university assessment instruments, if available; data from exit interviews or alumni reports on teaching performance; innovativeness of teaching methods or techniques; and support for students writing

honors theses and independent studies projects.

IV. RESEARCH

A. Sufficient conditions for the various ratings are as follows:

1. Promotion to Associate Professor or Receipt of Tenure

Satisfactory: A stock of research consisting of two (2) articles and eight (8) research points in total.

Exceptional: A stock of research consisting of three (3) publications, two (2) of which must be articles, and sixteen (16) research points in total.

2. Promotion to Full Professor

Satisfactory: A stock of research consisting of three (3) articles and sixteen (16) research points in total.

Exceptional : A stock of research consisting of five (5) publications, three (3) of which must be articles, and thirty-two (32) research points in total.

B. NOTE: Research point totals must meet the following requirements:

1. Articles must account for at least 50% of the required total points.

2. Articles in ranked journals must account for at least 30% of the required total points.

3. For promotion to Full Professor, at least 40% of the required total points must have been earned in the base period and one article must be sole authored.

C. Research points may be earned according to the following scheme:

1. For articles accepted after 5/1/94

(I) Article in Top Ranked journal.....11 points

(ii) Article in Second Ranked journal.....7 points

(iii) Article in Third Ranked journal.....4 points

(iv) Article in other Journal indexed

in the Journal of Economic Literature.....2 points

(v) Article in other refereed economics or

cognate discipline journal.....1 point

2. For articles accepted after 3/1/88 and before 5/1/94

(I) Article in Top Ranked journal.....11 points

- (ii) Article in Second Ranked journal.....7 points
- (iii) Article in Third Ranked journal.....4 points
- (iv) Article in other journal listed in the
Journal of Economic Literature.....3 points
- (v) Article in other refereed economics or
cognate discipline journal*.....2-4 points

3. For articles accepted before 3/1/88

- (I) Article in Top Ranked journal.....11 points
- (ii) Article in Second Ranked journal.....8 points
- (iii) Article in Third Ranked journal.....6 points
- (iv) Article in Fourth Ranked journal.....4 points
- (v) Article in other journal listed in the
Journal of Economic Literature.....3 points
- (vi) Article in other refereed economics or
cognate discipline journal*.....2-4 points

*It is the responsibility of the candidate to specify and justify, using a published quantitative instrument of journal rankings, what he/she believes is the proper point assignment within the range of 2-4 points.

4. Lists of the specific journals comprising the categories (I)-(iv) (pre-3/1/88) and (i)-(iii) (post-3/1/88) are attached. The points assignable to any publication will be determined by the ranking categorization scheme in effect at the date of the publication's acceptance.

5. NOTE: A comment or note in a journal will be assigned one-half (1/2) of the points that would be assigned to an article in the same journal. Publications in journal categories (i) through (iv) [after 3/1/88] and (I) through (v) [before 3/1/88] which are sole authored will have their point values multiplied by a factor of 1.2.

D. Alternate research vehicles

Monographs, chapters in books, textbooks, published proceedings papers and book reviews are legitimate alternate research vehicles. However, given the differences in goals, audiences, and quality, it is virtually impossible for the department to design a weighting scheme or specify the appropriate rates of substitution between these alternate research vehicles. This, it must be the responsibility of the candidate to specify the points that he or she believes to be appropriate for an alternate research vehicle and to provide a justification for that point specification.

V. SERVICE

Determination that a candidate for tenure or for promotion to Associate or Full Professor is either unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or exceptional, will be made by the members of the PAC on the basis of their professional judgment. Entering into that judgment should be evidence regarding the quantity and quality of their service activities for the Department of Economics, the College of Business, James Madison University as a whole, the economics profession as a whole, the academic community as a whole, and the non-academic community at large, both locally and more widely.

VI. THIRD-YEAR REVIEWS OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

The PAC will conduct a "third year" evaluation of all tenure-track Faculty in the spring of the faculty member's third year at JMU. The faculty member will submit to the PAC (by March 1st of the third year) a report on his/her scholarship and service activity in addition to copies of course syllabi, examinations, student evaluations, a statement of the faculty member's teaching philosophy, and other materials related to teaching (including any materials requested by the PAC). The faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion with respect to teaching, research, and service will be evaluated and reported to the faculty member in the form of a letter (by April 15th). A copy of this letter will be placed in the faculty member's permanent file.

ATTACHMENT

Journal categories pertinent to the research criteria for promotion and tenure

IN RE: Categories pertinent to publications before 3/1/88.

The journals comprising categories (i) through (iv) have been identified by the unions of quality rankings appearing in the following sources: C. C. McDonough. "The Relative Quality of Economics Journals Revisited," *Quarterly Review of Economics and Business* (Spring 1975) 15:91-97 and R.G. Hawkins, L.S. Ritter and I. Walter. "What Economists Think of Their Journals," *Journal of Political Economy* (July/August 1973) 81:1017-1032. More specifically, the category (i) group is the union of the top 10 journals from each study; category (ii) is the union of 11th-20th journals; category (iii) is the union of the 21st-40th journals; and category (iv) is the union of all other journals ranked in either of the two studies.

The journals in category (v) are those not appearing in categories (i) through (iv) but which are regularly listed in the *Journal of Economic Literature*. This list was compiled by consulting 1 year of JEL issues beginning with volume 19, no. 3 (September 1981) and ending with volume 20, no. 2 (June 1982).

IN RE: Categories pertinent to publications 3/1/88 - 5/1/94.

The modified categorization scheme is based on the prior scheme and information in S.J. Liebowitz and J.P. Palmer. "Assessing the Relative Impacts of Economics Journals," *Journal of Economic Literature* (March 1984) 22:77-88.

Modification included reranking some journals, preserving the number of journals in the top-rated category, combining the second and third categories into a single rank, and expanding the enumeration of journals listed in the JEL by consulting 1 year of JEL issues beginning with volume 27, no. 3 (September 1989) and ending with volume 28, no. 2 (June 1990).

IN RE: Categories pertinent to publications after 5/1/94.

The modified categorization scheme is based on the prior scheme, on information in R.B. Archibald and D.H. Finifter. "Multivariate Citation Functions and Journal Rankings," *Eastern Economic Journal* (April-June 1990) 16:151-58, and on 1993 communication with the Editor of the *Journal of Economic Literature*. Modification included reranking some journals, reducing the points awarded to publications in lower ranked categories and shifting the responsibility to the candidate for demonstrating that a journal not in categories (i) to (iii) is JEL indexed.

Categories for publications prior to 3/1/88

(i) TOP RANKED

American Economic Review

Economic Journal

Econometrica

Economica

International Economic Review

Journal of Economic Theory

Journal of Political Economy
Journal of the American Statistical Association
Oxford Economic Papers
Quarterly Journal of Economics
Review of Economics and Statistics
Review of Economic Studies
(ii) SECOND RANKED
Annals of Mathematical Statistics
Canadian Journal of Economics
Economic Development and Cultural Change
Journal of Money, Credit and Banking
Journal of Business
Journal of Economic History
Journal of Economic Literature
Journal of Finance
Journal of Law and Economics
Journal of International Economics
Kyklos
Southern Economic Journal
(iii) THIRD RANKED
Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science
Banca nazionale del Lavoro
Quarterly Review
Bell Journal
Economic Inquiry
Economic Record
Economia Internazionale
Harvard Business Review
Industrial and Labor Relations Review
Journal of Applied Economics
Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis
Journal of Human Resources
Journal of Industrial Economics
Journal of Regional Science
Land Economics
Management Science
Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies
National Tax Journal
Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics
Public Choice
Public Finance
Public Interest
Quarterly Review of Economics and Business
Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv
(iv) FOURTH RANKED
American Journal of Economics and Sociology
Antitrust Bulletin
Applied Economics
Banker
Business Economics
European Economic Review
Economic Geography
Financial Analysts Journal
Finanz-Archiv
Growth and Change

Indian Economic Review

Industrial Relations
Inter-American Economic Affairs
International Development Review
Journal of Development Studies
Journal of Developing Areas
Journal of Econometrics
Journal of Economic Education
Journal of Economic Issues
Journal of Environmental Economics and Management
Journal of Monetary Economics
Journal of Urban Economics
Lloyds Bank Review
Metroeconomica
Moorgates Wall Street
National Westminster Bank Review
Public Policy (Now: Journal of Policy Analysis & Management)
Regional Science Assoc. Papers and Proceedings
Review of Income and Wealth
Review of Radical Political Economy
Review of Social Economy
Science and Society
Scottish Journal of Political Economy
Sloan Management Review
South African Journal of Economics
Three Banks Review
Tijdschrift Voor Economie en Management
Trans-Action
Yorkshire Bulletin of Economic and Social Research
Zeitschrift für die Gesamte
Stratswissenschaft
Zeitschrift Nationalökonomie

Categories for publications 3/1/88 - 5/1/94

(i) TOP RANKED

American Economic Review

Economic Journal

Econometrica

Economica

International Economic Review

Journal of Economic Literature

Journal of Economic Theory

Journal of Monetary Economics

Journal of Political Economy

Quarterly Journal of Economics

Review of Economics and Statistics

Review of Economic Studies

(ii) SECOND RANKED

Bell Journal (NOW: Rand Journal of Economics)

Brookings Papers on Economic Activity

Canadian Journal of Economics

Economic Development and Cultural Change

Economic Inquiry

Economic Record

Industrial and Labor Relations Review

Journal of Accounting Research

Journal of Business

Journal of Econometrics

Journal of Economic History

Journal of Finance

Journal of Financial and

Quantitative Analysis

Journal of Financial Economics

Journal of Human Resources

Journal of Industrial Economics

Journal of International Economics

Journal of Law and Economics

Journal of Legal Studies

Journal of Mathematical Economics

Journal of Money, Credit and Banking

Journal of Public Economics

Journal of Regional Science

Journal of Urban Economics

Journal of the American Statistical Association

Kyklos

Land Economics

Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies

National Tax Journal

Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics

Oxford Economic Papers

Public Choice

Public Finance

Quarterly Review of Economics and Business

Scandinavian Journal of Economics

Southern Economic Journal

Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv

(iii) THIRD RANKED

American Journal of Agricultural Economics

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science
Annals of Mathematical Statistics
Applied Economics
Banca Nazionale del Lavoro
Quarterly Review
British Journal of Industrial Relations
Economia Internazionale
Economic Geography
Economics Letters
European Economic Review
Explorations in Economic History
Harvard Business Review
History of Political Economy
Industrial Relations
Inquiry
Journal of Applied Economics
Journal of Consumer Research
Journal of Development Economics
Journal of Development Studies
Journal of Developing Areas
Journal of Economic Education
Journal of Economic Issues
Journal of Economics and Business
Journal of Environmental Economics and Management
Journal of Risk and Insurance
Journal of Royal Statistical Society Association A & B
Lloyds Bank Review
Management Science
Monthly Labor Review
Nebraska Journal of Economics and Business

Public Policy (Now: Journal of Policy Analysis & Management)

Public Interest

Regional Science and Urban Economics

Review of Social Economy

Science and Society

Scottish Journal of Political Economy

Sloan Management Review

Urban Studies

Yale Law Journal

Categories for publications 5/1//94 - 7/1/95

(i) TOP RANKED

American Economic Review

Economic Journal

Econometrica

Economica

International Economic Review

Journal of Economic Literature

Journal of Economic Theory

Journal of Monetary Economics

Journal of Political Economy

Quarterly Journal of Economics

Review of Economics and Statistics

Review of Economic Studies

(ii) SECOND RANKED

Brookings Papers on Economic Activity

Canadian Journal of Economics

Economic Development and Cultural Change

Economic Inquiry

Economic Record

Industrial and Labor Relations Review

Journal of Accounting Research

Journal of Business

Journal of the American Statistical Association

Journal of Econometrics

Journal of Economic History

Journal of Economic Perspectives

Journal of Finance

Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis

Journal of Financial Economics

Journal of Human Resources

Journal of Industrial Economics

Journal of International Economics

Journal of Law and Economics

Journal of Legal Studies

Journal of Mathematical Economics

Journal of Money Credit and Banking

Journal of Public Economics

Journal of Regional Science

Journal of Urban Economics

Kyklos

Land Economics

Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies

National Tax Journal

Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics

Oxford Economic Papers

Public Choice

Public Finance
Scandinavian Journal of Economics
Southern Economic Journal
Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv
(iii) THIRD RANKED
American Journal of Agricultural Economics
American Journal of Economics and Sociology
Applied Economics
British Journal of Industrial Relations
Cambridge Journal of Economics
Carnegie-Rochester Series on Public Policy
Economic Geography
Economic History Review
Economics Letters
European Economic Review
Explorations in Economic History
History of Political Economy
Industrial Relations
Inquiry
International Journal of Industrial Organization
International Monetary Fund Staff Papers
Journal of Business and Economic Statistics
Journal of Comparative Economics
Journal of Consumer Research
Journal of Developing Areas
Journal of Development Economics
Journal of Development Studies
Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization
Journal of Economic Education

Journal of Economic Issues
Journal of Economics and Business
Journal of Environmental Economics and Management
Journal of Health Economics
Journal of International Money and Finance
Journal of Labor Economics
Journal of Post Keynesian Economics
Journal of Risk and Insurance
Journal of Royal Statistical
Society Association A & B
Lloyds Bank Review
Monthly Labor Review
Nebraska Journal of Economics and Business
Public Finance Quarterly
Quarterly Review of Economics and Business
Regional Science and Urban Economics
Review of Income and Wealth
Review of Social Economy
Science and Society
Scottish Journal of Political Economy
Sloan Management Review
Urban Studies
Yale Law Journal
Categories for publications after 7/1/95
(i) TOP RANKED
American Economic Review
Economic Journal
Econometrica
International Economic Review
Journal of Economic Literature
Journal of Economic Theory
Journal of Finance
Journal of Financial Economics
Journal of Monetary Economics
Journal of Political Economy
Quarterly Journal of Economics
Rand Journal of Economics
Review of Economics and Statistics
Review of Economic Studies
(ii) SECOND RANKED
Brookings Papers on Economic Activity
Canadian Journal of Economics
Economic Inquiry
Economics Letters
Economica
Economic Record
International Journal of Industrial Organization
Industrial and Labor Relations Review
Journal of Accounting Research
Journal of Banking and Finance
Journal of Business
Journal of the American Statistical Association
Journal of Business and Economic Statistics
Journal of Econometrics
Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control

Journal of Economic History
Journal of Economic Perspectives
Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis
Journal of Human Resources
Journal of Industrial Economics
Journal of International Economics
Journal of Labor Economics
Journal of Law and Economics
Journal of Legal Studies
Journal of Mathematical Economics
Journal of Money Credit and Banking
Journal of Public Economics
Journal of Regional Science
Journal of Urban Economics
Kyklos
Land Economics
Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies
National Tax Journal
Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics
Oxford Economic Papers
Public Choice
Public Finance
Scandinavian Journal of Economics
Social Choice and Welfare
Southern Economic Journal
Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv
(iii) THIRD RANKED

American Journal of Agricultural Economics
American Journal of Economics and Sociology
Applied Economics
British Journal of Industrial Relations
Cambridge Journal of Economics
Carnegie-Rochester Series on Public Policy
Cato Journal
Demography
Eastern Economic Journal
Econometric Theory
Economic Development and Cultural Change
Economic Geography
Economic History Review
Economic Record
European Economic Review
Explorations in Economic History
History of Political Economy
Industrial Relations
Inquiry
International Monetary Fund Staff Papers
Journal of Comparative Economics
Journal of Consumer Research
Journal of Developing Areas
Journal of Development Economics
Journal of Development Studies
Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization
Regional Science and Urban Economics
Journal of Economic Issues
Journal of Economics and Business
Journal of Environmental Economics and Management
Journal of Financial Research
Journal of Forecasting
Journal of Health Economics
Journal of International Business Studies
Journal of International Money and Finance
Journal of Labor Research
Journal of Macroeconomics
Journal of Post Keynesian Economics
Journal of Risk and Insurance
Journal of Royal Statistical Society Association A & B
Monthly Labor Review
Population and Development Review
Public Finance Quarterly
Quarterly Review of Economics and Business
Review of Income and Wealth
Review of Social Economy
Science and Society
Scottish Journal of Political Economy
Sloan Management Review
Urban Studies
World Economy
Yale Law Journal

Categories for publication after 7/1/06

FIRST RANKED

American Economic Review
Econometrica
Economic Journal
International Economic Review
Journal of Econometrics
Journal of Economic Literature
Journal of Economic Perspectives
Journal of Economic Theory
Journal of Financial Economics
Journal of Monetary Economics
Journal of Political Economy
Quarterly Journal of Economics
RAND Journal of Economics
Review of Economics and Statistics
Review of Economic Studies

SECOND RANKED

Brookings Papers on Economic
Activity
Canadian Journal of Economics
Econometric Theory
Economic Inquiry
Economic Theory
Economica
Economics Letters
European Economic Review
Games and Economic Behavior
International Journal of
Industrial Organization
Journal of Business and
Economic Statistics
Journal of Development Economics
Journal of Economic Behavior
and Organization
Journal of Economic Dynamics
and Control
Journal of Economic Education
Journal of Economic Growth
Journal of Economic History
Journal of Finance
Journal of Human Resources
Journal of Industrial Economics
Journal of International Economics
Journal of International Money and
Finance
Journal of Labor Economics
Journal of Law and Economics

Journal of Money, Credit and Banking
Journal of Public Economics
Journal of Urban Economics
Land Economics
Macroeconomic Dynamics
National Tax Journal
NBER Macroeconomics Annual
Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics
Oxford Economic Papers
Public Choice
Review of Economic Dynamics
Review of Financial Studies
Scandinavian Journal of Economics
Social Choice and Welfare
Southern Economic Journal
Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv
THIRD RANKED
American Journal of Agricultural
Economics
Journal of Economics and Business
Journal of Economics and Management
Strategy

American Journal of Economics and Sociology
Applied Economics
British Journal of Industrial Relations
Cambridge Journal of Economics
Cato Journal
Eastern Economic Journal
Economic Development and Cultural Change
Ecological Economics
Economic Geography
Economic History Review
Economic Policy
Economic Record
Economics of Education Review
Environmental and Resource Economics
Explorations in Economic History
Health Economics
History of Political Economy
Industrial and Labor Relations
Review
Industrial Relations
Inquiry
International Journal of
Game Theory
International Monetary Fund
Staff Papers
International Tax and Public
Finance
Journal of Accounting and Economics
Journal of Banking and Finance
Journal of Business
Journal of Comparative Economics
Journal of Development Studies
Journal of Economic Issues
Journal of Economics and Business
Journal of Environmental Economics
and Management
Journal of Financial and Quantitative
Analysis
Journal of Forecasting
Journal of Health Economics
Journal of Japanese and International
Economics
Journal of Labor Research
Journal of Macroeconomics
Journal of Policy Analysis and
Management
Journal of Post Keynesian Economics
Journal of Regional Science

Journal of the American Statistical
Association
Kyklos
Labour Economics
Manchester School
Monthly Labor Review
Oxford Review of Economic Policy
Population and Development Review
Public Finance Quarterly
Quarterly Review of Economics and
Finance
Regional Science and Urban
Economics
Review of Income and Wealth
Review of Industrial Organization
Review of Social Economy
Science and Society
Scottish Journal of Political Economy
World Bank Economic Review
World Development
World Economy

FINANCE & BUSINESS LAW PROGRAM ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

An annual evaluation of each faculty member's performance shall be conducted by the program director each year. This document will serve as a guide for the program director and faculty members in the evaluation process and as a guideline for categorizing items in each of the three evaluation areas. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide documentation supporting the inclusion of an item in any category.

The annual evaluation will be based on faculty performance over the preceding three year period. Therefore, each item to be considered should appear on three successive annual evaluation documents but not more than three.

For annual evaluation purposes, faculty members must submit a complete package of materials for evaluation to the program director on or before May 15. The materials to be supplied by the faculty member are detailed within this document. If required documentation is not included in the initial package, the program director is not obligated to consider an item in the faculty member's annual evaluation. In addition, a faculty member must submit on or before May 15 an annual plan which sets forth objectives in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications and professional service for the next academic year. The plan must meet with the approval of the program director. The program director will notify the faculty member by June 15 if the plan is not approved. The annual plan is to be a working document which may be amended up until the annual evaluation packet is submitted.

The program director should, at the earliest possible date, communicate to the faculty, either by memo or in a program meeting, the percentage raise allocation for the program as a whole, the percentage allocated for across the board raises and the percentage for merit raises.

A preliminary written evaluation will be given to each faculty member by the program director prior to the evaluation conference. A final written evaluation and determination of the faculty member's salary for the upcoming year would not be made until after the evaluation conference. This procedure will allow points of contention to be addressed before final decisions concerning raises are made by the program director. The official written evaluation must be given to the faculty member by October 1.

Faculty members will be independently evaluated in each of the three functional areas: teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications and professional service. An individual's overall evaluation will be determined by taking a weighted score of the rating in each of the three areas. The program director shall include the method used in determining the relative evaluation of the members of the program with each faculty member's evaluation.

Data on a faculty member's performance shall be determined in the same manner for each faculty member in the program. A spreadsheet for tabulating the data is attached to this document. This spreadsheet shall be used by the program director until such time that the program director presents an alternative method for tabulation to the program faculty at the beginning of the evaluation period.

The numeric score earned by a faculty member shall be the basis for determining the qualitative ratings of excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in each area. The determination of the numeric scores necessary for exceptional and satisfactory ratings shall be within the discretion of the program director. In no case shall a faculty member with a higher numeric score than another faculty member receive a lower qualitative rating.

Appeal of an annual evaluation is to the AUPAC. Notice of appeal is to be made in writing to the chair of the AUPAC within seven days of receiving the official written evaluation by the program director. The appeal must be heard and a decision rendered by October 21.

The AUPAC shall be composed of all tenured faculty members of the program with more than two years residence in a tenure track position at JMU. Faculty members with actions pending before the AUPAC shall not serve on the AUPAC for that year.

A succession of satisfactory or exceptional annual evaluations in teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications or professional service is not conclusive evidence that the faculty member's work is satisfactory or exceptional for purposes of tenure or promotion.

TEACHING

Many of the variables in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness are not quantifiable. To insure that these variables are considered along with those that are quantifiable, the following items which reflect on teaching effectiveness should be considered where applicable.

Subject to the constraints indicated, each faculty member shall choose the weights to be placed on each of the following four evaluative areas of teaching, for a total of 100 percent.

I. Student Evaluations: Weight 20% - 45%

In addition to the numeric data, written comments may be taken into account in this area of teaching evaluation. Faculty members shall be given copies of all forms seeking written student comments.

Other factors may be considered when student evaluations are assessed. The faculty member may include any factors that are relevant to the numerical scores and the student written comments in the self-reported annual evaluation package of materials.

II. Teaching Methods: Weight 30% - 45%

- Inclusion of writing and problem-solving assignments
- Inclusion of oral presentations in courses
- Use of technology in courses (e.g. online courses, Web site development/maintenance, Web-based learning)
- Group and individual projects
- Use of essay, problem, and short answer examinations where class size permits.
- Significant and relevant reading assignments, other than the textbook, on which the student is either tested or prepares a written report
- Other

III. Teaching Workload: Weight 0% - 45%

- Class size and/or the total number of students taught per year
- Number of preparations taught per year, including recognition of the difficulty inherent in teaching courses infrequently or on an as-needed basis
- Frequency that a faculty member teaches a course
- Number of new preparations. (A new preparation would be one which the faculty member had not taught in two years or where course content has changed substantially due to external factors.) New preparation includes adoption and/or adaptation of course materials (e.g. new textbook, cases, readings, etc.).
- Number of functional areas taught
- Team teaching
- Preparation of original teaching materials
- Other

IV. Other Factors: Weight 10% - 45%

- Cooperation with the Program Director in teaching and scheduling of courses for the accomplishment of Program and College objectives and needs
- Supervision of independent study courses and honors theses
- Supervision of internships
- Other factors, which this document does not address, that enhance teaching effectiveness

SCHOLARLY ACHIEVMENT AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

A faculty member must include the entire original issue of the journal in which an article appears; a copy of the paper presented; the entire official program of the meeting at which a paper is presented; and the entire official program of the meeting at which the faculty member participates in a panel discussion. Original documents are to be returned to the faculty member after the evaluation process is complete.

Although it is frequently difficult to evaluate scholarly effort, the following categorizations will serve as a guideline for determining the relative merit of the various activities and research contributions of a faculty member. Each category contains an “other” item which will allow the faculty member to present the case for a particular effort to be included in that category when such an effort is not specifically mentioned. When doubt exists about the appropriate category to which an item belongs, the faculty member should discuss the categorization with the program director.

Since it is both necessary and desirable to rate scholarship on a qualitative as well as a quantitative basis, the Program Director will distinguish between scholarly effort both across and within the A, B and C categories. Each Category A effort will receive a score between 61 and 100, each Category B effort a score between 26 and 60 and each Category C effort a score between 5 and 25. In assigning a point value, the Program Director will consider the quality of the outlet for a scholarly effort.

Quality of a journal will be judged on the basis of:

- Quality and reputation of the publishing organization.
- Composition of the editorial advisory board.
- Quality of other articles published in the journal.
- Physical quality of the journal (i.e. desk top publishing vs. professional publishing house).

Quality of an association will be judged on the basis of:

- Prestige of the officers and members of the board of directors.
- Quality of the publication(s) of the association.
- Quality of the meeting as reflected in the official program of the meeting.

A general definition of each of the categories as to scholarly work is:

CATEGORY A: To be included in this category the item must represent a significant contribution to the discipline.

CATEGORY B: To be included in this category the item must represent a valued contribution to the discipline.

CATEGORY C: To be included in this category the item must represent a relevant scholarly effort.

CATEGORY A 61 – 100 points per item

- Books – text or professional
- Articles published in prestigious refereed journals
- Articles in law reviews published by prestigious law schools
- Research monographs published by national professional associations, academic associations, major research foundations or federal agencies
- Major research grants obtained from a source external to the University and awarded on basis of competitive research proposals. (Faculty member must submit a complete copy of the R.F.P. and a letter acknowledging receipt of the research grant).
- Articles in selected readings book or chapter contributions to state of the art books (listed as author).
- Other

CATEGORY B 26 – 60 points per item

- Articles published in recognized refereed journals
- Articles in law reviews published by recognized law schools
- Textbook revisions
- Substantial textbook ancillary materials (listed as author)
- Professional and academic papers presented at meetings of prestigious associations This category could include some regional meetings.
- Earned prestigious professional certifications (e.g. CFA, admission to the bar)
- Invited panel member at meetings of prestigious associations. The faculty member must have been invited to participate on the basis of a distinguished academic record or other clear evidence of expertise in the area. Panels should typically consist of a small number of participants all of whom have been invited based on their reputation. This item specifically excludes the typical discussant or session chair role, as well as, the typical round table discussion where participant is one of many.
- Research monographs published by state agencies
- Other

CATEGORY C 5 – 25 points per item

- Any non-A or B publication that represents scholarly effort
- Published book reviews (either listed as author or submit documentation)
- Papers presented at the meetings of other recognized academic or professional associations. This category will include most regional meetings.
- Other

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Service is any activity which contributes to the accomplishment of the mission of JMU, the COB, the Finance & Business Law Program or other COB program in which the faculty member teaches. These activities can be a service to JMU, the profession or the community. The following categories identify the relative importance of some of the items which are generally considered to constitute faculty service.

The quality of an association will be judged on the basis of:

- Prestige of the officers and members of the board of directors.
- Quality of the publication(s) of the association.
- Quality of the meeting as reflected in the official program of the meeting.

CATEGORY A 61 – 100 points per item

1. Professional service

- Prestigious professional associations: major officer and/or member of the board of directors
- Major consulting projects that bring significant recognition to JMU

2. University, College, Program Service

- Member of a committee which requires a work effort substantially above and beyond the typical committee
- Faculty advisor to student organizations that require a work effort substantially above and beyond that of a typical faculty advisor

3. Public service

- A major leadership role in charitable and community organizations, which brings significant recognition to JMU

4. Other prestigious service activities

CATEGORY B 26 – 60 points per item

1. Professional service

- Prestigious professional associations: member of association committee
- Recognized professional association: major officer or member of the board of directors
- Member of the editorial board of Category A journal

2. University, College, Program Service
 - Committee service at all levels in the university. It is difficult to rank committee assignments since an ad hoc departmental committee may involve more work and make a greater contribution than a standing university committee. It must therefore be up to the faculty member to indicate the significance of committee assignments to be included as a Category B item.
3. Public service
 - Other significant service to charitable and community organizations which brings significant recognition to JMU
4. Other significant service activities

CATEGORY C 5 – 25 points per item

1. Professional Service
 - Recognized professional associations: member of association committee
 - Member of editorial board of Category B journal
 - Ad hoc reviewer for journal. Copies of the reviews as well as the articles reviewed and the request to review must be provided.
 - Discussant or chair at meetings of recognized associations
2. University, College, Program Service
 - All other committee service at all levels in the university
3. Public service
 - Other service to charitable and community organizations which brings recognition to JMU
4. Other service activities

CATEGORY D 5 - 10 points per item

Cooperation with the program director in accepting service assignments necessary for accomplishment of the program objectives.

Merit Algorithm

Department of Finance and Business Law

The current evaluation document for the department details “points” that faculty earn for various measured accomplishments, which result in a score for the academic year. The document does not prescribe how these scores translate in to merit raises, but rather communicates that three years should be considered and that the scores should be weighted by the allocations chosen by the faculty member.

Step 1 Calculate scores according to the Department’s Annual Evaluation Guidelines.

Step 2 Rank faculty based on the weighted average scores for the past three years.

- The weights are the weights chosen by faculty for the teaching, research, and service allocations.
- As a check, ranked faculty on the basis of most recent year’s scores and the standardized 3-year score.

Step 3 Determined cutoffs in the three year average weighted scores based on rankings and scores.

- There were five natural clusters based on the scores.
- The ranking using the three-year average, and hence the merit allocation, does not differ significantly from the most recent year’s rankings.¹

Step 4 Allocate raises.

- Based on merit percentages to the five clusters, using 75 basis points (i.e., 0.75%) increments from 2.75%.

¹ The system set forth using the department’s guidelines is not instructive with respect to faculty who have not been on the faculty for less than three years. Therefore, rankings for the appropriate one or two years that a faculty member has been on the faculty were used in place of the three-year average.

1 **Department of Finance and Business Law**
2 **James Madison University**

3
4 **PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES, CRITERIA AND STANDARDS**

5
6 **I. PROCEDURES**

7
8 **A. Responsibilities of the Candidate**

9
10 Each member of the faculty is expected to contribute to the achievement of the
11 Department of Finance and Business Law's (Academic Unit's) mission through his or her
12 teaching and academic advising; research and/or scholarly achievement; and service.
13 Faculty who are candidates for promotion and/or tenure are expected to submit a
14 summary of activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly
15 achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service to the Academic
16 Unit's Department Head and the Academic Unit's Personnel Advisory Committee
17 (AUPAC) Chairman by October 1.
18

19
20 **B. Responsibilities of the Department Head and PAC**

21
22 The Department Head and AUPAC shall make independent evaluations of the facts and
23 make independent recommendations for promotion and/or tenure based on the criteria
24 outlined in this document. However, communication between the two is encouraged.
25 The written recommendations of the Department Head and AUPAC shall include a
26 justification of their conclusions. The recommendations shall be submitted to the COB
27 Dean by November 15 and a copy of both recommendations shall concurrently be
28 provided to the faculty member.
29

30 **II: CRITERIA AND STANDARDS**

31
32
33 The James Madison University Faculty Handbook states that promotion to Associate
34 Professor requires that a candidate's performance be evaluated as excellent in at least one
35 of the three functional areas (i.e., teaching, research, and service) and at least satisfactory
36 in the other two areas. The Handbook also states that Promotion to Professor requires
37 that a candidate's performance be evaluated as excellent in at least two of the functional
38 areas and at least satisfactory in the third area.
39

40 **A. Teaching**

41
42 **1. Criteria** Teaching is a multifaceted activity including among other factors, course
43 design and delivery, curriculum development, currency in the subject matter taught and
44 interaction with students. The evaluation is to consider as many criteria and sources of
45 information as practicable and is to take a broad view of the activities that constitute
46 effective teaching.
47

48 **2. Evaluation Standards For Teaching**

49

50 **Excellent Teaching:** Fulfillment of the criteria for satisfactory teaching performance in
51 an exemplary manner is required for an excellent rating in teaching. Additionally,
52 evidence of a strong, sustained commitment to teaching is expected. The Department
53 Head and the AUPAC will use discretion in making a final determination of excellence in
54 teaching. In order to be considered for an excellent rating in teaching the faculty member
55 must provide evidence, include supporting documentation, demonstrating that the faculty
56 member has gone above and beyond departmental expectations for satisfactory teaching.
57 Some indicators of excellent teaching include:

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

- development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials,
- development of new courses,
- major revision of existing courses,
- serving as chair of a student's honors thesis committee,
- teaching awards,
- outstanding student evaluations,
- unsolicited testimonials from former students and employers,
- invited evaluations of classroom performance by the department head or AUPAC,
- publication of widely-adopted and/or acclaimed instructional materials.

71

72

73

74

75

76

There are many paths to the achievement of an excellent rating in teaching. None of these indicators, in and of themselves, is either necessary or sufficient evidence of excellent teaching performance. The faculty member may provide evidence, including supporting documentation, to demonstrate excellent teaching.

77

78

79

Satisfactory Teaching: Satisfactory teaching is defined as effectively meeting the following standards:

80

Pedagogy

81

82

83

- stimulating student learning and interest in the subject matter,
- providing instruction at a level of rigor appropriate to the subject matter,
- meeting course learning outcomes.

84

Organization

85

86

87

88

89

- being well prepared for class,
- informing students of course objectives, assignments, and examination procedures,
- conducting the class in a well-organized manner,
- communicating the subject matter clearly.

90

Interaction with students

91

92

- maintaining scheduled office hours,
- providing career advising to students.

- 93 Evaluation
- 94 • maintaining fair and impartial grading standards,
 - 95 • providing timely feedback on progress.
- 96 Curriculum and course content
- 97 • staying current with the subject matter of courses taught,
 - 98 • participation in department activities to assess and update the curriculum.
- 99

100

101 None of these indicators, in and of themselves, is either necessary or sufficient evidence
102 of satisfactory teaching performance. The faculty member may provide evidence,
103 include supporting documentation, demonstrating satisfactory teaching.

104

105

106

107 **B. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY**

108

109 **1. Criteria** The following paragraphs reflect the broad dimensions of research/scholarly
110 accomplishments and intellectual contributions as defined by the AACSB.

111

112 **Basic Scholarship:** The creation of new knowledge.

113

114 Evidence of basic scholarship activities may include publication in refereed journals,
115 research monographs, scholarly books, chapters in scholarly books, proceedings from
116 scholarly meetings, papers presented at academic meetings, publicly available research
117 working papers, and papers presented at faculty research seminars.

118

119 **Applied Scholarship:** The application, transfer and interpretation of knowledge to
120 improve practice and teaching in the field.

121

122 Evidence of applied scholarship activities may include publication in professional
123 journals, public/trade journals, in-house journals, professional presentations, book
124 reviews, and papers presented at faculty workshops.

125

126 **Instructional Development:** The enhancement of the educational value of instructional
127 efforts of the institution or discipline.

128

129 Evidence of instructional development activities may include textbooks, publications in
130 pedagogical journals, written cases with instructional materials, instructional software,
131 and publicly available materials describing the design and implementation of new
132 courses.

133

134 There are additional activities and accomplishments that do not fall neatly into one of the
135 three categories listed above. These include, but are not limited to, research grants,
136 membership on editorial boards, ad hoc reviews, participation as a discussant at
137 professional meetings, professional certification, and other professional awards. In
138 addition, these three areas of contribution are not synonymous with the publications

139 categories designated A or B or B equivalency elsewhere in this document (e.g., it is
140 possible to have a Level B achievement in basic research, applied research, or
141 instructional development).

142

143 Faculty members must meet the minimum standards for satisfactory research to be
144 considered for tenure and promotion. Research counted towards tenure and promotion
145 includes works published while employed at JMU. Faculty who are hired at JMU and
146 have been given credit toward tenure will use works published at JMU and works
147 published during the credited period.

148

149 The AUPAC will maintain a publicly available appendix, Appendix A, that will provide
150 examples of journals and their rating by the department. This appendix will be updated
151 every three years in conjunction with the update of the corresponding appendix in the
152 annual evaluation document. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion may elect to have a
153 publication ranked by the standards of another department in the College of Business,
154 when appropriate. Journals will be classified according to the following ratings:

155

156

157 **Premier-Level Scholarly Work**

158

159 Premier publications are peer-reviewed articles published by the most prestigious
160 journals in their field. These journals are characterized by exceptionally high visibility
161 and an international reputation. One premier level publication is equivalent to three B-
162 level publications.

163

164

165 **A-Level Scholarly Work**

166

167 A-level scholarly work consists of peer reviewed articles, or their equivalent, that are
168 published in journals with a national or international reputation. These articles are
169 published in the top journals in their field and/or otherwise significantly enhance the
170 prestige of the department or college. One A-level scholarly work is equivalent to two B-
171 level articles.

172

173

174

175 **B-Level Scholarly Work**

176

177 B-level scholarly work consists of peer-reviewed articles which add something new to the
178 body of knowledge or their equivalent (such as authorship of a textbook).

179

180

181 **C-Level Scholarly Work**

182

183 C-Level scholarly work is visible in the professional community, work toward
184 publication that has not reached its conclusion, or similar activities (such as the

185 publication of a study guide). No accumulation of C-level activities may be regarded as
186 equivalent to a B-level publication.

187

188 For all publications considered, number of co-authors and/or authorship ordering on a
189 given paper will not bias the determination of an individual faculty member's
190 contribution. The value of a scholarly work shall be determined in the year in which it
191 was accepted for publication. Subsequent changes in the relative value of journals shall
192 not change the value of the contribution.

193

194

195

196

197 **2. Evaluation Standards for Scholarship**

198

199

200 **Excellent Scholarship:**

201

202 **For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or the granting of tenure**, the
203 minimum requirement for an excellent evaluation in the area of Research and Scholarly
204 Activity is the following:

205

206 A minimum of six B-level articles or equivalent, as described in Appendix A,
207 accepted for publication plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort.
208 At least one article that contributes to the total count must be a Premier-level or
209 A-level publication.

210

211

212 **For promotion to the rank of Professor**, the minimum requirement for an excellent
213 evaluation in the area of Research and Scholarly Activity is the following:

214

215 A minimum of eleven B-level articles or equivalent, as described in Appendix A,
216 accepted for publication plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort.
217 At least two articles that contribute to the total count must be Premier-level or A-
218 level publications, and at least one of these contributions must have been accepted
219 for publication since the application for Associate Professor.

220

221 *For example, seven B-level publications plus two A-level publications,*
222 *combined with ongoing scholarly effort, would result in an excellent rating in the*
223 *area of scholarship for the promotion to Professor, provided at least one of the A*
224 *or premier publications was accepted for publication subsequent to the*
225 *attainment of the rank of Associate Professor. Similarly, a rating of excellent may*
226 *be achieved by one premier publication, one A-level publication, and six B-level*
227 *publications, provided at least one of the A or premier publications was accepted*
228 *for publication subsequent to the application for the rank of Associate Professor.*

229

230

231 **Satisfactory Scholarship:**

232

233 **For promotion to Associate Professor and/or the granting of tenure**, the minimum
234 requirement for a satisfactory evaluation in the area of Research and Scholarly Activity is
235 the following:

236

237 A minimum of four B-level publications or equivalent, as described in Appendix
238 A, plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort.

239

240 **For the promotion to the rank of Professor**, the minimum requirement for a
241 satisfactory evaluation in the area of Research and Scholarly Activity is the following:

242

243 A minimum of seven B-level publications, or equivalent, as described in
244 Appendix A, plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort. At least
245 one article that contributes to the total count must be an A-level or premiere-level
246 publication, and at least one B-level contribution or its equivalent must have been
247 published since application for the rank of associate professor.

248

249 *For example, five B-level publications plus one A-level publication, combined*
250 *with ongoing scholarly effort, would result in a satisfactory rating in the area of*
251 *scholarship for the promotion to Professor, so long as one B-level publication or*
252 *its equivalent had been published since the application for the rank of associate*
253 *professor. Similarly, a satisfactory rating may be achieved by one premier*
254 *publication, one A-level publication, and two B-level publications.*

255

256

257

258

259

260 **C. SERVICE**

261

262 **1. Criteria**

263

264 **Level 1 Service:** Level 1 service is defined primarily as activity that involves a
265 significant time commitment. Secondary indicators of Level 1 service are 1) a high level
266 of personal responsibility; 2) involvement in activities that are critical to the mission of
267 the program, college, university, or professional organization; 3) distinguishing oneself in
268 a leadership role, whether elected or appointed; 4) serving, with distinction, one's
269 profession and/or the external community in a role that exploits one's professional
270 knowledge, skills, and talents; 5) "making a difference" in those areas in which one has
271 chosen to serve; 6) being widely recognized as one who has an exemplary attitude
272 towards service commitments and who serves as a role model for other faculty. Level 1
273 service does not require the presence of each secondary indicator of excellent
274 performance. In all cases there should be evidence of a substantial contribution and an
275 active role.

276

277 Examples of Level 1 service include:

278

- 279 • chair of a recruiting committee,
- 280 • major responsibility for significant curriculum reform,
- 281 • Speaker of Faculty Senate,
- 282 • program/track chair for a regional conference,
- 283 • Chair of AACSB or SACS re-accreditation efforts or other important university
- 284 committee,
- 285 • Chair of a program review committee,
- 286 • faculty advisor to an active, successful student organization,
- 287 • high-level office and or responsibility in a prestigious regional or national
- 288 organization.

289

290

291 **Level 2 Service:** Level 2 service is defined as important activities in support of one's
292 program, the department, college, university, or the profession that involve a moderate to
293 significant time commitment. It is anticipated that most of a faculty member's service
294 activities will fall into this category.

295

296 Examples of Level 2 service activities include:

297

- 298 • member of program, college, university committee, or Faculty Senate,
- 299 • proceedings editor for a regional conference, book review editor for a journal
- 300 • active participation in curriculum development,
- 301 • participation in university-sponsored programs,
- 302 • member of the program committee for a regional conference,
- 303 • actively engaging the industry in program activities.

304

305

306

307 **Level 3 Service:** Level 3 service is defined as participation in program, department,
308 college, and university events for which faculty visibility is important. Generally, level
309 three service does not require additional effort before or after.

310

311 Examples of Level 3 service include:

312

- 313 • attending department/program meetings.
- 314 • attending graduation ceremonies, COB Parent's Day Open House, COB awards
- 315 ceremonies
- 316 • participating in any program assessment efforts requiring universal faculty
- 317 involvement
- 318 • having lunch with potential employers of COB students or freshmen parents
- 319 • participating in faculty recruiting (meeting with candidates, attending candidate
- 320 seminars)
- 321 • attending the JMU career fair or Internship fair

322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366

2. Evaluation of Service

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide information that fully documents and demonstrates each service contribution. Faculty may reclassify service contributions from those levels provided in the examples above but must provide substantial evidence for the reclassification. Faculty members may supply written comments from committee chairs as part of the evaluation documentation. If the faculty member serves as the chair of a committee, the faculty member may ask the individual making the appointment to supply evidence of performance. In cases where service performance is judged unsatisfactory, no credit for that activity shall be given towards promotion and tenure.

Excellent Service: There are many acceptable paths to an excellent evaluation in the area of service. In general, excellent service is defined as professionally, effectively, and reliably assuming “significantly more than one’s fair share” of the tasks required to support the mission of one’s program, the department, college, university, and where appropriate a significant contribution to one’s profession and/or the external community. Service for which a faculty member is compensated, either by dollar payment or reduced teaching load, may be at least partially discounted. In cases of significant compensation, such activities may be fully discounted.

Satisfactory Service: Satisfactory service is participation in activities that are basic to the responsibilities of a faculty member. These include: taking an active role in programmatic efforts such as those set forth above as Level 3 service; seeking opportunities to serve by volunteering to sit on program, department, college and university committees and providing timely delivery of required commitments.

There are many acceptable paths to a satisfactory evaluation in the area of service. In general, satisfactory service is effectively and reliably assuming one’s “fair share” of the tasks required to support the operation of the program, department, college, university and, where appropriate, contributing to one’s profession and/or the external community. Service for which a faculty member is compensated, either by dollar payment or reduced teaching load, may be at least partially discounted. In cases of significant compensation, such activities may be fully discounted.

III: INTERIM EVALUATION PROCEDURES

367 All tenure-track faculty will submit a summary of their activities and accomplishments in
368 the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and
369 professional service by Feb. 1 of their third academic year for consideration by the
370 AUPAC. The summary should include a two-to-three page document highlighting
371 his/her activities and accomplishments during the three-year period plus documentation
372 supporting the summary (i.e., teaching evaluation summaries, copies of published articles
373 and working papers, and letters of appointment to university or professional organization
374 committees). The AUPAC may request additional documentation necessary to evaluate
375 the faculty member. No later than May 15, the AUPAC will provide each faculty in the
376 third year of his or her evaluation period with an evaluation, in writing, of their progress,
377 or lack thereof, towards promotion and tenure based on the criteria described in section
378 II. The evaluation will include suggestions for improvement.

Appendix A
Last Updated: April, 2009

379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411

The journals listed herein as examples were compiled by the department faculty with reference to the annual journal quality compilation published by Dr. Anne-Wil Harzig, Finrank, SSCI, and the law journal citation list maintained at Washington and Lee University.

The journals listed below illustrate journal quality for research within the Finance & Business Law Department. In order to promote cross-disciplinary research a faculty member may elect to have a publication ranked by the standards of another department in the College of Business, when appropriate.

Premier-Level Scholarly Work

Premier publications are peer-reviewed articles published by the most prestigious journals in their field. These journals are characterized by exceptionally high visibility and an international reputation. One premier level publication is equivalent to three B-level publications. The following are examples of premier journals:

<i>Journal of Finance</i>	<i>Journal of Financial Economics</i>
<i>Review of Financial Studies</i>	<i>Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis</i>
<i>Harvard Law Review</i>	<i>The University of Virginia Law Review</i>

A-Level Scholarly Work

A-level scholarship consists of peer reviewed articles, or their equivalent, that are published in journals with a national or international reputation. These articles are among the top journals in their field and/or otherwise significantly enhance the prestige of the department or college. One A-level scholarly work is equivalent to two B-level articles. The following are examples of A-level journals:

<i>American Business Law Journal</i>	<i>Journal of Financial Research</i>
<i>China and World Economy</i>	<i>Journal of Fixed Income</i>
<i>Finance and Stochastics</i>	<i>Journal of Futures Markets</i>
<i>Financial Analysts Journal</i>	<i>Journal of Intl. Money & Finance</i>
<i>Intl. Journal of Fin. and Econ.</i>	<i>Journal of Portfolio Management</i>
<i>J. of Money, Credit & Banking</i>	<i>Journal of Real Estate Research</i>
<i>Journal of Banking and Finance</i>	<i>Quantitative Finance</i>
<i>Journal of Corporate Finance</i>	<i>Real Estate Economics</i>
<i>Journal of Fin. Services Research</i>	<i>The Business Lawyer</i>
<i>Journal of Financial Intermediation</i>	<i>The Journal of Law and Economics</i>
<i>Journal of Financial Markets</i>	<i>The Journal of Legal Studies</i>

Any SSCI ranked Journal

412 **B-Level Scholarly Work**

413

414 B-level scholarship is peer-reviewed articles or their equivalent which add something
415 new to the body of knowledge. The following are examples of B-level journals:

416

417

Business Law Review

Business Law Today

Employee Responsibilities and Rights Jrnl.

Journal of Applied Finance

Journal of Economics and Finance

Journal of Inter. Finance and Economics

Journal of Investing

Journal of Legal Studies Education

Journal of Real Estate Portfolio Management

Journal of Real Estate Practice and Education

Quarterly Review of Finance and Economics

Research Issues in Real Estate

Review of Futures Markets

Rev. of Pacific Basin Fin. Markets and Policies

The Appraisal Journal

The Journal of Risk Finance

418

419

420

421 **C-Level Scholarly Work**

422

423 C-Level scholarly activity must be work that is visible in the professional community or
424 work toward publication that has not reached its conclusion. The following are examples
425 of C-level activity:

426

427 • Presentations at international, national and regional professional/academic
428 conferences

429 • Wall Street Journal op-ed articles.

430 • Publication in journals that don't meet the criteria of a premier, A, or B level
431 publication.

432 • Presentations at other universities.

433

434

435 No accumulation of C-level activities may be regarded as equivalent to a B-level
436 publication.

439

440

441

442



Management Department: Promotion and Tenure Standards

I. Teaching

Consistent with the mission statement of James Madison University (JMU):

“We are committed to preparing students to be enlightened and educated citizens who will lead proactive and meaningful lives.”¹

An auxiliary version of the College of Business's (COB) Mission Statement:

“The COB is committed to preparing undergraduate students to be active and engaged citizens who are exceptionally well qualified for life in a capitalist economic system.”²

And the (proposed) mission statement of the Management Program:³

“The Management Program is committed to offering students a full appreciation of the skills, tasks, and contexts of accomplishing work through others in an increasingly complex and diverse society.”

As professionals, we affirm our deep commitment to teaching and offer these criteria for its consistent, fair, reliable, and valid evaluation.

The Faculty Handbook (FH) in sub-section III.E.2.b.(1): Teaching on page 35 states:

Consideration of teaching performance must include, but need not be limited to, the following: *self-evaluation, evaluations by peers and/or academic unit heads, and student evaluations.*

¹ It is our focus on undergraduate students, rather than teaching, research and service that separates JMU from most other colleges and universities.

² • The actual COB mission statement is quite long, however, its first part is:

The COB aspires to be one of the best undergraduate programs in the United States. Its mission is to emphasize excellence and continuous improvement in undergraduate learning and to provide quality niche graduate programs.

• The auxiliary mission statement above clearly separates the COB from other colleges on campus by stressing the centrality of the capitalist economic system in our educational focus for our undergraduate students.

• Consistent with JMU's mission statement, the auxiliary mission statement above clearly separates the COB from other business schools by stressing undergraduate education rather than MBA education and research.

³ Per the 2001-2002 catalog, the current mission statement of the management program is:

The mission of the Management Program is to provide nationally competitive undergraduate and graduate education in the study of management. The program prepares its majors for entry-level jobs, and for eventual positions in middle-level and upper-level management, as well as for high-quality graduate programs. In addition, the program provides general management education to all students in the College of Business, and to students in a wide variety of programs across the university.

1. Self-evaluation of Teaching

The management faculty affirms the centrality of academic freedom in course delivery. Therefore, consistent with professional norms and as is presently standard practice in the program, each faculty member will prepare a self-evaluation of their teaching that includes (but is not limited to) the following information:

- Number of course preps, level and type of courses taught (e.g., undergraduate/graduate, seniors/freshmen, required/elective, etc.), class size, and any other descriptive that may have affected teaching success.
- Approximate grade distribution (or GPA) for each course (section) taught.
- Teaching honors and awards.
- Participation in teaching workshops, seminars, or other professional development focused on teaching.
- Innovation in teaching methods and materials.
- Notable successes or problems in the classroom.
- Interpretation/explanation of the most recent student evaluations, and modifications made to address problems or concerns of prior evaluations.

The self-assessment should also include unique challenges, special circumstances, and supplemental activities faced or undertaken by the faculty member. Failure to complete a comprehensive self-evaluation will negatively affect the overall performance evaluation.

Faculty members are encouraged to develop innovative teaching evaluation methods (e.g., a mid-semester student feedback survey) that can be used to supplement the traditional student evaluations. Any measure that a faculty member develops and systematically applies to their teaching performance will be considered in evaluating their teaching.

2. Student Evaluations

Consistent with professional norms and as is presently standard practice in the management program, student evaluations will be administered for all courses taught. The following information pertaining to student evaluations shall contribute to the performance appraisal outcome:

- Program wide summary statistics of student evaluation information for all management program faculty members.
- Summary statistics, such as averages, for courses with numerous sections, such as COB 202 or COB 487 (provided provision of summary statistics will not result in identification of individual professors).
- Scores of individual survey items (or small clusters of items) that have been identified as particularly relevant to the successful teaching of specific courses. For example, special consideration may be given to items that measure "degree of challenge" and/or "amount of effort required" in addition to the traditional focus on "overall teaching effectiveness".
- Written comments of students.

Quantitative performance from student evaluations that is below sectional averages is not, in isolation, indicative of "unsatisfactory" performance. Qualitative comments should be used to provide context for understanding quantitative scores.

3. Evaluation by Peers and/or Academic Unit Heads

Consistent with professional norms, faculty members are encouraged to cooperate extensively in course delivery, development, and innovation. As part of this effort peers and/or the Academic Unit Head may visit classes in progress at the invitation of the faculty member. In addition, as part of the program's assessment of the "collegiality" aspect of service, cooperation and mutual consideration between faculty members concerning the teaching function will be considered.

In the event of an "unsatisfactory" annual performance rating or external initiation (see 4.a. below) a designated peer (e.g. mentor or course coordinator) and/or the Academic Unit Head will visit the faculty member's classes in an effort to help improve course delivery. Consistent with professional norms, every effort will be made to consult with the faculty member concerning the time and manner of visits.

Consistent with the primacy of academic freedom, the adoption or non-adoption of specific course materials or specific delivery methods by a faculty member is not, in isolation, indicative of "unsatisfactory" performance.

4. Additional Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness

- a. Visits to Academic Unit Head or Dean regarding faculty member. Comments to the Academic Unit Head or Dean about faculty member performance can be used in determining teaching effectiveness if documented in a manner consistent with professional norms. Negative comments should result in consultation with the faculty member and may justify a class visit.
- b. Awards from students and peers can be considered as evidence of teaching effectiveness. The Management Program encourages the COB to widely disseminate results from student surveys regarding evaluations of teaching effectiveness by students and alumni.
- c. Students are not just our customers; they are also our eventual product. Therefore, it is the desire of the Management Program faculty to clearly state that student evaluations are important and useful but also have limitations and therefore, should not form the sole basis of evaluating teaching.

II. Scholarly Achievement

The Management Program includes a broad range of research and teaching areas: Organizational Behavior, Strategic Management, Human Resource Management, Industrial Relations, Entrepreneurship, and International Management.

Furthermore, the program is supportive of research that may extend beyond the "traditional" focus of the program, and is supportive of multi/interdisciplinary research with business-related disciplines outside of the immediate Management Program (e.g., economics, marketing, accounting, CIS, etc.).

The Management Program also encourages teamwork among faculty members. To promote teamwork, publications with one, two or three authors will be treated equally and the order of authorship will not be used to devalue a faculty member's contribution. Publications with four or more authors will still be considered valuable contributions, but will be weighted somewhat less than publications with three or fewer authors. For example, publications with 4-10 authors will usually be valued as 0.8 of a publication with three or fewer authors.

Tenure and Promotion Requirements in the Scholarship Domain

The minimum requirements for tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor are as follows:

Satisfactory Scholarship: A minimum of four Level B publications plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort.

Excellent Scholarship: A minimum of six Level B publications plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort.

Each candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or the granting of tenure may substitute one item from the program's "B equivalency" list for one of the required publications.

Publications are counted when they are formally accepted for publication, not when they are actually published. Research published prior to coming to JMU counts toward tenure and promotion, but "evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort" will be especially important in these cases.

The minimum requirements for promotion from Associate to Full Professor are as follows:

Satisfactory Scholarship: A minimum of seven (i.e., three beyond those required for promotion to Associate Professor) Level B publications plus evidence of a sustained record of accomplishment while holding the position of Associate Professor and ongoing scholarly effort.

Excellent Scholarship: A minimum of eleven (i.e., five beyond those required for promotion to Associate Professor with an exceptional rating in scholarly achievement) Level B publications plus evidence of a sustained record of accomplishment while holding the position of Associate Professor and ongoing scholarly effort.

Each candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Professor may substitute two items from the program's "B equivalency" list for two of the required publications.

The Management Program has the following Levels, and corresponding definitions, for research activity.

Level A:

Level A research publications are broadly defined as those publications that are recognized by scholars as being among the premier journal publication outlets within a particular area of study. In general, a Level A journal is representative of some combination of the following characteristics: a) peer review, b) recognized as a top international journal, c) highly ranked in surveys of journal quality, reputation, and visibility, d) journal acceptance rates that are less than or equal to 15% of submissions and e) a Social Science Citations Index (SSCI) greater than 0.5.

Premiere journals:

The following five journals are generally considered the premier journals in the Management discipline and have an exceptionally high impact on the field. A publication in any of the following five journals will count as two Level B publications toward tenure and promotion.

Academy of Management Journal
Administrative Science Quarterly
Journal of Applied Psychology

Academy of Management Review
Strategic Management Journal

All other Level A journals count as 1.2 Level B journals.

Level A journals are those that have peer review, have acceptance rates less than or equal to 15%, and have a SSCI greater than 0.5. Level A journals will also include journals the PAC classifies as Level A following the Classification Process described below.

Level B:

Level B research publications are broadly defined as those publications that are recognized among professional peers as being of reasonable quality and visibility. A Level B journal is representative of some combination of the following characteristics; a) peer review, b) national visibility, c) moderate ranking in surveys of journal quality, reputation, and visibility, d) journal acceptance rates between 15% and 30%, and e) a SSCI between 0.1 and 0.5.

Level B journals are those that have peer review, have acceptance rates greater than 15% and less than 30%, and have a SSCI between 0.1 and 0.5. Level B journals will also include journals the PAC classifies as Level B following the Classification Process described below.

Level B Equivalency:

A “level B equivalency” publication may include textbooks, educational journals, books, book chapters, or other types of publications not specifically identified as research in the Level A and Level B classifications. The criteria listed above for Level A and B journals usually do not apply for these types of publications. Level B equivalency publications should be of comparable quality to Level A or B journal publications.

Level C:

Level C research publications are broadly defined as those publications that are recognized as being of limited but sufficient quality and visibility. A Level C journal is representative of some combination of the following characteristics: a) the absence of peer review, b) editorial review, c) narrow focus and/or visibility, d) low, or lack of, ranking within surveys of journal quality, reputation, and visibility, e) high acceptance rates, and f) a Social Science Citations Index less than 0.1.

Examples of commonly recognized Level C journals would include:

American Journal of Small Business
Arbitration Journal
Family Business Review
Labor Law Journal
Mid-Atlantic Journal of Business
SAM Advanced Management Journal

Level C research publications may also include authorship of scholarly or practitioner books and book chapters that have limited national impact and visibility (as measured by citation indices, frequency of citation, and/or other documentation of national impact or visibility).

Level C research publications may also include authorship of papers that are distributed in the form of the proceedings of professional meetings and/or unpublished meeting presentations. Level C research may also include (a) invited presentations at professional meetings, workshops, seminars, or training programs, (b) the writing of research grants, (c) professional development through formal course work, and (d) consulting activities.

Level C publications may also include published Instructional material (text books, case studies, etc.) that do not have national impact and visibility, or that do not require the level of effort and review/quality control process comparable to publications in the Level B journals listed above.

For the purposes of promotion and tenure decisions, Level C articles may be used as evidence of “ongoing” research activity.

Classification Process

While the ranking of a particular journal may rise or fall over time, a specific faculty publication's ranking will not be lowered from its initial ranking once accepted, however, the ranking may be raised. Additionally, a publication may have its rank upwardly adjusted with supportive evidence of impact (i.e., citation ratings), even if the journal (or other outlet) did not experience a rankings change.

Faculty members who are unsure of the classification of a journal may request that the PAC classify the journal. Requests for journal classifications must be submitted to the PAC chair by September 15. The responsibility rests with the faculty member for providing documentation that would classify the publication into a particular category. Such documentation may include: letter or statement from the journal's editor indicating acceptance rates, members of the editorial review board, or other pertinent information (e.g., circulation, awards, citations to the article), or similar information obtained from Cabell's or other recognized sources. The PAC chair will provide a written ruling as to the journal's (or specific article's) classification for that year. The PAC may delay the classification of a journal (or specific article) due to inadequate data and request the faculty member supply more information.

Annual Evaluations:

The annual evaluation will include 7 rating levels: 1 *unsatisfactory*, 2-4 *satisfactory*, 5-7 *excellent*. For all faculty members at JMU at least three years, annual evaluations for scholarly activity will be based on performance during a rolling three-year period that includes the evaluation year and the prior two years. Performance will be evaluated based on criteria consistent with requirements for promotion and tenure. For example, an evaluation of *Satisfactory*(3) would usually require two Level B publications in the three-year period plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort. An evaluation of *Excellent*(6) would usually require three Level B publications in the three-year period plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort. Evidence of ongoing and scholarly effort includes all scholarly activities listed in Levels A, B, C above plus articles submitted to journals in the review process and the development of an ongoing stream of research.

Faculty members at JMU less than three years will be evaluated based on their progression toward tenure and promotion for that time period.

III. Service

PLEASE NOTE: This section of the Management department guidelines is currently undergoing revision by the department PAC in order to increase the level of clarity and specificity. Revision will be complete by December 1, 2007.

James Madison University's Faculty Handbook (2001:35) defines service as follows: "... community service and leadership at James Madison University or in professional or education organizations; or service otherwise enhancing the profession, academic unit, college or university."

The committee feels that the College of Business *Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures* (2000), overly relies on the completion of specific tasks. However, the committee encourages faculty to consult the *Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures* for advice in appropriate circumstances.

Criteria:

Program members need to:

- Perform professionally, effectively and reliably assuming one's "fair share" of the program's tasks.
- Readily assist others in program tasks going beyond narrow self-interests.
- Improve the college, university, national and international reputation of the program.
- Throughout one's career, increase the scope of one's service from the program, to the College, to the University, to the profession, to the nation and to the world.
- Strive to improve the community at large.
- Enhance the academic environment of the program and university.

Fair Share: We define fair share as "at a minimum satisfactory completion of the tasks you are assigned to do and nominal, additional service.

Process: The academic unit head (AUH) will evaluate each faculty member's service during the previous year. The AUH will first look at the faculty member's conduct, effort and accomplishments in the program, college and the university. In addition, the AUH will evaluate each faculty member's service to the discipline and profession. The AUH then makes a determination if the individual faculty member has contributed his or her "fair share" of the effort. Those that contribute their "fair share" will receive a rating of satisfactory. Those that go substantially beyond their "fair share" receive a rating of exceptional.

Satisfactory Service: A necessary, but not sufficient, condition for an evaluation of satisfactory in the area of service is participation in activities that are basic to the responsibilities of a faculty member. These are defined as activities in which faculty members are expected to participate without having been specifically assigned or designated, to do so.

Excellent Service: There are many, equally acceptable paths to the achievement of an exceptional evaluation in the area of service. In general, exceptional service is defined as professionally, effectively, and reliably assuming, over a sustained period of time, "significantly

more than one's fair share" of the tasks required to support the operation of a large university and, where appropriate, making a sustained and significant contribution to one's profession and/or the external community.

**Management Department
Procedure for Allocation of Merit Pay**

- 1) Faculty members receive an overall annual performance rating between 1 and 7. This rating is derived by summing the weighted scores (1 – 7) for each of the three performance areas (e.g., teaching 50%, scholarship 30%, and service 20%). The scores in each performance area are based on clearly defined guidelines in the MGT P&T document.
 - 2) The average performance rating for the department is calculated.
 - 3) Each faculty member's rating is divided by the mean score to arrive at the amount by which that faculty member's score differs from the mean.
 - 4) The calculation from the preceding step (rating/ mean) is multiplied by the merit allocation % (i.e., .04 for this year).
 - 5) The figure resulting from the previous step is then used as a multiplier of the faculty member's current salary, which determines the dollar amount of merit pay.
- Please see example below:
 1. Joe Smith receives an overall annual performance rating of 6.0
 2. The average performance rating for the department is 4.5.
 3. Joe's score differs from the mean by 1.33 ($6.0/4.5 = 1.33$).
 4. $1.33 * .04 = .053$.
 5. Joe's current salary is \$92,000. Joe's merit increase in dollars is $92000 * .053 = \$4876.00$.

This method takes into account individual performance as compared to the departmental mean, as well as differences in current salary level.

Marketing Department Merit Allocation Process

Merit process: We convert annual evaluations into a merit increase by determining the program mean evaluation score and dividing that into the individual's evaluation score to create an index number. The index number is then multiplied by the raise percentage. Qualitative judgment is then used to round the raise into absolute dollar figures.

**Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Document
Review of Criteria and Evaluative Processes
February 2007**

Marketing and Hospitality and Tourism Management Department

Overview

The Marketing and Hospitality and Tourism Management Department at James Madison University is a quality undergraduate programs with a balanced teaching and scholarly achievement emphasis. Discipline based, learning and pedagogical, and practice based research is important to the faculty in the marketing department at James Madison University. Faculty members also are expected to engage in a mixture of university, college, program, and professional service.

The Department Head and the Personnel Advisory Committee engage in faculty evaluation. As specified in the Faculty Handbook, section III.E.5.b.(2), the Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee is an independent body that separately evaluates faculty performance in the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. Like the Department Head, the AUPAC uses the standards provided in this document when evaluating a candidate's performance. Both the Department Head and the AUPAC will formally evaluate the performance of tenure track faculty in the third year of their six year probationary period and at the end of that probationary period. Tenure track faculty given credit for previous years of service and who have a probationary period shorter than six years will be formally evaluated by the Department Head and the AUPAC in the year specified in the candidate's contract and at the end of the probationary period. At its discretion, the Department Head and the AUPAC may also evaluate a candidate at other points in the probationary period. The Department Head also provides an annual evaluation of all faculty members.

Annual Evaluation Process

The annual evaluation process is used in making personnel decisions, including allocation of merit pay, continuation of employment, and initiation of post-tenure review.

Faculty Activity Plan. Each faculty member will complete a Faculty Activity Plan, consisting of a description of anticipated activities for the coming year. The proposed set of activities is submitted to the Department Head no later than the start of the academic year. For tenured faculty, the faculty member and the Department Head will together agree on a personal set of relative weights to be applied to the three performance areas of teaching, scholarly achievement, and service for the coming academic year. This agreement may be amended by mutual consent during the academic year.

Summary of Activities. At the conclusion of the academic year, the faculty member will submit a summary of activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and service. All faculty in the department will use the common Summary of Activities form to report performance activities. Typically, the Department Head will request performance reports at the end of the academic year, usually due in May. Any professional activities performed in the summer months will be reported in the next academic year Summary of Activities.

Evaluations. A preliminary written evaluation is given to each faculty member by the Department Head at least one day prior to an evaluation conference. The evaluation conference must provide an opportunity to discuss the faculty member's performance, professional contributions and needs as perceived by both the faculty member and the Department Head. The official written evaluation shall not be made until after the evaluation conference. The Department Head will provide the official written evaluation to the faculty member by October 1. Further processes, such as an appeals process, are described in the Faculty Handbook.

Performance Ratings. The department will employ a nine-point scale using three levels of performance evaluation ratings for each of evaluation category of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent, with ratings of 1 – 3 for unsatisfactory, 4 – 6 for satisfactory, and 7 – 9 for excellent. Faculty members will also receive an overall rating of satisfactory or unsatisfactory, which will be based on relative weights assigned to each area of performance. The

annual evaluation for an RTA faculty member will also include a recommendation on extending that faculty member's appointment.

The James Madison University Faculty Handbook states that promotion to Associate Professor requires that a candidate's performance be evaluated as excellent in at least one of the three functional areas (i.e., teaching, scholarly achievement, and service) and at least satisfactory in the other two areas. The Handbook also states that Promotion to Professor requires that a candidate's performance be evaluated as excellent in at least two of the functional areas and as at least satisfactory in the third area.

Evaluation of Teaching for Tenure, Promotion And Annual Evaluation

Teaching Criteria and Evaluation

Teaching is a multifaceted activity that includes course design and delivery, curriculum development, and interaction with students. Therefore, the evaluation process should be characterized by multiple sources of information and a broad view of the activities that constitute effective teaching.

Satisfactory Teaching: Satisfactory teaching is defined as effectively performing the following activities.

Learning/value added

- providing instruction at a rigorous and challenging level,
- stimulating learning and interest in the subject matter,
- serving as faculty advisor for one or two independent studies per semester,
- serving on an honors thesis committee,

Organization

- being well prepared for class,
- informing students of course objectives, assignments, and examination procedures.,
- conducting the class in a well-organized manner,
- communicating the subject matter clearly,

Interaction with students

- maintaining scheduled office hours,
- treating students with courtesy and respect,
- providing career advising to students,

Evaluation

- maintaining fair and impartial grading standards,
- providing timely feedback on progress,

Experiential Education

- providing student opportunities for “hands on” learning,
- creating opportunities for student/industry interactions,

Curriculum and course content

- staying current with the subject matter, and
- participating in program activities to assess and update the curriculum.

These activities are considered essential to good teaching, and thus are necessary for a rating of satisfactory in the area of teaching. The faculty member must provide evidence (i.e., include supporting documentation) demonstrating satisfactory teaching.

Excellent Teaching: Fulfillment of the criteria for satisfactory teaching performance in an exemplary manner is required for an exceptional rating in teaching. In addition, evidence of a strong, sustained commitment to teaching is expected. Fulfillment of the criteria for teaching performance in an exemplary manner is required for an excellent rating in teaching. Additionally, evidence of a strong, sustained commitment to teaching is expected. The Department Head and the AUPAC will use discretion in making a final determination of excellence in teaching. In order to be considered for an excellent rating in teaching, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to provide evidence (i.e., to include supporting documentation) demonstrating how the faculty member has gone above and beyond departmental expectations. Possible indicators of excellent teaching include:

- publication of widely-adopted and/or acclaimed instructional materials,
- development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials,
- development of new courses,
- major revision of existing courses,
- serving as chair of a student's honors thesis committee,
- teaching awards,
- outstanding student evaluations,
- pervasively demonstrating (using data) the linkages between marketing strategy and financial performance, and
- incorporation of mission-critical technologies (e.g., Excel, Access, SPSS) in instruction, and/or effective use of client-based instruction,
- use of experiential activities in the classroom.

There are many paths to the achievement of an exceptional rating in teaching. None of these indicators, in and of themselves, is either necessary or sufficient evidence of exceptional teaching performance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide information that documents and demonstrates his/her exceptional teaching.

Evaluation of Scholarship for Tenure, Promotion And Annual Evaluation

Faculty members advancing from the rank of Associate Professor to Professor are evaluated on the basis of their research/scholarly accomplishments since their prior promotion to the rank of Associate Professor as well as their overall record of research/scholarly accomplishments.

Research and/or Scholarly Activity Criteria

The following paragraphs reflect the broad dimensions of research/scholarly accomplishments and intellectual contributions as defined by the AACSB. The three generally recognized categories of research/scholarly activity are:

Discipline-based scholarship contributions add to the theory or knowledge base of the faculty member's field. Published research results and theoretical innovation qualify as Discipline-based scholarship contributions.

Contributions to practice influence professional practice in the faculty member's field. Articles in practice-oriented journals, creation and delivery of executive education courses, development of discipline-based practice tools, and published reports on consulting all qualify as Contributions to practice.

Learning and pedagogical research contributions influence the teaching-learning activities of the school. Preparation of new materials for use in courses, creation of teaching aids, and research on pedagogy all qualify as Learning and pedagogical research contributions.

Outputs from scholarship activities may include: Publication in refereed journals (including notes and book reviews), research monographs, scholarly books (including chapters), text books, proceedings from scholarly meetings, and written cases with instructional materials. NOTE: There are additional activities and accomplishment that do not fall neatly into the categories listed above.

Journal Ranking

For the purposes both of promotion and tenure and of annual evaluation, the A, B, C value of contributions will be based on the following journal ranking. Faculty have the right to request and receive from the Departmental PAC a binding advisory opinion on the ABC status of journals not listed below and on the status of books, book chapters, monographs, and other scholarly outputs.

This ABC scheme is designed to rank the various publication outlets in light of the support offered at JMU for research. The Department wishes to recognize publications in other disciplines, as long as those journals are of an acceptable quality as deemed by the Departmental PAC. The PAC will provide an illustrative list of journals that will be considered Level A, B & C journals following the journal classification process described below. Articles that appear in journals that are *not* on the ABC list but that *are* on the ABC list of another JMU COB academic department, and demonstrating marketing relevance, can receive credit for the rating of that journal, unless the Departmental PAC rules otherwise. For example, if someone publishes in a management journal that is on the Management Department's B list, but not on any Marketing/HTM Department list, that article may count as a B-level publication.

The Marketing Department and Hospitality and Tourism Program will maintain distinct journal ranking lists. Evaluations will be based on the apposite listing.

Premier and A-Level Publications

Level A research publications are broadly defined as those publications that are recognized by scholars as being among the premier journal publication outlets within a particular area of study. Publications meeting the A-Level standard have many or all of the following characteristics: a) peer review, b) top international journal, c) high ranking within surveys of journal quality, reputation, and visibility, d) journal acceptance rates which are less than or equal to 15% of submissions and e) Social Science Citations Index (SSCI) greater than 0.5.

These journals are generally considered the premier journals in the field and have an exceptionally high impact on the field. These journals count as 3 Level B journals toward tenure and promotion. All other Level A journals count as 1.2 Level B journals.

B-level Publications

Level B research publications are broadly defined as those publications that are recognized among professional peers of being of reasonable quality and visibility. A Level B journal is representative of some combination of the following characteristics; a) peer review, b) national visibility, c) midrange to modest ranking within surveys of journal quality, reputation, and visibility, d) journal acceptance rates between 15% and 30%, and e) SSCI between 0.1 and 0.5..

C-Level Publications

Level C research publications are broadly defined as those publications that are recognized as being of limited but sufficient quality and visibility. A Level C journal is representative of some combination of the following characteristics: a) the absence of peer review, b) editorial review, c) narrow focus and/or visibility, d) low or absent ranking within surveys of journal quality, reputation, and visibility, e) high acceptance rates, and f) Social Science Citations Index less than 0.1. These journals count as .5 Level B journals toward tenure and promotion (maximum 2 C-Level Publications).

Level C research publications may also include authorship of scholarly or practitioner books and book chapters that have limited national impact and visibility (as measured by citation indices, frequency of citation, and/or other documentation of national impact or visibility). Level C research publications may also include authorship of papers that are distributed in the form of the proceedings of professional meetings.

Requirements for Tenure and Promotion

Faculty members must meet the minimum standards for satisfactory research to be considered for tenure and promotion. Research counted towards tenure and promotion includes work published while employed at JMU. Faculty who are hired at JMU and have been given credit toward tenure will use works published at JMU and works published during the credited period.

Satisfactory Research: The *minimum* requirement for a satisfactory evaluation in the area of research/scholarly accomplishments for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or the granting of tenure in the College of Business is the following:

A minimum of four peer-reviewed publications from the department's B list (or equivalent) plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort.

Each candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or the granting of tenure may substitute two items from the department's C list for one of the four peer reviewed B list publications.

The *minimum* requirement for a satisfactory evaluation in the area of research/scholarly accomplishments for promotion to the rank of Professor is the following:

A minimum of three peer-reviewed publications from the department's B list (or equivalent) during the five year period prior to seeking promotion plus evidence of a sustained record of accomplishment while holding the position of Associate Professor and of ongoing scholarly effort.

Excellent Research: The *minimum* requirement for an excellent evaluation in the area of research/scholarly accomplishments for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or the granting of tenure in the College of Business is the following:

A minimum of six peer-reviewed publications from the department's B list (or equivalent) plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort.

The *minimum* requirement for an excellent evaluation in the area of research/scholarly accomplishments for promotion to the rank of Professor is the following:

A minimum of five peer-reviewed publications from the department's B list (or equivalent) during the five year period prior to seeking promotion plus evidence of a sustained record of accomplishment while holding the position of Associate Professor and of ongoing scholarly effort.

Annual Evaluation of Research

All faculty members will submit as part of their annual evaluation the five year rolling average of their B list intellectual contributions

For a faculty member seeking: (1) tenure and/or (2) promotion, a five-year annual average of .7 contributions would generally merit a Satisfactory annual rating (4 to 6 on the 9-point scale, the actual rating to be determined at the Department Head's discretion) while an average of 1.2 would generally merit an Excellent rating (7 to 9 on the 9-point scale, the actual rating to be determined at the Department Head's discretion).

Non tenure track faculty will be evaluated annually based on the completion of activities that preserve their AQ/PQ status according to AACSB standards. Such faculty should consult the College of Business AQ/PQ document for standards on professional qualifications.

Both Satisfactory and Excellent evaluations presuppose evidence of ongoing scholarly effort. Faculty will also indicate in the report the number of C list contributions that have been part of their rolling average over the past three years. Contributions from the C list in excess of the two that may be substituted for a B list contribution may

receive limited credit in the performance evaluation. Any faculty member failing to maintain AQ status may receive a score of zero for the research component of the annual evaluation.

In the first two years of an Assistant Professor's probation period, the Department Head may base the evaluation on work in progress rather than on work accepted for presentation/publication. Until they have completed five years at JMU, new Assistant Professors who lack previous tenure track experience will use their number of years in the position as the divisor of their rolling average. New tenure track faculty of any rank who have been given credit toward tenure will use works published in the past five years (this includes any works published prior to arriving at JMU within the five year period) as the divisor of their rolling average. The Department Head may exercise judgment in granting extra credit for sole authorships, publications that are positioned very high in their respective lists, and other indicators of special merit. Moreover, when doing annual evaluations, the Department Head may grant extra credit if recent levels of scholarly activity have been high.

Journal Ranking List

The following publications are *examples* of A-, B-, and C-Level publications. The lists are not intended to be *exhaustive* but rather *illustrative*.

Marketing

Premier Publications

Journal of Consumer Research
Journal of Marketing
Journal of Marketing Research

Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science
Journal of Retailing
Marketing Science

A-Level Publications

Industrial Marketing Management
International Marketing Review
Journal of Advertising
Journal of Advertising Research
Journal of Business Research
Journal of International Marketing

Journal of International Business Studies
Journal of Macromarketing
Journal of Marketing Education
Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management
Psychology and Marketing

B-Level Publications

Academy of Marketing Studies Journal
AMS Review
Asian Journal of Marketing
Case Research Journal
European Journal of Marketing
International Journal of Advertising
International Journal of Research in Marketing
Journal of Brand Management
Journal of Business
Journal of Business Ethics
Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing
Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing
Journal of Business Logistics
Journal of Business and Psychology
Journal of Consumer Marketing
Journal of Case Studies
Journal of Consumer Psychology
Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction, and Complaining Behavior

Journal of Euromarketing
Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management
Journal of Global Marketing
Journal of Interactive Marketing
Journal of Marketing Channels
Journal of Marketing Communications
Journal of Marketing Management
Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice
Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing
Journal of Product Innovation Management
Journal of Promotion Management
Journal of Public Policy and Marketing
Journal of Services Marketing
Journal of Strategic Marketing
Marketing Education Review
Marketing Letters
Marketing Theory

C-Level Publications

Advances in Consumer Research
AMA Educators' Conference Proceedings

HTM

A- level Publications

- *Annals of Tourism Research*
- *Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Quarterly*
- *International Journal of Hospitality Management*
- *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*
- *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*
- *Journal of Leisure Research*
- *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*
- *Journal of Travel Research*
- *Tourism Management*

B – level Publications

- *FIU Hospitality Research Journal*
- *Hospitality Tourism Quarterly*
- *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*
- *International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*
- *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*
- *Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing*
- *Journal of American Dietetic Association*
- *Journal of College and University Foodservice*
- *Journal of Convention & Exhibition Management*
- *Journal of Eco-tourism Development*
- *Journal of Food Production Management*
- *Journal of Food Products Marketing*
- *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*
- *Journal of Hospitality Financial Management*
- *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*
- *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism Services*
- *Journal of Tourism Studies*
- *Leisure Sciences*
- *Leisure Studies*

C - level Publications

- *Australian Journal of Hospitality Management*
- *Current Issues in Tourism*
- *Festival Management & Event Tourism*
- *Bottom-line, the Journal of Hospitality Financial and Technology*
- *Information Technology & Tourism*
- *Journal of Applied Hospitality Management*
- *Journal of Foodservice Systems*
- *Journal of Gambling Studies*
- *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism Services*
- *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism Services*
- *Journal of Restaurant & Foodservice Marketing*
- *Journal of Leisurability*
- *Journal of Nutrition in Recipe & Menu development*
- *Journal of Parks & Recreation Administration*
- *Journal of Vacation Marketing*
- *Pacific Tourism Review*
- *Praxis The Journal of Applied Hospitality Management*
- *Tourism Analysis Journal*
- *Tourism Culture & Communication*
- *Tourism Economics*
- *Tourism Geographies*
- *Tourism Recreation Research*
- *Travel and Tourism Analyst*

Evaluation of Service for Tenure, Promotion And Annual Evaluation

Service Criteria

Definition of Level 3 Service: Level 3 service is defined as participation in program, college, and university events for which faculty visibility is important. Generally, such participation does not require additional efforts either before or afterwards.

Examples of Level 3 service include:

- having lunch with potential employers of COB students or freshmen parents
- attending graduation ceremonies, COB Parent's Day Open House, COB awards ceremonies, program meetings or program seminars
- participating in any program assessment efforts requiring universal faculty involvement
- participating in faculty recruiting (meeting with candidates, attending candidate seminars)
- attending the JMU career fair or Internship fair
- attending senior project presentations

Definition of Level 2 Service: Level 2 service is defined as important activities in support of one's program, the college, the university, or the profession that involve a moderate to significant time commitment. It is anticipated that the bulk of one's service activities will fall into this category.

Examples of Level 2 service activities include:

- member of program, college, or university committees, or Faculty Senate
- proceedings editor for a regional conference, book review editor for a journal or program/track chair for a regional conference
- active participation in curriculum development
- participation in university-sponsored programs
- actively engaging the industry in program activities

Definition of Level 1 Service: Level 1 service is defined primarily as activities that involve a very significant time commitment. Secondary indicators of Level 1 service are 1) a high level of personal responsibility; 2) involvement in activities that are critical to the mission of the program, college, university, or professional organization; 3) distinguishing oneself in a leadership role, whether elected or appointed; 4) serving, with distinction, one's profession and/or the external community in a role that exploits one's professional knowledge, skills, and talents; 5) "making a difference" in those areas in which one has chosen to serve; and 6) being widely recognized as one who has an exemplary attitude towards service commitments and who serves as a role model for other faculty. Level 1 service should not be interpreted as requiring the presence of each and every secondary indicator of exceptional performance. In particular, Level 1 service does not require a leadership role (e.g., chair of a major committee). However, in all cases there should be evidence of a substantial contribution and an active role.

Examples of Level 1 service include:

- chair of an important recruiting committee
- major responsibility for significant curriculum reform
- Speaker of Faculty Senate
- Chair of AACSB or SACS re-accreditation efforts or other important university committee
- Chair of program review committee
- faculty advisor to an active, successful student organization
- high level office in a prestigious regional or national organization involving a significant time commitment

Service Evaluation

Satisfactory Service: A necessary, but not sufficient, condition for an evaluation of satisfactory in the area of service is participation in activities that are basic to the responsibilities of a faculty member. These are defined as activities in which faculty members are expected to participate without having been specifically assigned, or designated, to do so. Examples of such service activities include 1) attending Spring commencement exercises; 2) attending departmental meetings; and 3) participating in peer evaluation of faculty in one's program. Beyond this, there are many, equally acceptable paths to the achievement of a satisfactory evaluation in the area of service. In general, satisfactory service is defined as professionally, effectively, and reliably assuming one's "fair share" of the tasks required to support the operation of a large university and, where appropriate, contributing to one's profession and/or the external community. A "fair share" is defined as a reasonably steady stream of service activity consisting of A) a yearly average of one Level 1 activity plus a representative mixture of Level 3 activities or B) a yearly average of three Level 2 activities plus a representative mixture of Level 3 activities. At least one of these Level 2 activities must be service that is internal to the university. Service that is external to the university is not required. Service for which a faculty member is compensated, either by dollar payment or reduced teaching load, should be at least partially discounted. In cases of significant compensation, such activities may be fully discounted.

In all cases it is expected that a faculty member will 1) seek out opportunities to serve rather than expect others to identify those opportunities; 2) take an active role in committees and programmatic efforts, participate in college and university events where faculty visibility is important, support one's profession in various ways, and provide timely delivery of required commitments; 3) demonstrate an attitude that encourages others to seek one's assistance on important projects; and 4) describe and document one's efforts and contributions (as opposed to simply listing the committees on which one has served). It is also to be expected that the mix of activities will vary from year to year and over one's career.

Exceptional Service: There are many, equally acceptable paths to the achievement of an exceptional evaluation in the area of service. In general, exceptional service is defined as professionally, effectively, and reliably assuming, over a sustained period of time, "significantly more than one's fair share" of the tasks required to support the operation of a large university and, where appropriate, making a sustained and significant contribution to one's profession and/or the external community. "Significantly more than one's fair share" of service activities is defined as a reasonably steady stream of service activity consisting of A) a yearly average of one Level 1 activity plus two Level 2 activities plus a representative mixture of Level 3 activities or B) a yearly average of five Level 2 activities plus a representative mixture of Level 3 activities. At least two of these activities must be service that is internal to the university. Service that is external to the university is not required. Service for which a faculty member is compensated, either by dollar payment or reduced teaching load, should be at least partially discounted. In cases of significant compensation, such activities may be fully discounted.

In all cases it is expected that a faculty member will 1) seek out opportunities to serve rather than expect others to identify those opportunities; 2) take an active role in committees and programmatic efforts, participate in college and university events where faculty visibility is important, support one's profession in various ways, and provide timely delivery of required commitments; 3) demonstrate an attitude that encourages others to seek one's assistance on important projects; and 4) describe and document one's efforts and contributions (as opposed to simply listing the committees on which one has served). In addition, exceptional performance requires some evidence of a significant contribution over and above satisfying the numerical quota of service activities at the various levels. One way to demonstrate a significant contribution would be to provide evidence that one's service activities incorporate one or more of the secondary indicators that define Level 1 service. Finally, it is to be expected that the mix of activities will vary from year to year and over one's career.

Evaluating Service Contributions: It is the responsibility of the faculty member being evaluated to provide information that documents and demonstrates Level 1, 2, or 3 service. Faculty are free to reclassify service contributions from those levels provided in the examples (e.g. upgrading a Level 2 example to a Level 1) but must provide substantiation for the reclassification.

Faculty members under review who serve on committees may supply written comments from committee chairs as part of the evaluation documentation. If the faculty member serves as the chair of a committee, the faculty member may ask the individual who made the appointment, e.g., the dean, the VP of Academic Affairs, etc., to supply evidence of service performance for documentation. In cases where service performance is judged unsatisfactory, no credit for that activity should be given towards promotion and tenure.