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: \textit{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 descriptor 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
- Strategic Management Journal
- Journal of Applied Psychology

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.