Department of Computer Information Systems and Business Analytics

Evaluation and Procedures

Approved: 2023

Table of Contents

Department of Computer Information Systems and Business Analytics: Procedures and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

PART I: RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Responsibilities of the Candidate

Tenure-track faculty members are evaluated by the CIS & BSAN Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC) and AUH during their first and third years (or as specified in their contracts) and when they apply for promotion and/or tenure (P&T). Revolving-term appointment (RTA) faculty are evaluated during their first and third years (mandatory), the sixth year if requested by the PAC, and when they apply for promotion to senior and/or principal lecturer.

Each member of the faculty is expected to contribute to the achievement of the University's mission through their teaching, research and scholarly achievement, professional development, and service, consistent with their AACSB qualifications classification. Faculty members who are candidates for review or promotion and/or tenure are expected to document these contributions by compiling and submitting a dossier according to the guidelines specified in Part III of this document to the Computer Information Systems and Business Analytic (CIS &BSAN) Academic Unit Head (AUH) and to the PAC.

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure are expected to submit the dossier by October 1 or other date as specified by the James Madison University (JMU) Faculty Handbook. Deadlines for all other types of review are given in Part IV of this document. All candidates are expected to read and understand the latest AACSB accreditation requirements for corresponding faculty classifications (e.g., Scholarly Academics, Scholarly Practitioners). These requirements are listed in the JMU College of Business (COB) Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications document available in a widely-known and centralized location.

B. Responsibilities of the PAC

The PAC shall be involved in the evaluation of a faculty member for tenure track promotion and/or tenure, interim evaluation of untenured and RTA faculty, RTA promotion to senior lecturer and principal lecturer, and any appeal of the AUH's annual evaluation of a faculty member.

The PAC is expected to provide the Dean of the COB with a written evaluation of the candidate's teaching, research and/or professional activities, and service performance over the evaluation period. This evaluation should include a discussion of trends in performance (if any); a recommendation as to whether the candidate's performance in each of these areas should be rated excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory; and statements supporting each rating. Adhering to the criteria described in Part II and the procedures described in Part IV of this document, the PAC should carefully consider each candidate for tenure and/or promotion and render a recommendation by November 15 to the Dean of the COB as to whether that candidate should be tenured and/or promoted. A copy of the letter must be provided to the candidate at that time. For

all other reviews, a letter from the PAC will be provided to the candidate and a copy will be given to the AUH, and, as appropriate, provided to the Dean's office for inclusion in the faculty member's COB personnel file. Annual evaluations of faculty performance will be conducted by the AUH and do not fall under the purview of the PAC except in the case of appeals of the AUH's annual evaluation of the faculty member.

C. Responsibilities of the CIS & BSAN AUH

The CIS & BSAN AUH will contact the Associate Dean of Human Resources before the end of the spring semester to identify individuals who will be evaluated during the next academic year. This Associate Dean will then inform individuals concerned and the chair of the PAC before the end of the spring semester.

The CIS & BSAN AUH will also provide new faculty with a copy of this document and inform them of the requirement to undergo an initial evaluation in the second semester of their first year. The PAC and the CIS & BSAN AUH will both conduct separate promotion and tenure evaluations of tenure-track faculty, submitting their decisions independently to the Dean of the COB. Annual evaluations of faculty performance are conducted by the CIS & BSAN AUH.

PART II: CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION, PROMOTION AND TENURE

A. Overview

The purpose of evaluation of faculty members at James Madison University is to promote professionalism, encourage performance at the highest levels, and indicate areas in which improvement is needed. Evaluations are also used in making personnel decisions, including allocation of merit pay increases, continuation of employment, and initiation of post-tenure review. The CIS & BSAN Department values activities that support the mission and strategic goals of the university.

B. Tenure-track & RTA Promotion

The current JMU 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, research, or service) and at least satisfactory in the other two areas. The JMU Faculty 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 Section III of the JMU Faculty Handbook regarding "Faculty Employment Policies and Procedures."

Additionally, the JMU 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 completion of 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 is evaluated as excellent in all three functional areas.

The Faculty Handbook states that promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer requires the candidate's performance be evaluated as excellent in teaching and at least satisfactory in scholarly activities, practitioner activities, and service. Further, the promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer requires the candidate's performance be evaluated as excellent in teaching, excellent in one of the other areas, and at least satisfactory in all remaining areas. The review window for RTA promotion should be at least the three prior years at the time of promotion application, but may be longer at the discretion of the PAC. The candidate must have also worked at least five years in their current classification prior to promotion.

C. 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.

C.1. Satisfactory Teaching: The following activities are considered necessary to good teaching and are critical for candidates seeking satisfactory in the area of teaching:

Classroom Essentials
- Holds each class at the scheduled time and location
- Informs students of course objectives, assignments, and examination procedures
- Grades in a timely manner
- Maintains classroom control and scheduled office hours

Classroom Flow
- Maintains a reputation of being well prepared for class
- Organizes and delivers lectures that transcend rote learning
- Maintains an environment of mutual courtesy and respect
- Uses appropriate tools and learning aids

Course Documents
- Provides timely access to organized course materials
- Provides examinations that adequately cover course objectives
- Provides additional learning materials beyond the book

Student Interaction
- Most students find the class challenging
- Most students feel comfortable engaging with you

Course Contributions
- Participating in department activities to assess, update and improve the curriculum
- Shows a willingness and desire to teach more than one course

Collaboration (Teaching Improvements)

- Listens and responds positively to constructive criticism
- Seeks help from senior faculty when difficult issues arise

More detail of how to achieve a satisfactory rating in teaching is shown in Appendix A.

C.2. Excellent Teaching: Fulfillment of the criteria for satisfactory teaching performance in an exemplary manner is required for an excellent rating in teaching. In addition, evidence of a strong, sustained commitment to teaching is expected. Examples of 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 or major revision of existing courses
- Teaching awards
- Publication in refereed pedagogical journals
- Outstanding student evaluations
- Sharing and development of instructional materials with colleagues

There are many paths to the achievement of an excellent rating in teaching. The indicators shown above should not be viewed as exhaustive nor should any individual indicator be seen as necessary or sufficient for achieving an excellent rating in teaching. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide information that documents and demonstrates their excellent teaching.

More detail of how to achieve an excellent rating in teaching is shown in Appendix A.

D. Research, Scholarly Activity, and/or Practitioner Activity Criteria
For the purpose of PAC evaluation, research scholarship can be divided into two categories: discipline-related research and pedagogical research.

1. Discipline-related research includes a wide variety of possibilities, encompassing both basic and applied research. Some examples include: articles involving empirical analysis, literature reviews and/or surveys, conceptual/theoretical pieces, and design science.

2. Pedagogical research involves publications pertaining to research in teaching, curriculum development, assessment, accreditation, and other educational concerns related to the discipline. JMU values pedagogical research and considers it to be a legitimate scholarly activity to be included in a faculty member's scholarly portfolio.

Regardless of the category, research that will be counted towards promotion and tenure should be related to the CIS & BSAN discipline. For CIS & BSAN department, this means anything related to information systems and technologies, analytics, operations, and/or quantitative methods. Any research published in outlets not directly related to the CIS or BSAN disciplines may be counted if the candidate provides the appropriate support and documentation to the PAC (See: Appendix B).

A faculty member's scholarly portfolio will ideally include a balance of both discipline and pedagogical research publications in quality peer-reviewed journals. The precise distribution of this balance should be up to the faculty member. It is not up to the PAC to prescribe or dictate this balance. However, an assistant professor applying for tenure should have a minimum of one B level discipline-related publication in their portfolio.

D.1. AACSB Definition: The following paragraphs reflect the broad dimensions of research/ scholarly accomplishments and intellectual contributions as defined by the AACSB.

1. **Basic or Discovery Scholarship**: The creation of new knowledge. Outputs from basic 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. **Applied or Integrated/Application Scholarship**: The application, transfer, and interpretation of knowledge to improve management practice. 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. **Teaching and Learning Scholarship:** 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, published cases with instructional materials, instructional software, and publicly available materials describing the design and implementation of new courses.

It should be noted that 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, professional certification, and other professional awards. In addition, these three areas of contribution are not synonymous with the publications categories designated Premier, A, or B or B equivalency by the department (e.g., it is possible to have a Level B achievement in basic research, applied research, or teaching and learning).

D.2. Criteria for Tenure Track Promotion and Tenure: 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.

Only articles in Premier, A, or B level journals presently on the CIS & BSAN Department list (See Appendix B) or another COB Department's journal level list will be considered toward tenure and/or promotion. Candidates for promotion or tenure who publish in journals not rated by the CIS & BSAN Department or another COB Department must ask the CIS & BSAN PAC to make a

journal level determination. The procedure for adding a journal to the Premier, A or B lists is described in Appendix B.

When counting articles for promotion and evaluation, the article count will be expressed in B-level articles using the following rules:
- An article published in a Premier journal is worth three B-level articles
- An article published in an A category journal is worth two B-level articles
- An article published in a B category journal is worth one B-level article

D.2.a. 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 & BSAN Department is the following:

> A minimum of four peer-reviewed B-level journal articles or equivalent, as described in Appendix B, plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort that meets the AACSB Scholarly Academic (SA) requirements.

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 B-level 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 peer-reviewed B-level journal articles or equivalent, as described in Appendix B, plus evidence of a sustained record of accomplishment while holding the position of Associate Professor and ongoing scholarly effort that meets the AACSB Scholarly Academic (SA) requirements.

Each candidate seeking promotion to rank of Professor may substitute two B equivalency items for two of the seven peer-reviewed journal articles. In addition, at least three of these seven peer reviewed B-level journal articles must have been accepted or published since the application for Associate Professor.

D.2.b. 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 CIS & BSAN Department is the following:

> A minimum of six peer-reviewed B-level journal articles or equivalent, as described in Appendix B, plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort that meets the AACSB Scholarly Academic (SA) requirements.

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

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 eleven peer-reviewed B-level journal articles or equivalent, as described in Appendix A, plus evidence of a sustained record of accomplishment while holding the position of Associate Professor and ongoing scholarly effort that meets the AACSB Scholarly Academic (SA) requirements.

Each candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Professor may substitute two B equivalency items for two of the eleven peer-reviewed B-level journal articles. In addition, at least four of these peer reviewed journal articles must have been accepted or published since the application for Associate Professor.

D.3. Criteria for RTA Promotion: RTA faculty consist of three ranks: Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer.

1. **Lecturer**: The rank of Lecturer is for individuals within the academic unit whose primary responsibility is teaching. Lecturers are expected to be effective teachers, participate in professional service activities, and be engaged in activities that support professional development.

2. **Senior Lecturer**: In addition to the requirements of Lecturer, the rank of Senior Lecturer is expected to demonstrate a sustained record of exemplary teaching. Service performance, evidence of continued scholarly activities, and/or professional development in their field of study should meet at least satisfactory expectations. Lecturers may apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer after five years as a Lecturer.

3. **Principal Lecturer:** In addition to the requirements of Senior Lecturer, the rank of Principal Lecturer is expected to demonstrate a sustained record of exemplary teaching and evidence of recognition (e.g., awards) in the areas of continued scholarly activities and/or professional development in their field of study and/or service performance. Senior Lecturers may apply for Principal Lecturer after five years as a Senior Lecturer.

Each candidate seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer must meet the minimum standards for maintaining AACSB qualifications to be considered for promotion. AACSB accreditation standards classify faculty members as Scholarly Academic (SA), Practice Academic (PA), Scholarly Practitioner (SP) or Instructional Practitioner (IP), and the requirements for each are outlined in the JMU COB Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications.

Only articles in Premier, A, B, C, or PAC approved journals presently on the CIS & BSAN Department list (See Appendix B) or another COB Department's journal level list will be counted towards RTA promotion. RTA promotion candidates who publish in journals not rated by the CIS & BSAN Department or another COB Department must ask the CIS & BSAN PAC to make a

journal level determination. The procedure for adding a journal to the Premier, A, B, or C lists is described in Appendix B.

D.3.a. Satisfactory Scholarly Activities for SA or SP RTA Faculty: The minimum requirement for a satisfactory evaluation in the area of scholarly activities for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer is the following:

> The candidate must meet the scholarly activity requirements according to the JMU COB Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications while holding the position of Lecturer.

The minimum requirement for a satisfactory evaluation in the area of scholarly activities for promotion to the rank of Principal Lecturer is the following:

> The candidate must meet the scholarly activity requirements according to the JMU COB Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications while holding the position of Senior Lecturer.

D.3.b. Excellent Scholarly Activities for SA or SP RTA Faculty: The minimum requirement for an excellent evaluation in the area of scholarly activities for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer is the following:

> A minimum of two scholarly activities and one peer reviewed journal article published in journal(s) appearing on current PAC journal lists, plus evidence of continued scholarly effort that meets the JMU COB Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications requirements while holding the position of Lecturer.

The minimum requirement for an excellent evaluation in the area of scholarly activities for promotion to the rank of Principal Lecturer is the following:

> A minimum of three scholarly activities and two peer-reviewed journal articles published in journals appearing on current PAC journal lists plus evidence of continued scholarly effort that meets the JMU COB Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications requirements while holding the position of Senior Lecturer.

D.3.c. Satisfactory Practitioner Activities for SA or SP RTA Faculty: The minimum requirement for a satisfactory evaluation in the area of practitioner activities for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer is the following:

> The candidate must meet the practitioner activity requirements according to the JMU COB Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications while holding the position of Lecturer.

The minimum requirement for a satisfactory evaluation in the area of practitioner activities for promotion to the rank of Principal Lecturer is the following:

> The candidate must meet the scholarly activity requirements according to the JMU COB Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications while holding the position of Senior Lecturer.

D.3.d. Excellent Practitioner Activities for SA or SP RTA Faculty: The minimum requirement for an excellent evaluation in the area of practitioner activities for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer is the following:

> A minimum of two practitioner activities plus evidence of continued practitioner effort that meets the JMU COB Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications requirements while holding the position of Lecturer.

The minimum requirement for an excellent evaluation in the area of practitioner activities for promotion to the rank of Principal Lecturer is the following:

> A minimum of three practitioner activities plus evidence of continued practitioner effort that meets the JMU COB Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications requirements while holding the position of Senior Lecturer.

D.3.e. Satisfactory Practitioner Activities for IP or PA RTA Faculty: The minimum requirement for a satisfactory evaluation in the area of practitioner activities for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer is the following:

> The candidate must meet the practitioner activity requirements according to the JMU COB Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications while holding the position of Lecturer.

The minimum requirement for a satisfactory evaluation in the area of practitioner activities for promotion to the rank of Principal Lecturer is the following:

> The candidate must meet the scholarly activity requirements according to the JMU COB Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications while holding the position of Senior Lecturer.

D.3.f. Excellent Practitioner Activities for IP or PA RTA Faculty: The minimum requirement for an excellent evaluation in the area of practitioner activities for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer is the following:

> A minimum of four practitioner activities that meet the JMU COB Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications requirements while holding the position of Lecturer.

The minimum requirement for an excellent evaluation in the area of practitioner activities for promotion to the rank of Principal Lecturer is the following:

> A minimum of seven practitioner activities that meet the JMU COB Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications requirements. In addition, three out of seven practitioner activities must have occurred after the Senior Lecturer promotion.

E. Service Criteria

Service will be evaluated using three levels: Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3. Level 1 service is considered the most significant in terms of time commitment and Level 3 service is considered the least.

E.1. Level 3 Service: Level 3 service is defined as participation in department, college, and university events for which faculty visibility is important. Generally, such participation does not require additional efforts either before or after the event. Some examples of Level 3 service activities include:
- Having lunch with potential employers of COB students or meeting with prospective freshman parents
- Participation in COB Open House, Choices, or departmental seminars
- Participating in faculty recruiting (e.g., meeting with candidates, attending candidate Seminars)

E.2. Level 2 Service: Level 2 service consists of important activities in support of one's department, the college, the university, the profession and/or the external community in a role that uses one's professional knowledge, skills, and talents. Such activities involve a moderate to significant time commitment. It is anticipated that the bulk of one's service activities will fall into this category. Some examples of Level 2 service activities include:
- Member of department, college, or university committees, or Faculty Senate
- Proceedings editor for a regional conference, book review editor for a journal
- Program/track chair for a regional conference
- Active participation in curriculum development
- Discussion of papers at academic conference
- Session chair at an academic conference
- Faculty representative to Honor Council proceedings
- Participation in university-sponsored programs, such as the minority mentor program

E.3. Level 1 Service: Level 1 service consists of activities that involve a significant time commitment. Secondary indicators of Level 1 service include:
- An elevated level of personal responsibility
- Involvement in activities that are critical to the mission of the department, college, university, or professional organization
- Distinguishing oneself in a leadership role, whether elected or appointed
- Serving, with distinction, one's profession and/or the external community in a role that uses one's professional knowledge, skills, and talents

- Making a difference in those areas in which one has chosen to serve
- Being widely recognized as one who has an exemplary attitude towards service commitments and who serves as a role model for other faculty
- Receiving a professional service award.

Level 1 service should not be interpreted as requiring the presence of each and every secondary indicator shown above. 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. Some concrete examples of Level 1 service activities include:
- Chair of a recruiting committee
- Major responsibility for significant curriculum reform
- Speaker of Faculty Senate
- Major contributor to 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
- Serving as a First-Year Advisor

E.4. 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. Satisfactory service is service beyond the required obligations of a faculty member that include attending department meetings and attending graduation. 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, such as:
- A yearly average of one Level 1 activity plus a representative mixture of Level 3 activities
- 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 departmental 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
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 service activities will vary from year to year and over one's career.

E.5. Excellent Service: There are many equally acceptable paths to the achievement of an excellent evaluation in the area of service. In general, excellent 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. Some examples of excellent service are:
- A yearly average of one Level 1 activity plus two Level 2 activities plus a representative mixture of Level 3 activities
- 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 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 addition, excellent performance requires 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.

There are many paths to the achievement of an excellent rating in service. None of these indicators, in and of itself, is either necessary or sufficient evidence of excellent service performance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide information that document and demonstrates their excellent service.

PART III: GUIDELINES FOR DOSSIER CREATION

A. Overview

All candidates should prepare a dossier that contains a summary document, not to exceed 25 pages, describing accomplishments in each of the three functional areas over the evaluation period. In addition to this summary document, supplementary materials as requested in Part III of this document, Sections B, C, and D, (e.g., student evaluations, copies of publications, course materials, letters from committee chairs describing service performance, etc.) should be provided. An electronic copy of this dossier should be provided to the PAC and the AUH by October 1 or other date as specified by the JMU Faculty Handbook. All submitted material should be logically organized via a table of contents.

B. Teaching

The dossier should provide a comprehensive self-evaluation of the faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher in any course taught as part of their regular teaching load, regardless of the department or college within JMU. Courses taught on overload, for extra pay, or other benefits should not be included for evaluation by the PAC.

The summary document must include the following information:

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

2. For each semester of the evaluation period, provide a completed table with the headings:

Semester/ Year	Course Number/ Section Number	New prep Y/N	Ending Enrollment	Class Grade Distribution (%A, %B, etc.)	Teaching Evaluation Mean Value*					
					1	2	3	4	5	6

*The teaching evaluation mean value for questions 1–6 can be found on your student evaluation report provided to you electronically at the end of each semester. As shown in Figure 1, the value you should report for each question is the mean of all scores and is located in the table that proceeds the overall chart for each question.

Compared to all other classes taken, evaluate the degree of challenge in this class.					
Options	Score	Count	Percentage	Statistics	Value
Much Lower	1	0	0.00%	Response Count	25
Lower	2	0	0.00%	Mean	4.64
Average	3	0	0.00%	Median	4.72
Higher	4	9	36.00%	Mode	5
Much Higher	5	16	64.00%	Standard Deviation	0.49

Figure 1: Value to Report for Teaching Evaluation Mean Value 1

Questions 1-6 provide measures of:
1. Challenge of class
2. Your interest in teaching the students
3. Your preparation for class
4. Your help outside of class
5. Your fairness and impartiality with the students
6. How the students rate you amongst all of their other professors

It should be noted that the PAC does not use teaching evaluation scores as a sole indicator of a candidate's instructional efficacy.

Supplementary material must include:

1. For each course taught during the evaluation period, submit a complete set of the following from a most recent semester organized by course (only one set per course) and identified by semester and year:
   • Syllabus
   • Examinations, tests, and quizzes
   • Assignments
   • In-class exercises
   • Handouts
   • Other items specific to the course such as list of outside readings
2. For all sections of all courses in the last two academic years (excluding summers), provide the following:
   • Electronic copy of student evaluation scores and written comments
   • Associated grade distribution for each course
3. Optionally, other evidential information may be included, as appropriate. Examples of additional evidence might include the following:
   • New courses developed
   • Development of instructional materials
   • Interdisciplinary and team-teaching projects
   • Publications in teaching journals
   • Active participation in conference presentations and workshops devoted to the enhancement of teaching
   • Involvement in teaching continuing education courses

- Reviews of textbook chapters
- Independent studies and/or honor theses supervised/read
- Other documentation to support teaching effectiveness

C. Research and Scholarly Activity

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

1. Refereed journal articles
2. Refereed book chapters/ books/cases
3. Refereed journal articles under review
4. Refereed proceedings articles
5. Refereed proceedings articles under review
6. Presentations of papers at professional meetings not included in proceedings
7. Presentations of abstracts at professional meetings not included in proceedings
8. Non-refereed publications
9. Working papers
10. Competitive grants received
11. Honors and awards
12. Professional contributions
13. Professional development activities
14. Consulting, indicating whether paid or unpaid

For items 1 through 9, provide (where applicable), the names of authors (in order on publication), title, name of journal/publisher/organization, volume/number, year, page numbers.

For items 10 and 11, provide (where applicable), the names of authors (in order), title, name of awarding agency, year, grant amount.

For item 12, provide the type of contribution (such as reviewer, discussant, etc.), number of papers reviewed/discussed, organization, location, and year.

For item 13, provide a description of activity, sponsoring organization, length of activity, date(s), certification/training program/other (specify).

For item 14, provide a description of activity, organization, approximate beginning and ending dates, estimate of time spent (total hours).

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

1. Copies of:
   - articles published in refereed journals
   - chapters in books or research volumes

- books published (scholarly, textbook)
- published cases
- research monographs
- instructional software development
- ancillaries (e.g., instructor's guides) published
- articles published in refereed proceedings
- articles published in non-refereed journals
- drafts of work in progress

2. Supporting documentation such as letters of acceptance, contract letters, etc. for:
   - articles accepted for publication
   - books under contract
   - research grants received
   - research grants applied but not received
   - professional honors or awards
   - membership on editorial board of a journal
   - ad hoc reviewer for professional journals
   - book reviewer
   - reviewer of manuscripts/submissions for professional meetings
   - participation as discussant at professional meetings
   - external reviews of professional presentations
   - professional development activities

D. Service
Provide the following information in the summary document:

1. An overview of the various service activities. Give an assessment of both the quantity and quality of efforts and describe plans for continuing service contributions.
2. For each academic year, provide a list of service activities in each of the following areas:
   a. JMU service, grouped by
      - University
      - College of Business
      - Department(s)
      - Student organizations
   b. Service to professional organizations
   c. Community service (if applicable)

   For each activity, indicate role or position, the dates of service, and indicate if the service was compensated by reduced teaching load or other compensation. Briefly outline the scope and purpose of each service activity and give a description of specific responsibilities or contributions.

Supplementary materials should include:

1. Supporting documentation (if available) of the service activities listed in the summary document. Examples include:
   - Thank you notes
   - Appointment memos
   - Letters of acknowledgement
   - Copies of citations/awards
   - Excerpts from written reports

PART IV: PAC COMPOSITION AND PROCEDURES

A. Composition of the PAC

The PAC will consist of all full-time CIS & BSAN Department faculty tenured at JMU. Each untenured faculty will be invited to observe the PAC's deliberations on a promotion and/or tenure decision, providing an opportunity exists. Per Section III.E.2.a of the JMU Faculty Handbook, members of the PAC have the right to participate in evaluations while on leave or absent from the university, but will recuse themselves during evaluation of a family member.

Faculty cannot discuss or vote on applications for promotion to rank higher than the one they hold. Whereas the PAC may consult with the AUH or the Dean, the PAC and the AUH will make independent evaluations and submit independent recommendations.

An extended PAC will consist of all tenured full-time faculty plus Senior Lecturer and Principal Lecturer faculty to conduct RTA (SP & IP) promotion evaluations. Senior and Principal Lecturers may participate in and vote on Senior Lecturer promotion evaluations. However, only Principal Lecturers and tenured faculty may participate in and vote on Principal Lecturer promotion evaluations.

All PAC promotion and tenure recommendations and all other issues will be decided by majority vote (except as noted below).

A.1. PAC Chair: A member of the PAC will be elected to chair the committee for the academic year. The PAC chair is a voting member. If the PAC chair is not a full professor, a full professor will serve as the chair for the review of candidates for promotion to full professor. The roles of the PAC chair include:
- Invite untenured faculty to observe when appropriate
- Convene PAC meetings
- Prepare an agenda for each meeting
- Conduct each meeting in a professional manner
- Capture the salient features of discussions
- Write letters that include the salient points
- Circulate the letters to voting members of the PAC for feedback in a timely manner
- Convene any additional meetings as needed
- Deliver evaluation letters to the appropriate individuals

- Draft changes to the PAC document

B. First Year Evaluations

All new tenure-track and RTA faculty will submit their complete dossiers for consideration to the PAC by the first Monday of their second academic semester at JMU. These dossiers must be compiled according to the guidelines described in Part III of this document. No later than the third week of the faculty's second semester, the PAC will provide the candidate with an evaluation, in writing, of their first year's performance based on the criteria described in Part II. The evaluation will be limited to feedback regarding teaching, research, and service. A copy of the letter will be given to the AUH. Additionally, new tenure-track and RTA faculty will also undergo an initial evaluation separately with the CIS & BSAN AUH at the start of their second semester (per JMU Faculty Handbook section III.E.3)

C. Interim Evaluations

All tenure-track faculty will submit their completed dossiers by March 15 of their third academic year for consideration by the PAC. These dossiers must be compiled according to the guidelines described in Part III of this document. No later than April 25, the PAC will provide each faculty in the third year of their evaluation period with an evaluation, in writing, of their progress, or lack thereof, towards promotion and tenure based on the criteria described in Part II. The evaluation will include suggestions for improvement. A copy of the letter will be given to the AUH, and, as appropriate, provided to the Dean's office for inclusion in the faculty member's COB personnel file.

All RTA faculty will also submit their complete dossiers by March 15 of their third year. The PAC may also conduct a sixth-year review of RTA faculty if performance concerns with the faculty member have been identified. If a sixth-year review is deemed necessary by the PAC, the faculty member will be informed upon completion of their third-year review. These dossiers must be compiled according to the guidelines described in Part III of this document. No later than April 25, the PAC will provide each faculty with an evaluation, in writing, of their teaching, research, and service. The evaluation will include suggestions for improvement. A copy of the letter will be given to the AUH, and, as appropriate, provided to the Dean's office for inclusion in the faculty member's COB personnel file.

If the PAC requests additional materials from faculty members after the dossier submission deadline, the request should go to the PAC chair first, who will then ask the PAC to determine if the request should proceed.

D. Non-Renewal of Appointment

Untenured faculty members have no right to renewal of their appointments. Nonrenewal of tenuretrack faculty before undergoing tenure or of RTA faculty may be initiated by the PAC or the AUH and conducted per Section III.F.3 of the JMU Faculty Handbook. The PAC will review pertinent facts and make independent recommendations with justification. These written recommendations will be submitted to the Dean within five days of receiving notice that nonrenewal is to be considered except in the case of a first-year faculty member, in which case the

letter will be submitted within seven days. After the Dean has received both recommendations, a copy of the PAC's letter will be provided to the AUH.

E. Tenure and/or Promotion Decisions

- The policies and procedures in Section III.E.6.b of the JMU Faculty Handbook must be followed when applying for promotion and tenure, and the standards of Section III.E.6.a must be met. Applications for early tenure, before the end of faculty's probationary period, must meet the standard in Section III.E.7.b of the Handbook and Section A of Part II of this document.

- A candidate will be able to choose the guidelines under which their application for promotion and tenure should be evaluated. A candidate who has not yet been promoted may choose to be evaluated for tenure and promotion by the guidelines in place at the time of their hiring or any later guidelines. A candidate who has been promoted may choose to be evaluated for future promotions by the guidelines in place at the time of their most recent promotion or any later guidelines. The cover letter submitted by the candidate must indicate the guidelines chosen by the individual.

- The members of the PAC will discuss a candidate's performance, as defined by the guidelines chosen by the candidate. Points raised during this discussion should be noted for use as justification for the candidate's overall evaluation and should also be included in the evaluation letter.

- PAC members will vote by secret ballot on the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. A PAC member unable to attend the meeting is expected to provide a ballot to the PAC chair prior to the voting.

- The ballot will consist of three separate areas for teaching, research, and service, respectively. For each area, PAC members should be able to indicate their evaluations of the candidate in terms of Excellent, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Abstention.

- When all the ballots have been received, the ballot results will be aggregated by the PAC chair and disseminated to all PAC members. For each area, the majority vote is determined and the resulting rating will be incorporated into the letter by the PAC chair, along with the appropriate justification.

- In case of the absence of a majority vote in any area, any PAC member may ask for a second discussion and a second ballot, which will include all three areas. The same process will apply as before. There may be no more than two discussions or two ballots.

- If there is no majority and the number of Satisfactory or higher ratings matches or is greater than the number of Unsatisfactory ratings, the candidate will receive a Satisfactory rating.

- Certain special cases are noted for the second ballot:

- 44% votes for Excellent, 44% votes for Satisfactory, and 12% for Unsatisfactory will be recorded as Satisfactory;
- 22% votes for Excellent, 33% votes for Satisfactory, and 45% for Unsatisfactory will be recorded as Satisfactory.

- Members of the PAC shall respect and maintain the strict confidentiality of all relevant documents and deliberations.

F. Timeline and Communication

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to apply to be considered for promotion and/or tenure in a given academic year and to declare their intention in writing to the PAC chair and AUH by September 1. They must submit their dossier, with supporting documentation, to the PAC chair and AUH by October 1 or other date as specified by the JMU Faculty Handbook. These dossiers must be compiled according to the guidelines described in Part III of this document. The PAC and AUH will carefully examine the record of each candidate according to the criteria described in Part II of this document and will make independent recommendations to the Dean no later than November 15. A copy of the letter must be provided to the candidate by the same date.

The letter of recommendation from the PAC will rate the candidate as excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in each of the three evaluation areas (teaching, research, and service) and will include justification for each rating. The letter will also include an overall recommendation, whether positive or negative. A positive recommendation for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor requires an evaluation of excellent in at least one area and evaluations of satisfactory in the remaining areas. A positive recommendation for promotion to Professor requires an evaluation of excellent in at least two areas and an evaluation of at least satisfactory in the remaining area. The appeals process for a tenure denial is detailed in the JMU Faculty Handbook III.E.7.f.(9).

G. PAC Document Revisions

Revisions to this document, including changes in the criteria for promotion and/or tenure, may be made at any time if approved by majority of the full-time tenured, tenure-track, or RTA CIS & BSAN faculty. All proposed revisions must first be distributed to faculty and AUH, and three full weeks of the regular academic year must be allowed for discussions and suggestions. The amended document must be distributed to all faculty and two full weeks must be allowed before the fulltime faculty vote on the proposal. Once approved by the faculty and the AUH, the proposal will be sent for approval to the Dean and Provost. All approved revisions are to be effective as of the beginning of the next academic year. The current PAC document will be available electronically and a copy will be provided to new faculty by the AUH.

PART V: ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS

Annual evaluations and subsequent faculty conferences are conducted by the AUH as outlined and in accordance with Section III.E.4. of the JMU Faculty Handbook. Once the process is complete,

the AUH will then send a signed copy of the evaluation to the Dean, according to the specifications of the JMU Faculty Handbook.

A well-designed and well-administered annual evaluation process should result in promotion, tenure, and/or contract renewal decisions that are reasonably well anticipated by the candidate. While one cannot expect to completely eliminate the element of surprise from P&T and contract renewal processes, the objective should be to keep this element as small as possible. To achieve this, in the areas of research, teaching, and service, annual faculty evaluations will be based on relevant criteria as described in Part II of this document, and these criteria will be applied consistently and uniformly across ranks and from year to year.

All annual evaluations should be on a scale of 1-9 (1-3 for unsatisfactory, 4-6 for satisfactory, and 7-9 for excellent). When performance in an area is less than excellent, suggestions for improvement should be given.

In addition, a string of annual evaluations specifying a certain performance level should, if the annual evaluation process is conducted in a manner consistent with this document, be consistent for purposes of the P&T and other academic decisions. Disagreements between the PAC and the AUH in evaluating a faculty member may arise due to some element of judgement in the criteria.

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

As a result of considering three years in annual evaluations, Premier and A-level Journal publications carry more weight than B-level publications in annual evaluations. That is, a faculty member with one premier publication will be evaluated as excellent for three years in the faculty's annual evaluation and a faculty member with one A-level publication will be evaluated as excellent for two years in the faculty's annual evaluation.

Regarding AACSB classifications, the annual evaluation will be based on the JMU COB Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications. The Department of CIS & BSAN seeks to have all faculty meet the College of Business AACSB criteria for faculty qualifications and engagement. Regardless of category (Scholarly Practitioners, Scholarly Academics, Instructional Practitioners, or Practice Academics) each faculty member is expected to maintain these qualifications. Failing to do so will affect the outcome of the annual review.

If the AUH recommends that a tenured faculty member undergo remediation due to unsatisfactory annual evaluations, the PAC will follow the procedure detailed in Section III.E.8 in the JMU

Faculty Handbook. Faculty members have a maximum of seven days from receipt of an AUH evaluation to lodge an appeal with the CIS & BSAN PAC as per the JMU Faculty Handbook in section III.E.4.(g).

PART VI: DETERMINING MERIT PAY

If merit pay has not been received continuously for one or more years, merit pay is then determined by a weighted average of annual evaluation scores over the number of years since the last merit pay period (if less than five years) or five years since the last merit pay period (if five or more years).

APPENDIX A – EXAMPLES OF SATISFACTORY AND EXCELLENT TEACHING

Teaching Dimension	Examples of Satisfactory Teaching	Examples of Excellent Teaching
Classroom Essentials	• Holds each class at the scheduled time and location unless a sufficiently strong reason for not doing so exists (e.g., sickness, plant tour, professional conference attendance). • Communicates clearly course policies and expectations (classroom behavior, assignment policies, due dates, etc.) and enforces these policies in a clear and impartial manner. • Grades and returns graded assignments in a timely manner. Schedules office hours consistent with departmental policy and is ready to assist students who come to them, including discussion of previously completed/returned assignments. • Exercises control over the classroom to create a courteous and productive environment. Provides a syllabus consistent with university requirements.	Meets Satisfactory standards, and: • Gives sufficient and clearly stated lead time on submitted assignments or tests. • Provides additional resources when students are struggling with mastering the material (e.g., write-ups, practice assignments or tests, examples of excellent work, review sessions). • Creates an environment in which students are active participants in their learning, using a presentation that develops the material in a way that is clear, structured, and engaging. • Encourages and actively listens to questions in class and is courteous to those who ask them. Asks if they answered the question.
Classroom Flow	• Presentations/lectures/exercises almost always prepared ahead of class. • Presentation is organized and clear, with more complicated topics building on simpler ones. • In-class examples are common and include numerous items higher on Bloom's Taxonomy than "memorize/remember". • Student questions are welcome. Practical applications are discussed and used as motivation. • Use of the tools that students are expected to use (Excel, programming language, etc.) demonstrated in class. • Substantive errors in a presentation are addressed and corrected by the next class.	Meets Satisfactory standards, and: • Signposting is used (where we were, where we are, where we're going). • In-class examples/exercises are crafted carefully to advance student understanding of the material and are varied with a range of difficulties. • Most work involves something more than the "remember/memorize" level of Bloom's Taxonomy, and connections among various techniques/concepts are explored. • Teacher finds ways to keep class engaging and appropriately challenging, helping students to develop both confidence and competence with the material. • Students feel the class and the time spent with it are worthwhile.

	• For courses with a common syllabus, the entire course content is covered and tested.	

Course Documents	• Students have timely access to course materials and are aware of what they are responsible for, and when. • Materials are not haphazard and with the exception of some small errors, are substantively correct. • Tests should thoroughly cover the topics they are supposed to test and not require specialized knowledge outside of course material to answer. • Questions should be at a variety of difficulties and conceptual levels and be relatively free of errors or ambiguities. • Newer faculty members should assure the difficulty and coverage of their exams is comparable to those of more experienced teachers. • Learning materials may include supplements to the actual course text.	Meets Satisfactory standards, and: • High quality and relevant supplementary materials provided to the students (e.g., write-ups, class or homework exercises, current event articles, excellent examples/applications, practice exams or exercises, journal articles). • Creation of one's own high-quality materials is appreciated especially because it indicates the teacher is actively and creatively engaging with the course content and its effective presentation. This includes textbooks or video presentations published by a respected publishing firm, invited teaching presentations at national professional meetings, other colleges or universities, businesses. • To a lesser extent, having JMU colleagues use your materials is also notable.

Student Interaction	• Most students find the class to be at least satisfactory, as indicated in long-term student evaluations. • Problems identified in one or more semesters should be objectively considered and subsequently addressed. • Most students are reasonably comfortable engaging with you in class and in office hours. • It is not true that most students find the course to be extremely easy.	Meets Satisfactory standards, and: • Evidence of exceptional student success: standardized exams, coursebased competitions, graduate admissions, success in later courses or jobs using your course, etc. • Exceptional rapport with students: exceptional student evaluations, unsolicited notes or solicited letters of praise, etc. • Activities that highlight exceptional dedication to student learning: being a thesis advisor/reader, coaching a professional competition team in the discipline, etc.
Course Contributions	• For newer hires, this contribution is likely to be primarily the preparation of presentations and materials for the courses they teach. As time passes, it also includes a willingness to teach other courses which their training qualifies them for, especially when it fills a departmental need. • Taking part in departmental or college discussions concerning the direction of the program(s) and how to effectively improve them.	Meets Satisfactory standards, and: • Maintains a substantive commitment to keeping up with developments in the field and developing and effecting improvements to course delivery, course development, or curriculum content.
Collaboration (Teaching Improvement)	• Usually listens to constructive criticism on classes when it is offered from colleagues and students. • Usually responds to constructive criticism in a timely and positive way. • When aware of a course problem but unable to identify a good solution, seeks help/advice from more experienced colleagues and/or the AUH.	Meets Satisfactory standards and: • Often seeks out or welcomes constructive criticism, both from colleagues and students. • Evaluates such criticism and sensibly decides how it should be responded to. • Uses resources involving other people to grow as an effective teacher (e.g., mentorship, CFI, TAP, workshops). This may include inviting classroom visitations or attending sessions of other teachers' classes. • More experienced teachers should clearly communicate a willingness to help/advise/support colleagues less experienced in the course. • Completion of workshops, relevant coursework, certifications, awards,

		and education grants are also indicators in this area.

APPENDIX B: CIS & BSAN JOURNAL LIST

A. Overview

The journals listed below are examples of journals in each classification. All journals in the Premier, A, and B lists must be peer-reviewed and relevant to the faculty members' professional activities. The following lists are not intended to be exhaustive but illustrative. Abstracts in conference proceedings do not count toward publication credits for RTA and tenure track faculty promotion; however, they may provide evidence of ongoing scholarly effort or activities. The following journal lists are subject to review every two academic years (starting in Fall 2022) by the PAC to ensure their rigor, accuracy, and relevance.

B. Determining Publication Level for Journals Not Currently on List

For a journal not currently on the CIS & BSAN or another COB Department's journal list, a faculty member may request that the CIS & BSAN PAC make a determination of the specific journal's classification. To make this request, the faculty member must submit appropriate documentation to the PAC chair. The PAC will then make a decision no later than three months after the original date of the request.

A faculty member must provide evidence that the journal meets the standards comparable to those given below for the various journal levels. In particular, if widely accepted, discipline specific, published journal rankings based on journal quality, reputation, and/or visibility exist in another discipline, they must be provided. Some of the well-known journal quality metrics may include (but are not limited to) Scimago SJR score, H Index, Journal Citation Report score (Clarivate Analytics), and inclusion/ranking in reputable lists (e.g., FT-50, UTD-24, ABDC journal quality list, etc.).

C. Premier Journal Criteria

Premier journals are universally recognized in the discipline as having the highest level of recognition and impact. These journals are characterized by exceptionally competitive acceptance rate, high visibility, and strong reputation around the world. One premier journal publication is equivalent to three B-level publications. In addition, one premier publication affects a faculty's annual evaluation for three years as excellent. The following are alphabetical lists of premier journals in the CIS & BSAN Department.

C.1. CIS Premier Journals
- Decision Support Systems (Elsevier)
- European Journal of Information Systems (Taylor & Francis)
- Information and Management (Elsevier)
- Information and Organization (Elsevier)
- Information Systems Journal (Wiley)
-
- •
-
-

- Information Systems Research (INFORMS)
  Journal of the Association for Information Systems (Association of Information Systems)
  Journal of Information Technology (Palgrave)
  Journal of Management Information Systems (M.E. Sharpe)
  Journal of Strategic Information Systems (Elsevier)
  MIS Quarterly (Management Information Systems Research Center)

C.2. BSAN Premier Journals
- Decision Sciences (Wiley-Blackwell)
- European Journal of Operational Research (Elsevier)
- Journal of the American Statistical Association (Taylor & Francis)
- Journal of Operations Management (Wiley)
- Manufacturing & Service Operations Management (INFORMS PubsOnLine)
- Management Science (INFORMS Institute for Operations Research and the Management
  - Sciences)
- Operations Research (INFORMS Institute for Operations Research and the Management
  Sciences)
- Production and Operations Management (Wiley-Blackwell)

D. A-Level Journal Criteria
A-level journals have well-established national or international reputations. These journals are among the top journals in their field and/or otherwise significantly enhance the prestige of the department or college. One A-level publication is equivalent to two B-level publications. In addition, one A-level publication affects a faculty's annual evaluation for two years as excellent. The following are alphabetical lists of A-level journals in the CIS & BSAN Department.

D.1. CIS A-Level Journals
- ACM Transactions (all) (ACM)
- Communications of the ACM (ACM)
- Communications of the Association for Information Systems (AIS eLibrary)
- Electronic Commerce Research and Applications (Elsevier)
- Expert Systems with Applications (Elsevier)
- Harvard Business Review (Harvard Business Publishing)
- IEEE Transactions (all) ((IEEE)
- International Journal of Electronic Commerce (Taylor & Francis online)
- The Data Base for Advances in Information Systems (SIG MIS)

-
- •
-
-

D.2. BSAN A-Level Journals
- Decision Support Systems (Elsevier)
- IEEE Transactions (case by case. depending on areas) (IEEE)
- INFORMS Journal on Computing (INFORMS PubsOnLine)
- International Journal of Operations and Production Management (Emerald)
- International Journal of Production Economics (Elsevier)
- International Journal of Production Research (Taylor& Francis Online)
- International Journal of Project Management (Elsevier)
  Journal of Business Logistics (Wiley)
    Mathematics of Operations Research (INFORMS PubsOnLine)
    Logistics and Transportation Review (ScienceDirect)
    Journal of Supply Chain Management (Wiley)
    Naval Research Logistics (Wiley)
- OMEGA (Elsevier)
- Sloan Management Review (MIT)
- Transportation Research – Parts A, B, C, and E (Elsevier)
- Transportation Science (INFORMS)

E. B-Level Journal Criteria
B-level journals publish peer-reviewed articles that contribute to the evolving body of knowledge. These journals have moderately low acceptance rates and moderately high citation rates. The following are alphabetical lists of B-level journals in the CIS & BSAN Department.

E.1. CIS B-Level Journals
- Behavior & Information Technology (Taylor & Francis Online)
- Computers, Informatics, Nursing (Wolters Kluwer)
- Computers in Human Behavior (Elsevier)
- Electronic Commerce Research and Applications (ScienceDirect)
- Human-Computer Interaction (ScienceDirect)
- Information and Computer Security (Emerald)
- Information and Software Technology (Elsevier)
- Information Resource Management Journal (IGI Global)
- Information Systems Frontiers (Springer)
- International Journal of Healthcare Information Systems and Informatics (IGI Global)
- International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction (Taylor & Francis Online)
- International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education (IGI Global)
- International Journal of Healthcare Information Systems and Informatics (IGI Global)

-
- • •
-
-

29

- International Journal of Human-Computer Studies (Elsevier)
- International Journal of Innovation and Learning (InderScience)
- International Journal of Mobile Communications (Inderscience)
- Journal of Computer Information Systems (Taylor & Francis)
- Journal of Database Management (IGI Global)
- Journal of Global Information Technology Management (Taylor & Francis Online)
- Journal of Information Systems Education (ISCAP)
- Journal of Information Technology Education: Research (Informing Science Institute)
- International Journal of Information Technology and Management (InderScience)
- Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce (Taylor & Francis Online)
- Journal of Organizational and End User Computing (IGI Global)
- Journal of Systems and Software (Elsevier)

E.2. BSAN B-Level Journals

Academic Emergency Medicine (SAEM)
Annals of Operations Research (Springer)
Central European Journal of Operations Research (Springer)
Computers and Industrial Engineering (Elsevier)
Computers and Operations Research (Elsevier)

-
-
-
-

- Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education (Wiley)
- EURO Journal on Computational Optimization (Elsevier)
- INFORMS Journal on Applied Analytics (Interfaces)
- INFORMS Transactions on Education (Informs PubsOnLine)
- International Journal of Information Technology and Decision Making (World Scientific)
- International Journal of Operational Research (Inderscience)
- International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management (Inderscience)
- Journal of Combinatorial Optimization (Springer)
- Journal of Global Optimization (Springer)
- Journal of Heuristics (Springer)
- Journal of Optimization Theory and Application (Springer)
- Journal of Scheduling (Springer)
- Journal of the Operational Research Society (Taylor & Francis Online)
- Journal of Transportation Engineering (ASCE Library)
- Operational Research: An International Journal (Springer)
- Operations Management Research (Springer)
- Operations Research Letters (Elsevier)
- Production and Inventory Management Journal (APICS Supply Chain Council)
- Production, Planning & Control (Taylor & Francis Online)
- Production Engineering (Springer)
- SIAM Journal of Optimization (Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics)
- Socio-Economic Planning Sciences (Elsevier)
- Technometrics (Taylor & Francis Online)

F. B-Equivalent Publication Criteria

Some publications that do not meet the criteria for B-level journals may be considered as B-equivalent publications and may substitute for a B-level journal article. A limited number of such substitutions are allowed, as outlined in Part III of this document. The following publications may be considered as B-equivalent:

- A refereed book chapter or monograph published by a reputable publisher.
- At least three peer-reviewed international or national conference proceedings papers.
- At least five peer reviewed regional conference proceedings papers. Abstracts are not considered.
- A textbook that goes through the editorial process, is published by a reputable publisher, and is adopted by other schools.
- At least three published cases.
- Three or more C-level publications may count as a B-equivalent.
- A publication that makes a significant contribution to education in our field may be considered a B-equivalent. Evidence of significant contribution to education may include:
    - o the teaching material is published and is used at several universities o the publication is cited in major textbooks

o   the publication is assigned reading at several universities

Note: Publishing an abstract in a Conference Proceedings is not considered a publication but is considered continuing research activity. Conference proceedings that are peer-reviewed and constitute substantial scholarly achievement may be considered as scholarly research for promotion purposes.

G. C-Level Publication Criteria

Publications that are not counted as Premier, A, or B-level journals are counted as C-level publications. The following are examples of CIS and BSAN C-level publications.

G.1. C-Level Publications
- Coastal Business Journal
- Computerworld
- Datamation
- Decision Line
- Information Week
- Issues in Information Systems
- OR/MS Today

H. Publications Categorization Process

The CIS & BSAN journal lists will undoubtedly change over time. For purposes of evaluating the level of an article by a faculty member, the journal's level will be accepted as either the level at the time of submission of the article or the journal's level at the present time, whichever is higher. An article's level may be adjusted upward with sufficient supportive evidence of impact (e.g., citation ratings), even if the journal did not experience a change in ranking.