

Department of Marketing  
Evaluation and Procedures  
Approved: 2023

**Annual, Third-Year, and Promotion and Tenure Evaluation  
Review of Criteria and Evaluative Processes  
Department of Marketing  
(Approved by the Department February 23, 2023)**

**Overview**

The Department of Marketing at James Madison University is a quality undergraduate program with a balanced teaching and scholarly achievement emphasis. Basic or discovery, applied or integration/application, and teaching and learning based research is important to the faculty in the Department of Marketing. Faculty members also are expected to engage in a mixture of university, college, program, and professional service. The Department of Marketing values teaching, scholarship, professional development, and service activities that support the goals and objectives of the College and University.

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

**Codification of the Process**

Membership and Voting requirements for the Department of Marketing AUPAC shall be as follows:

1. The AUPAC consists of all faculty, except the AUH, who are at the ranks of tenured associate or full professor or senior or principal lecturer.
2. Membership begins upon the date the University officially grants promotion or appointment.
3. Each member must cast their vote in-person by ballot except in emergency circumstances that prevent the individual from voting in-person. If this is the case, then the individual must contact the AUPAC Chair and cast a vote by email. Full-time faculty members on leave may cast a vote electronically as well.
4. Following discussion of the domain to be voted on (teaching, research, professional development, or service), each AUPAC member will vote to rate performance as excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. If the number of votes for a higher and lower rating is tied, the AUPAC will issue the higher rating.
5. Any Department of Marketing faculty member may propose changes in this document.
6. All full-time members of the Department of Marketing (with the exception of the AUH, who reviews separately) will be allowed to vote on proposed changes to this document as it has the potential to affect everyone. In order to approve changes to this document a quorum of two-thirds is necessary with a simple majority needed to pass changes to this document. Upon approval by the department, the document is sent for review to the AUH, Dean, and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Curriculum.
7. Recommendation for promotion to associate professor will be rendered by current associate and full professors. Recommendations for promotion to full professor shall be rendered by current full professors.
8. Recommendation for promotion to Senior Lecturer will be rendered by current associate and full professors, and current senior and principal lecturers. Recommendations for promotion to principal lecturer shall be rendered by current associate and full professors and principal lecturers.

## **Description of Ranks and Titles**

### Lecturers

The responsibilities of a faculty member appointed to one of the lecturer ranks are focused on undergraduate education, with an expectation that the faculty member has at least a 60% or 65% teaching obligation under the guidelines established by the College of Business and annually agreed upon with the AUH. Lecturer roles typically have 4/4 teaching load in the department. In addition, Lecturer appointments may include expectations for student advising, departmental service related to their instructional role, and/or scholarly achievement and professional development. The evaluation and promotion process will consider their contributions and achievement in light of the expectations set forth in the appointment. Tenure will not be awarded at any of these ranks.

### Lecturer Rank Definitions

**Lecturer:** The rank of lecturer is used 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. Lecturers may perform other tasks as required by the department including, but not limited to: student advising, revising courses and curricula, and other administrative duties. Lecturers must have earned a minimum of a master's degree in their discipline, or related field, and have work experience and/or professional certifications that meet SACSCOC and AACSB (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) accreditation requirements.

**Senior Lecturer:** In addition to the requirements of Lecturer, the rank of Senior Lecturer is expected to demonstrate a sustained record of teaching mastery. Service performance and professional development in their field of study should meet at least satisfactory expectations. In addition, Senior Lecturers may be tasked with mentoring colleagues and undergraduate students, assisting with the development of courses or curricula, and having a sustained record of external outreach.

**Principal Lecturer:** In addition to meeting the requirements of Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer are expected to demonstrate a sustained record of exemplary teaching and service, providing evidence of recognition (e.g., awards, etc.) in the areas of teaching and/or professional service and evidence of continued professional development in their field of study. In addition, a Principal Lecturer may be expected to have a considerable role in mentoring colleagues and graduate teaching assistants, leading course development or curricula changes, and guiding special instructional initiatives.

## **Initial Evaluation Process**

The AUH provides a new faculty member with information concerning the academic unit evaluation procedures and criteria in the faculty member's first semester of full-time employment at JMU. The initial evaluation is conducted by the AUH at the beginning of the faculty member's second semester. The evaluation includes the following elements:

**Conference.** The AUH and faculty member meet to discuss the first-semester performance and any need for improvement and/or professional support. The AUH may request, either before or after the meeting, that the faculty member supply documents containing information relevant to the review.

**Written Evaluation.** The AUH provides the new faculty member with a written initial performance evaluation within 14 days of the evaluation conference. The evaluation must state whether the performance has been acceptable or unacceptable. This part of the evaluation process must be completed by the end of the third week of the second semester.

**Dean's Review.** A copy of the evaluation, signed by the faculty member and the AUH, must be sent to the dean by the AUH. Refusal to sign the evaluation must be noted on the evaluation when the AUH sends it to the dean.

Nonrenewal. Unacceptable performance as determined in the initial evaluation will normally result in nonrenewal of the appointment of an untenured first-year faculty member. If the AUH finds the faculty member's performance unacceptable, AUPAC review of the faculty member's performance is required as specified in Faculty Handbook, Section III.F.3. The AUPAC review must be completed and sent to the dean no later than seven days after receipt of the AUH nonrenewal recommendation.

### **Annual Evaluation Process**

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

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

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

**Evaluations.** A preliminary written evaluation is given to each faculty member by the AUH at least one day prior to an evaluation conference. The evaluation conference must provide an opportunity to discuss the faculty member's performance, professional contributions and needs as perceived by both the faculty member and the AUH. The official written evaluation shall not be made until after the evaluation conference. The last date that the conference can take place is Sept 21. The AUH will provide the official written evaluation to the faculty member by October 1.

**Performance Ratings.** The department employs a nine-point scale using three levels of performance evaluation for each evaluation category (unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and excellent) with ratings of 0 – 2 for unsatisfactory, 3 – 5 for satisfactory, and 6 – 8 for excellent. Faculty members also receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory or satisfactory, which is based on relative weights assigned to each area of performance. Faculty with a score of zero in any single functional area (teaching, scholarly achievement/professional development, or service) receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory for that evaluation period. A zero is given when faculty have not made a good faith effort to fulfill their responsibilities in a functional area. Faculty may avoid a zero rating by demonstrating that they are striving to fulfill their functional obligations, e.g., by making changes in how they interact with students or present course material when previous practices have been pedagogically ineffective, by writing articles and submitting them for review, by accepting and fulfilling assignments to serve the department, university, or profession. The annual evaluation for an RTA (Renewable Term Appointment) faculty member shall include a recommendation on extending that faculty member's appointment.

**Annual Evaluations' relationship to Promotion.** Promotion evaluations are based upon the designated review period. The expectation is the preponderance of annual evaluations meet the requirements listed in the next two paragraphs.

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

The James Madison University Faculty Handbook states an excellent rating in teaching and at least a satisfactory rating in all other areas is required for promotion to Senior Lecturer. The handbook states the excellent ratings in teaching and one other area and at least a satisfactory rating in the third area is required for promotion to Principal Lecturer.

**Merit Pay Calculations.** Merit pay will be allocated as follows:

- 1) Faculty members receive an overall annual performance rating: scores in teaching, scholarly achievement/professional development, and service are multiplied by their respective weights and are then summed.
- 2) Average performance rating for the department is calculated.
- 3) Each faculty member's rating is divided by the department mean which yields a performance index.
- 4) The performance index (rating/mean) is multiplied by the merit allocation % (e.g., .04 or .02).
- 5) The product of step 4 is multiplied by the faculty member's current salary to determine merit pay.
- 6) In the event that there are years in which no merit raises are offered, the yearly average performance rating since the last merit raise is calculated for each faculty member. That value is divided by the departmental average during that period to yield a performance index as in step 3 above. The index is then used as in steps 4 and 5 above to determine merit pay. The index of faculty who have not served during the entire time in which there has been no merit pay will be calculated based on their scores during the years when they have received annual evaluations.

Appeals of the Annual Review. As specified in Faculty Handbook section III.E.4.g, faculty have the right to appeal the annual evaluation issued by the AUH. Faculty submit their appeal to the AUPAC. The faculty member has a maximum of seven days following receipt of the official written evaluation to make the appeal in writing, providing with the appeal, the evaluation issue by the AUH and a statement on why the evaluation is not valid. Failure to file a timely written appeal will result in the evaluation being forwarded to the dean, and no further appeal rights are available. In response to the appeal, the AUPAC will issue a written judgement on how the faculty member's performance should be evaluated.

### **Third-Year Review Process**

Each new tenure track faculty member in the Department of Marketing will participate in a third-year midpoint review. Documentation of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, research, and service is due to the AUPAC Chair by Oct 1 in the fourth year of service at JMU. As faculty prepare their submission for third-year review, they should be guided by the sections in this document on the evaluation of teaching, research, and service and by the teaching, research, and service standards for promotion. Citing those standards, faculty seeking review should make their best case for being on track to meet the standard for an excellent in teaching or research and at least satisfactory performance in the two other domains that are reviewed. Faculty may argue that they merit an excellent rating in more than one domain. The AUPAC will review the submission and issue a letter no later than Oct 21 outlining what the candidate must do to demonstrate satisfactory or excellent performance in each domain and to be recommended for the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. This letter will be sent to the Dean of the College of Business and the Associate Dean of Human Resources and Administration on or before Oct 21.

### **Tenure and Promotion Review Process**

The tenure and promotion evaluation process is specified in Faculty Handbook section III.E.6. Candidates for tenure and promotion should familiarize themselves with that section of the Handbook. This brief listing of deadlines does not supplant careful reading of that Handbook section and compliance with its requirements. A written statement of intent to apply for promotion and tenure must be submitted to the AUH by September 1. The faculty member who wishes to be considered for promotion must then submit to the AUH and AUPAC a summary of activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement, and service by October 1. Failure to submit a summary of activities and accomplishments by the October 1 deadline constitutes withdrawal of an application. As noted above, to merit an award of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a faculty member must document the achievement of excellent performance in teaching or research and satisfactory performance in the other two

performance domains. To merit promotion to Full Professor, a faculty member must document the achievement of excellent performance in two domains and satisfactory performance in the third domain. It is the responsibility of the candidates to make the case, citing standards listed below, that they have achieved the requisite level of performance. The recommendations of the AUH and AUPAC for the issuance or denial of promotion must be submitted to the dean by November 15. The recommendations must be justified using the Department of Marketing criteria set forth below. To justify application for promotion before completing five years in academic rank, candidates must have a contract that specified they would be evaluated early or must present compelling evidence of accomplishment that merits early evaluation and promotion.

### **Evaluation of Teaching in Annual, Third-Year, and Tenure and Promotion Reviews**

#### **Teaching Criteria and Evaluation**

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

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

##### **Learning/value added**

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

##### **Organization**

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

##### **Interaction with students**

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

##### **Evaluation**

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

##### **Experiential Education**

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

##### **Curriculum and course content**

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

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

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

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

#### **Requirements for Tenure and/or Promotion in Teaching for all Instructional Faculty**

There are many paths to the achievement of an excellent rating in teaching. None of the above indicators, in and of themselves, is either necessary or sufficient evidence of excellent teaching performance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide information documenting and demonstrating excellence in teaching.

Faculty will be expected to put together a 'packet' of their teaching activities. The objective of this 'packet' is to demonstrate a preponderance of excellent teaching during the review period, a commitment to continuous improvement in teaching, and indications of a continuance in mastery of teaching in the future.

#### **Evaluation of Research for Tenure and Promotion for Faculty in Tenure Track or Tenured Positions And Annual Evaluation for Faculty in Tenure Track or Tenured Positions**

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.

#### **Scholarly Development and Academic Engagement Criteria**

The following paragraphs reflect the broad dimensions of scholarly development and academic engagement as defined by the AACSB. The three generally recognized categories of scholarly development activities are:

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

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

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

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

### **Journal Ranking**

For the purposes both of promotion and tenure and of annual evaluation, the A, B, C value of contributions will be based on the following journal ranking. Faculty have the right to request and receive from the Departmental PAC a binding advisory opinion on the ABC status of journals not listed below and on the status of books, book chapters, monographs, and other scholarly outputs. The PAC will have two weeks to respond to the faculty member's request from the date that the request is received by the PAC chair. Criteria should include but are not limited to acceptance rate of the Journal in question, the Social Science Index rating equal to the journal level the faculty member is requesting and any other data the faculty member submits, and the PAC deems salient. Once journal classification is determined by the PAC, the journal is added to the departmental list.

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

The Department of Marketing will maintain distinct journal ranking lists. Evaluations will be based on the journal listing.

### **Premier Publications**

Premier publications are the six journals explicitly listed in this document that are universally recognized in the discipline as having the highest level of recognition and impact. These journals count as 3 Level B journals toward tenure and promotion.

### **A-Level Publications**

Level A research publications are broadly defined as those publications that are recognized by scholars as being among the top journal publication outlets within a particular area of study. Publications meeting the A-Level standard have many or all of the following characteristics: a) peer review, b) top international journal, c) high ranking within surveys of journal quality, reputation, and visibility, d) journal acceptance rates which are less than or equal to 15% of submissions and e) Social Science Citations Index (SSCI) greater than 0.5. Level A-journals count as 1.5 Level B journals.

### **B-level Publications**

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) midrange to modest ranking within surveys of journal quality, reputation, and visibility, d) journal acceptance rates between 15% and 30%, and e) SSCI between 0.1 and 0.5.

### **C-Level Publications**

Level C research publications are broadly defined as those publications that are recognized as being of limited but sufficient quality and visibility. A Level C journal is representative of some combination of the following

characteristics: a) the absence of peer review, b) editorial review, c) narrow focus and/or visibility, d) low or absent ranking within surveys of journal quality, reputation, and visibility, e) high acceptance rates, and f) Social Science Citations Index less than 0.1. These journals count as .5 Level B journals toward tenure and promotion (maximum 2 C-Level Publications).

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

**Michael O'Fallon: Above, on page 7 under Scholarly Development and Academic Engagement Criteria, you list Teaching and Learning Research as a scholarly development activity. However, I do not see how these contributions fit in your A, B, C criteria above. How are these types of contributions evaluated and used in determining an overall rating under scholarly achievement and professional qualifications for a faculty member who completes these types of activities?**

### **Requirements for Tenure and Promotion**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Annual Evaluation of Research**

All faculty members will submit as part of their annual evaluation the five-year rolling average of publications and an annual score of their B list intellectual contributions.

For a faculty member seeking: (1) tenure and/or (2) promotion, a five-year annual average of .8 contributions would generally merit a Satisfactory annual rating (3 to 5 on the 9-point scale, the actual rating to be determined at the AUH's discretion) while an average of 1.2 would generally merit an Excellent rating (6 to 8 on the 9-point scale, the actual rating to be determined at the AUH's discretion).

Both Satisfactory and Excellent evaluations presuppose evidence of ongoing scholarly effort. Faculty will also indicate in the report the number of C list contributions that have been part of their rolling average over the past three years. Contributions from the C list in excess of the two that may be substituted for a B list contribution may receive limited credit in the performance evaluation. Any faculty member without qualified status, and who fails to make progress toward achievement of qualified status, may receive a score of zero for the research component of the annual review. Further, they will receive additional teaching assignment as specified by *James Madison University COB Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications*.

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

### **Journal Ranking List**

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

### **Marketing**

#### **Premier Publications**

*Journal of Consumer Research*  
*Journal of Marketing*  
*Journal of Marketing Research*  
*Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*  
*Journal of Retailing*  
*Marketing Science*

#### **A-Level Publications**

*Industrial Marketing Management*  
*International Marketing Review*  
*Journal of Advertising*  
*Journal of Advertising Research*  
*Journal of Business Research*  
*Journal of International Marketing*  
*Journal of International Business Studies*  
*Journal of Macromarketing*  
*Journal of Marketing Education*  
*Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*  
*Psychology and Marketing*

**B-Level Publications**

*Academy of Marketing Studies Journal*  
*AMS Review*  
*Asian Journal of Marketing*  
*Case Research Journal*  
*European Journal of Marketing*  
*International Journal of Advertising*  
*International Journal of Research in Marketing*  
*Journal of Brand Management*  
*Journal of Business*  
*Journal of Business Ethics*  
*Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing*  
*Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*  
*Journal of Business Logistics*  
*Journal of Business and Psychology*  
*Journal of Consumer Marketing*  
*Journal of Case Studies*  
*Journal of Consumer Psychology*  
*Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction, and Complaining Behavior*  
*Journal of Euromarketing*  
*Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*  
*Journal of Global Marketing*  
*Journal of Interactive Marketing*  
*Journal of Marketing Channels*  
*Journal of Marketing Communications*  
*Journal of Marketing Management*  
*Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*  
*Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*  
*Journal of Product Innovation Management*  
*Journal of Promotion Management*  
*Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*  
*Journal of Services Marketing*  
*Journal of Strategic Marketing*  
*Marketing Education Review*  
*Marketing Letters*  
*Marketing Theory*

**C-Level Publications**

*Advances in Consumer Research*  
*AMA Educators' Conference Proceedings*

**Evaluation of Professional Qualifications for Instructional Faculty not Tenure Track or Tenured And Annual Evaluation of Professional Qualifications for Instructional Faculty not Tenure Track or Tenured**

**Annual Evaluation of Professional Qualifications (RTA faculty)**

COB SP (Scholarly Practitioner) and IP (Instructional Practitioner) (Instructional Practitioner) requirements are based on guidelines established by the AACSB. As stipulated by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) on page 49 of the Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation

(adopted 4/8/2013), the following is a non-exhaustive list of possible activities that RTA faculty members may undertake to support the maintenance of professional qualifications:

- a. **CONTINUING EDUCATION AND CERTIFICATIONS**
  - Earned and/or maintained at least one recognized professional certification in the field relating to the teaching assignment, in the past five years
  - Documented attendance at continuing education professional classes that are significant in length.
  - Completed a faculty externship with a company
  
- b. **CONSULTING**
  - Work on a significant consulting project (paid or unpaid) that is material in terms of time and substance; consulting services should demand a high degree of expertise and experience in the academic discipline where the faculty member teaches
  - Other forms of substantive linkages to practice, consulting, and other forms of professional engagement that require extensive interaction with organizations outside of JMU
  
- c. **BOARDS**
  - Serves on a board or other oversight position for a profit or not-for-profit organization where the duties are significant in time and scope, and the duties are related to the discipline in which one teaches
  - Serves on the board or other officer position, or serves in another capacity involving significant participation, for an international/national professional organization in the discipline
  
- d. **RECOGNIZED PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE IN TEACHING DISCIPLINE**
  - Invited talks or keynote speeches delivered to professional audiences
  - Development and presentation of continuing professional education, executive education programs, and/or practitioner-based webinars
  - Ongoing and sustained participation in professional events that focus on the practice of business, management and related issues
  - Service on an AACSB or ABET accreditation visit team
  
- e. **OTHER PUBLICATIONS NOT MEETING DEFINITION OF QUALITY PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL ARTICLE**
  - Publication within a professional practitioner or occupation trade publication
  - Case study published in non-refereed outlet
  - Published manual, guide or textbook supplement
  - Textbook related to area of teaching
  - Scholarly book in one's discipline
  
- f. **UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES (counts as one practitioner activity)**
  - Full-time administrative roles include dean, associate dean, academic unit head, director of a school, MBA director
  
- g. **PEER REVIEWED QUALITY PUBLICATION**

For the annual performance evaluation of RTA faculty, the Department of Marketing will use the point system described below. Points will accrue over a rolling five (5) year period and will be evaluated in accordance with COB and AACSB maintenance standards for professional qualifications. According to COB guidelines SP/IP is based on achievement in a variety of activities, therefore Department of Marketing SP/IP points must be earned for at least two different activities within any five-year period in order to achieve a satisfactory or higher rating. Faculty members who fall below three (3) points during the five-year period will no longer have SP/IP status, resulting in an unsatisfactory rating. An unsatisfactory rating may require remedial actions in accordance with COB policy.

Points	Evaluation Rating
< 3	Unsatisfactory (0)
3	Unsatisfactory (1)
4	Unsatisfactory (2)
5	Satisfactory (3)
6	Satisfactory (4)
7	Satisfactory (5)
8	Excellent (6)
9	Excellent (7)
10+	Excellent (8)

Most items on the COB/AACSB list are worth one point. Some exceptions and special cases appear below.

- Three hours of graduate coursework in an area relevant to teaching responsibility = 1 point, no more than 2 in a five-year period
- Peer reviewed quality journal publication = 2 points
- Center Directorship = 1 point
- The significance of outside employment is indicated by compensation and responsibilities (i.e., budget authority and supervision of staff).
- The significance of a consulting project is indicated by compensation (though compensation is NOT required), the duties outlined in the engagement letter, and/or the preparation of a substantive report based on the consulting activity. Providing consulting in conjunction with an organization affiliated with JMU (e.g., the Small Business Development Center) is also viewed positively.
- Newly appointed business professionals are given SP/IP status for the first five years (based on prior professional experience), with the understanding that they will engage in further qualification activities over that time that contribute to maintenance of SP/IP status. At the end of RTA faculty's sixth year, they need three points earned over the prior five-year period in order to maintain satisfactory SP/IP status.

### **Requirements for and Promotion to Senior Lecturer and Principal Lecturer**

Faculty members must meet the *minimum* standards for satisfactory professional development to be considered for promotion. Excellence in professional development is one of the two possible categories required for promotion to Principal Lecturer. The preponderance of annual evaluations should demonstrate satisfactory or excellence in Professional Development.

### **Evaluation of Service for Tenure, Promotion for all Instructional Faculty and Annual Evaluation of Service for all Instructional Faculty**

#### **Service Criteria**

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

Examples of Level 3 service include:

- having lunch with potential employers of COB students or freshmen parents
- attending graduation ceremonies, COB Parent's Day Open House, COB awards ceremonies, program meetings or program seminars
- participating in any program assessment efforts requiring universal faculty involvement

- participating in faculty recruiting (meeting with candidates, attending candidate seminars)
- attending the JMU career fair or Internship fair
- attending senior project presentations

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

Examples of Level 2 service activities include:

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

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

Examples of Level 1 service include:

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

### **Service Evaluation**

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

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

**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 consisting of A) a yearly average of one Level 1 activity plus two Level 2 activities plus a representative mixture of Level 3 activities or B) a yearly average of five Level 2 activities plus a representative mixture of Level 3 activities. At least two of these activities must be service that is internal to the university. Service that is external to the university is not required. Service for which a faculty member is compensated, either by dollar payment or reduced teaching load, should be at least partially discounted. In cases of significant compensation, such activities may be fully discounted.

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

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

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

#### **Requirements for Tenure and/or Promotion in Service for all Instructional Faculty**

There are many paths to the achievement of a satisfactory and/or excellent rating in teaching. None of the above indicators, in and of themselves, is either necessary or sufficient evidence of satisfactory and/or excellent performance. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide information documenting and demonstrating excellence in service.

Excellence in service is one of the two possible categories required for promotion to Principal Lecturer. The preponderance of annual evaluations should demonstrate satisfactory or excellence in Service.