

Department of Management
Promotion and Tenure Evaluation
Guidelines

Approved: 2017

Department of Management Procedures and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

(Adopted March 28, 2014; Revised January 26, 2017)

The purpose of evaluation of faculty members at James Madison University is to promote professionalism, to encourage performance at the highest levels and to 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. (JMU Faculty Handbook, III.E.)

The following document provides a detailed explanation of the procedures and criteria used by the Management Department Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC) and/or the Management Department Academic Unit Head (AUH) for evaluation of faculty performance in the following circumstances: 1) initial evaluation of faculty members following their first semester, 2) annual performance evaluation, 3) PAC third-year review, and 4) comprehensive evaluation for promotion and tenure. The Management Department values faculty involvement in activities that are in alignment with the CoB and JMU goals and objectives.

Additionally, as specified in the JMU Faculty handbook, this document provides information regarding the procedures and operation of the Management Department PAC.

This document is available to all MGT faculty in electronic form on the MGT common drive (N:/COB/MGMT-Common), and is provided to new faculty by the MGT AUH upon completion of the hiring process. Any changes to COB policy or JMU Faculty handbook that conflict with these guidelines take precedence.

All MGT faculty members will be held accountable for the information contained within this document, as well as all relevant material related to evaluation contained in the most recent revision of the JMU Faculty Handbook (http://www.jmu.edu/facultysenate/facultyhandbook/pdf/FH_Final_070113.pdf).

Table of Contents

I. MGT Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC)	3
A. Procedures and Operation.....	3
B. Responsibilities.....	3
C. Confidentiality.....	3
II. Initial Evaluation	5
III. Annual Evaluation	6
A. Procedure.....	6
B. Performance Criteria.....	7
C. Weighting of Performance Areas.....	10
D. Performance Rating System	11
IV. Comprehensive Evaluation (Promotion and Tenure)	12
A. Promotion.....	12
1. Standards.....	12
2. Criteria	13
3. Procedure.....	21
B. Tenure.....	22
1. Standards and criteria.....	22
2. Procedure.....	24
3. Early Tenure.....	25
Appendix 1: Merit Procedure.....	26

I. Management Department Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC)

As specified in the JMU Faculty Handbook (FH), each academic unit must have a personnel advisory committee (PAC) that advises the academic unit head (AUH) and makes independent recommendations on personnel matters. The PAC is responsible to its faculty and AUH, and is under the oversight of the College of Business (COB) dean. (FH III.E.2.a)

The full-time faculty of the academic unit except the AUH shall be responsible for determining the composition and electing the membership of the AUPAC (FH III.E.2.a).

A. Procedures and Operations

Full-time Management (MGT) faculty members will meet at the beginning of each academic year to determine the composition of the PAC. Only tenured Management faculty members are eligible to serve on the PAC as voting members. Members of the MGT PAC will select a chair each year to serve in a leadership capacity. Candidates for PAC chair can be self-nominated or nominated by other PAC members, and the position is decided by a majority vote of the PAC members.

Only MGT PAC members that have achieved promotion to Professor will be involved in the evaluation of MGT faculty members seeking promotion to Professor. In all tenure and/or promotion decisions, each member of the PAC will vote on performance ratings in the areas of teaching effectiveness, scholarly activity, and service activity. In addition, each member of the PAC will also vote on an overall recommendation as to each candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion. MGT PAC members who are on academic leave or who are unable to attend PAC meetings (i.e. teaching abroad) may participate in PAC activities "virtually", or may ask to be recused from activities for a specified period of time. PAC members will not be allowed to participate in the evaluation of a family member or relative, and may ask for recusal in other circumstances where there may be a conflict of interest.

B. Responsibilities

The MGT PAC will meet on an ad hoc basis to address various responsibilities, including:

1. Third Year (Interim) Review for Tenure-track faculty members.

The MGT PAC will provide a developmental interim review (between the initial and comprehensive reviews) of MGT faculty members' progress towards tenure and promotion. Full-time tenure track faculty members will submit materials for review to the PAC no later than January 15th of the third year of the faculty member's probationary period. The third year review packet submitted by a faculty member will contain an overview of the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The PAC will evaluate the faculty member's materials and provide written feedback in the form of a letter, as well as a one-on-one feedback

session with a PAC member, no later than February 28th. Once the feedback session has been conducted a copy of the evaluation will be signed by the faculty member and the PAC Chair (representing the PAC members), and forwarded to the COB Dean no later than March 1st. A copy of the third year review letter will be included in the faculty member's permanent personnel file. Any tenure track faculty member whose contract stipulates a shortened tenure track will submit materials for an interim review at the halfway point of their probationary period.

2. Comprehensive Review of tenure-track faculty members for promotion and tenure.

The PAC will participate in the Comprehensive Evaluation process as delineated in Sections III.E.6 – III.E.7. of the JMU Faculty Handbook (most recent edition) and Section IV of the MGT Department Procedures and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation document.

3. Annual Evaluation Appeal.

The MGT PAC will hear the appeal of any faculty member asking for review of an annual evaluation. As specified in the FH (Section III.E.4.g), *the faculty member has a maximum of seven days following receipt of the official written evaluation to make the appeal in writing. Failure to file a timely written appeal will result in the evaluation being sent forward to the dean, and no further appeal rights are available.* Following the appeal hearing the PAC will make a formal recommendation to the AUH regarding any suggested revisions to the faculty member's annual evaluation document.

4. Modification of Existing MGT Department Evaluation Guidelines.

As specified in the FH (III.E.4), the number of performance levels, the manner of determining these performance levels, the manner of determining overall performance and the annual evaluation appeal procedure shall be developed by the full-time faculty members of each academic unit, approved by the AUH, dean, appropriate vice provost and provost, and distributed to the faculty of the academic unit. However, in accordance with FH (III.E.4), the MGT PAC *may modify existing evaluation guidelines* provided those changes are agreed on by a majority of the MGT faculty, and subsequently approved by MGT AUH, COB Dean, and JMU Provost (and/or vice provost).

5. Post Tenure Review.

The PAC will participate in the post-tenure review process as specified in the Faculty Handbook (III.E.8 – III.E.8.q).

6. Separation from Employment.

The PAC will participate in the separation process as specified in the Faculty Handbook (III.F – III.F.4.c.(3)).

7. Other personnel issues or concerns at the request of the AUH, the MGT faculty as a whole, or an individual MGT faculty member.

C. Confidentiality

All members of the AUPAC must respect and maintain strict confidentiality of deliberations on all matters under their consideration. Failure to maintain confidentiality may be grounds for removal from the AUPAC or for a misconduct charge under Faculty Handbook, Section III.A.25.

II. Initial Performance Evaluation

As specified in the FH (III.E.3), the MGT AUH will conduct an initial evaluation for new full-time faculty members (tenure-track and RTA) at the beginning of the faculty member's second full semester of full-time employment at JMU. In accordance with procedural rules stipulated in the JMU FH, the initial evaluation of MGT faculty entails the following steps.

A. First Semester Faculty Performance Report

At the end of the faculty member's first semester s/he will prepare a summary of accomplishments and challenges in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, focusing on performance during the first semester at JMU. In addition to this summary, faculty members are expected to provide a thoughtful self-evaluation of their performance to date in each of the three performance areas. This information should be submitted to the MGT AUH in the first week of the second full semester of employment.

B. AUH Review and Preliminary Evaluation

The MGT AUH will review the information submitted by the faculty member, as well as additional materials such as course syllabi and student evaluations. Based on a careful review of these materials, the AUH will draft a written evaluation and schedule a conference with the faculty member to discuss first semester performance. The written evaluation will include: 1) developmental feedback in each of the three performance areas (teaching, scholarship/qualification activities, and service), 2) a rating of excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in each of the three performance areas, and 3) an overall performance evaluation of satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The conference provides the opportunity for discussion of performance issues, as well as any other professional concerns or questions the faculty member may have.

C. Finalization of Initial Evaluation

Following the conference the AUH will make any necessary revisions to the written evaluation and provide a final draft to the faculty member within 14 days of the conference. The faculty member will return a signed copy of the evaluation to the AUH. This entire process will be completed by the fifth week of the second semester. The written evaluation, with faculty member and AUH signatures, is then sent to the COB Dean for review and inclusion in the faculty member's permanent personnel file.

D. Unsatisfactory Rating

As specified in the FH (III.E.3.f), an overall unsatisfactory performance rating will result in nonrenewal of an untenured first-year faculty member. Revolving Term Appointment

(RTA) faculty who receive an overall unsatisfactory performance rating will receive a notification of recommendation for non-renewal of their appointment.

III. Annual Performance Evaluation

As specified in the Faculty Handbook (II.E.4-II.E.4.n), the MGT AUH will conduct an annual performance evaluation for every full-time MGT faculty member. The annual evaluation addresses the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship (or Professional Qualifications in the case of RTA faculty), and service activities during the preceding academic year.

A. Procedure

1. Annual Performance Report

At the conclusion of the academic year all full-time faculty will submit an Annual Performance Report to the AUH. Submission deadline for the Annual Performance report is June 1st, unless otherwise stipulated by the AUH. The Annual Performance Report is generated through the Digital Measures database system used by COB faculty. It is the faculty member's responsibility to ensure that information in the database is updated on a regular basis and is complete and accurate prior to generating the Annual Performance Report document. The Annual Performance report summarizes the faculty member's accomplishments and activities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, Professional Qualification activities, and service activities during the preceding academic year.

a. Self Evaluation

In addition, faculty members are required to provide a thoughtful self-evaluation of their performance in each of the performance areas. The self-evaluation is a critical element in the evaluation process, as it gives the faculty member the opportunity to reflect on and explain unique circumstances, challenges, problems, etc. that may have affected his/her performance over the preceding year. Upon completion of the self-evaluation faculty members will save the document as a Microsoft Word file and send an electronic copy to the AUH by the stipulated deadline.

b. Reporting Period

The cut-off date for inclusion of research publications in the annual performance report is 30 April. The annual performance report will include teaching efforts through the spring semester (summer teaching will be included in the following years' annual performance report).

2. AUH Review

The AUH will thoroughly review the faculty member's Annual Performance Report, student evaluations, and other supplemental materials deemed relevant in preparation for drafting the preliminary performance evaluation document. If the faculty member has teaching or service assignments outside the MGT Department, the AUH may solicit information or performance feedback from appropriate individuals outside the department.

3. Evaluation Conference

All full-time faculty members will meet with the MGT AUH for an evaluation conference following receipt and review of their written preliminary evaluation document (FH (III.E.4.c-d)). The preliminary written evaluation must be given to faculty members at least one day prior to the evaluation conference. The conference provides an opportunity for the AUH and faculty member to discuss the preliminary report, as well as any other questions or concerns related to the performance evaluation process.

4. Finalization of Annual Evaluation Process

Following the conference sessions the AUH will finalize the performance evaluation document (making any necessary changes/revisions) and provide an official written copy to the faculty member by October 1.

Upon receipt of the official written evaluation document the faculty member has seven (7) days to review the document and, if s/he so desires, appeal the evaluation to the MGT Department PAC. The appeal must be made in writing, and delivered to the PAC chair. Failure to file an appeal within the seven (7) day window will result in forfeiture of the right to appeal (FH III.E.4.g.).

Both the AUH and the faculty member are required to sign the official written document. The faculty's member's signature is acknowledgement of receipt and discussion of the preliminary written evaluation, not necessarily indicating agreement with the entirety of its contents. The AUH will send the signed copy to the COB Dean by October 21. The official performance evaluation document then becomes a part of the faculty member's permanent personnel file.

Items included in the faculty member's Annual Performance Report, such as student evaluations and the self-evaluation narrative, are available to the AUH and PAC for review, and are considered confidential. However, activities (such as university or college service) and accomplishments (such as publications or teaching awards) contained in the Annual Performance Report may also be included in the MGT Department Annual Report that is submitted to the COB Dean by the AUH.

5. PAC Developmental Feedback

The PAC welcomes and strongly encourages tenure track faculty to submit their annual review to the PAC for developmental feedback.

B. Performance Criteria

1. Teaching (Tenure-track, tenured and RTA faculty)

The following elements will be taken into consideration by the AUH when evaluating a tenure-track, tenured or RTA MGT faculty member's performance in the teaching area.

- a. Number of course preps, level and type of class taught, class size and other descriptors that may affect teaching success.
- b. Grade distributions or per section GPA.
- c. Teaching honors and awards.
- d. Participation in workshops, seminars, or other professional development focused on teaching.
- e. Innovation in teaching methods and materials.
- f. Student evaluations (numerical and written comments).
- g. Contributions to individualized instruction (e.g., special studies, Honor's thesis).
- h. Unique challenges, special circumstances, and supplemental teaching-related activities faced or undertaken by the faculty member.
- i. Other elements deemed appropriate at the discretion of the AUH.

2. Scholarship (Tenure-track and tenured faculty)

The following elements will be taken into consideration when evaluating a tenure-track or tenured faculty member's performance in the area of scholarship.

- a. Their contribution made towards their number and quality of publications.
- b. Sustained and ongoing scholarly effort.
- c. Where applicable, progress towards tenure and promotion.
- d. Satisfactory standing according to COB AACSB Faculty Qualification Guidelines.

3. Professional Qualifications (RTA faculty)

COB SP and IP 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 PA 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 annual performance evaluation of RTA faculty the Management Department 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 Management Department 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.

<u>Points</u>	<u>Evaluation Rating</u>
< 3	Unsatisfactory (1)
3	Satisfactory (2)
4 - 5	Satisfactory (3)
6	Satisfactory (4)
7	Excellent (5)
8	Excellent (6)
9+	Excellent (7)

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 (NOTE: “Strategic Leadership” PhD classes generally do not meet this requirement, individual classes may.)
- Peer reviewed quality journal article = 2 points
- Significance of employment is indicated by compensation and responsibilities (i.e., budget authority and supervision of staff).
- 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 a RTA faculty’s sixth year, s/he would need three points earned over the prior five year period in order to maintain satisfactory SP/IP status.

4. Service Activities (Tenure-track, tenured and RTA faculty)

Regarding professional service activities, the Faculty Handbook (III.E.2.b) stipulates that *evaluation of activity in this area shall include committee service and leadership at James Madison University or in professional or educational organizations, or service otherwise enhancing the profession, academic unit, college or university.*

The underlying premise of the service evaluation is an assessment of whether or not a faculty member is doing his/her “fair share” of service activities in relation to other faculty members. In accordance with this basic premise, the following elements will be taken into consideration by the AUH when evaluating a tenure-track, tenured or RTA faculty member’s performance in the service area.

- a. Service activities on behalf of the department, college, university, and professional organizations
- b. Professionally related service to the community (e.g., guest speaker for the Small Business Development Center as opposed to coaching a local youth soccer team)
- c. Breadth and depth of the service commitment
- d. Amount of time required for the service activity
- e. Level of responsibility involved (e.g., chair of a committee versus member)
- f. Visibility of the activity (e.g., Service that enhances the visibility or reputation of the department or college such as editor of a professional MGT journal)

C. Weighting of Performance Areas

The three performance areas of teaching, scholarship/qualifications, and service (and the rating given in each area) do not contribute equally to the overall performance rating of faculty members. As stipulated in the FH (III.E.4), *a factor in determining overall annual performance must be the relative weight associated with each of the areas of performance.*

Weights for faculty who are tenured or tenure-track will generally be 50/30/20 (teaching/scholarship/service). However, research can vary between 20 and 30 percent, depending upon the annual agreement the faculty member makes with his/her program director, and service can likewise vary between 20 and 30 percent. Faculty members holding endowed professorships that provide for reduced teaching loads and stress either research or service as criteria for holding the chair may reduce their weight on teaching to as low as 35 percent, with the remaining percentage distributed between research and service as dictated by the chair requirements and the faculty member's objectives for the academic year.

RTA faculty, in consultation with their Academic Unit Head, will establish the relative weights in the categories of teaching and service as either a 65/20/15 (teaching/professional qualification activities/service) or a 60/20/20 weighting of performance areas.

D. Performance Rating System

In compliance with the Faculty Handbook, three descriptive ratings are used in evaluating MGT faculty members' performance: excellent, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. The following scale is used by the MGT Department for numerical ratings in each of the three performance categories; teaching, scholarship and professional qualifications, and professional service.

Excellent	5, 6 or 7
Satisfactory	2, 3 or 4
Unsatisfactory	1

* Please note that this is not a continuous scale, thus constraining the degree to which faculty performance can be differentiated via the rating system.

1. Scholarly Achievement

For all faculty members at JMU at least three years, annual evaluations for scholarly activity will be based on performance during a rolling three-year period that includes the evaluation year and the prior two years. Performance will be evaluated based on criteria consistent with requirements for promotion and tenure. Evidence of ongoing and scholarly effort includes all scholarly activities listed in Levels A, B, C above plus articles submitted to journals in the review process and the development of an ongoing stream of research. Faculty members at JMU less than three years will be evaluated based on their progression toward tenure and promotion for that time period.

2. Professional Qualifications

Please refer to section III.B.3 for details regarding how professional qualifications are reflected in annual performance evaluations.

3. Overall Performance Rating

As stipulated in the FH (III.E.4), *in addition to an evaluation in each of the three areas of performance, the faculty member's overall performance must be evaluated satisfactory or unsatisfactory.* Additionally, the annual evaluation document for MGT faculty members clearly states whether or not the faculty member is currently categorized as Scholarly Academic, Practice Academic, Scholarly Practitioner, or Instructional Practitioner according to AACSB guidelines, and whether or not the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and/or promotion or contract renewal (RTA faculty).

IV. Comprehensive Evaluation: Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

As stated in the Faculty Handbook (III.E - III.E.1), comprehensive evaluations are concerned with promotion and tenure decisions and are conducted in addition to the initial and annual evaluations. Each academic unit must establish written procedures and criteria for the comprehensive evaluation. The procedures, standards and evaluation criteria used by the Management Department AUH and PAC for comprehensive evaluations are provided below. Detailed information regarding the university guidelines for comprehensive evaluation can be found in the Faculty Handbook in sections III.E.6 - III.E.7.f.(12). Only full-time tenure-track and tenured faculty members participate in comprehensive evaluations. RTA faculty members are eligible for contract renewal based on the annual evaluation process.

Promotion and Tenure expectations are only explicitly linked to annual evaluations in the area of Scholarly Activity. The Management Department has a long history of excellent teaching and exceptional service to the college, university, community, and profession. Therefore, while annual evaluations for Scholarly Activity should closely track tenure and promotion expectations, annual evaluations for teaching and service may not. For example, a record of low “excellent” (5) ratings in teaching or service should not be taken as evidence of excellence for tenure or promotion.

A. Promotion

The promotion of an instructional faculty member shall be determined by merit regardless of the distribution of faculty by academic rank within the academic unit. Normally, a faculty member should have completed five years in academic rank at the university before being reviewed for promotion. Though length of service may be given consideration, it is not a sufficient basis for recommendation for promotion. A faculty member’s pattern of prior annual evaluations should be carefully considered in the analysis of an application or nomination for promotion, but each administrator and committee should use judgment and discretion in making recommendations on promotion. A&P faculty members may also apply for or be nominated for promotion in academic rank, and the following policies and procedures shall apply (FH III.E.6).

1. Promotion Standards

Teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service are the basis for evaluating the performance of candidates for promotion in academic rank. In each of these areas, the faculty member shall be evaluated as excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Problems with a faculty member’s conduct may disqualify a candidate for promotion in academic rank (FH III.E.6.a.).

In the evaluation of MGT faculty members being considered for promotion in academic rank, the following standards apply.

- a. Assistant Professor**
At least satisfactory ratings in all performance areas are required for promotion to assistant professor.
- b. Associate Professor**
An excellent rating in one performance area and at least satisfactory ratings in the others are required for promotion to associate professor.
- c. Professor**
Excellent ratings in two performance areas and at least a satisfactory rating in the third area are required for promotion to professor.

2. Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty Seeking Promotion

a. Teaching Effectiveness Criteria

According to the Faculty Handbook (III.E.2.b.(1)), consideration of teaching performance must include, but need not be limited to, the following: *self-evaluation, evaluations by peers and/or academic unit heads, and student evaluations*. The Management Department AUH and PAC will consider the elements discussed below relevant to the comprehensive evaluation of faculty performance in the area of teaching.

(1) Self Evaluation

Each faculty member will prepare a thoughtful self-evaluation of their teaching accomplishments, challenges and activities that includes (but is not limited to) the following information.

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

Failure to complete a comprehensive self-evaluation will negatively affect the overall performance evaluation.

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

will be considered in evaluating their teaching. A statement of teaching philosophy may be helpful to evaluators in understanding the faculty member's pedagogical choices.

(2) Student Evaluations

Student evaluations are administered for all courses taught by Management Department faculty members during the regular academic semesters. Due to varying instructional periods, student evaluations are done at faculty request during the summer session. The following information pertaining to student evaluations shall contribute to the performance appraisal outcome:

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

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

(3) Evaluation by Peers and/or Academic Unit Heads

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

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

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

In addition to the criteria discussed above, the AUH or PAC may consider:

- (a) Unsolicited information provided to the Academic Unit Head or Dean regarding a particular faculty member (e.g., student, parent, or faculty concerns). These comments to the Academic Unit Head or Dean about faculty member performance may be used in determining teaching effectiveness if documented in a manner consistent with professional norms. Negative comments should result in consultation with the faculty member and may justify a class visit.
- (b) Awards for teaching effectiveness from students or peers. The Management Program encourages the COB to disseminate results from student surveys regarding evaluations of teaching effectiveness by students and alumni.

b. Scholarly Achievement Criteria

The Management Department supports a broad range of scholarly activities in disciplines such as Organizational Behavior, Strategic Management, Human Resource Management, Industrial Relations, Entrepreneurship, and International Management, as well as interdisciplinary research (e.g., collaboration in areas such as economics, marketing, CIS, etc.).

The Management Department values all types of scholarship identified by the AACSB including basic/discovery; applied/integration/application; and teaching/learning.

There are three key elements in evaluating scholarship – contribution, quantity, and impact.

Contribution. The Academy of Management Code of Conduct makes clear that faculty must make a clear and substantial contribution to a paper in order to be listed as an author. Therefore, in their annual report or promotion or tenure document each faculty member should clearly state the contribution they made to a paper that has multiple authors. The level of contribution can modify the base number of publication points received.

The Management Department encourages teamwork among faculty members. To promote teamwork, publications with one, two or three authors will be treated equally and the order of authorship will not be used to devalue a faculty member's contribution as long as that contribution is clearly delineated. In addition, publications with more than 3 authors will still be considered valuable contributions. Assuming a high contribution, papers with 4-5 authors will count at least 80% of the designated publication value. Papers with more than 5 authors will count at most 80% of the designated publication value, but may be weighted somewhat less than publications with fewer authors, depending on individual contribution and quality of publication.

Quantity. Scholarship is built on a body of work. Faculty at JMU are expected to build a body of work within identifiable streams of research that builds their reputation as leaders in a field.

Publications are counted toward meeting the above standards when they are formally accepted for publication, not when they are actually published.

For each new hire the AUH, PAC members, and incoming faculty member will reach agreement on which (if any) of the individual's prior publications will count toward tenure and promotion at JMU. This agreement will be put in writing and will become a part of the faculty member's permanent file.

(1) Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

The following criteria will be used to determine whether or not the faculty member has met the standard for Satisfactory Scholarship in seeking promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:

- A minimum of four publication points, and
- evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort (e.g., research grants, presentations at professional conferences, Level D publications, etc.).

The following criteria will be used to determine whether or not the faculty member has met the standard for Excellent Scholarship in seeking promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:

- A minimum of six publication points, and
- evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort.

Faculty members seeking promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or the granting of tenure may earn at most one point from either C level journals or the program's alternate scholarship area to achieve either a satisfactory or excellent rating. Please see page 19 for a detailed description of alternate scholarship.

(2) Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

The following criteria will be used to determine whether or not the faculty member has met the standard for Satisfactory Scholarship in seeking promotion from Associate Professor to Professor:

- A minimum of seven (i.e., three of which were earned since promotion to Associate Professor) publication points.
- evidence of a sustained record of publication while holding the position of Associate Professor, and
- ongoing scholarly effort (e.g., research grants, presentations at professional conferences, Level D publications).

The following criteria will be used to determine whether or not the faculty member has met the standard for *Excellent Scholarship* in seeking promotion from Associate Professor to Professor:

- A minimum of eleven (i.e., five of which were accepted since promotion to Associate Professor) publication points
- evidence of a sustained record of publication while holding the position of Associate Professor, and
- ongoing scholarly effort (e.g., research grants, presentations at professional conferences, Level D publications).

Each candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Professor may earn at most two points from either C level journals or the program's alternate scholarship area to achieve either a satisfactory or excellent rating. Please see page 19 for detailed description of alternate scholarship.

Impact. The evaluation of publication quality is one of the most difficult tasks that all academic organizations must grapple with. Ideally it is the individual article that would be evaluated, but since evaluative decisions often have to be made before the full impact of an article can be determined journal quality is used as a proxy.

The Management Department recognizes five categories of scholarly publications:

(a) A+ Level

A+ level journals are defined as those publications that are generally considered to be the premier journals in the Management discipline and that have an exceptionally high impact on the field. An article appearing in one of the following six journals will count as two (2) publication points toward tenure and promotion.

- Academy of Management Journal
- Academy of Management Review
- Administrative Science Quarterly
- Journal of Applied Psychology
- Journal of Management
- Strategic Management Journal

(b) A Level

A level journals, while not generally considered to be 'premier' journals, are also considered to have a high degree of impact on the Management field. A publication in one of these journals will count as 1.5 publication points toward tenure and promotion. An A level publication has all of the following characteristics: a) peer review, b) high rankings in surveys of

journal quality, c) highly competitive acceptance rates and d) a Social Science Citations Index (SSCI) impact factor rating comparable to the journals listed below which typically have a rating greater than 3. The number of times an article has been cited may also be used to establish research impact.

Examples of A level journals include:

- Journal of Business Venturing
- Journal of International Business Studies
- Journal of Management Studies
- Journal of Organizational Behavior
- Organization Science
- Personnel Psychology

(c) B Level

A publication in a B level journal will count as 1 publication point toward tenure and promotion. A B level journal has some combination of the following characteristics: a) peer review, b) moderate rankings in surveys of journal quality, c) competitive acceptance rates and d) a Social Science Citations Index (SSCI) greater than .5. The number of times an article has been cited may also be used to establish research impact.

Examples of B level journals include:

- British Journal of Management
- Business & Society
- Corporate Governance: An International Review
- Human Relations
- Human Resource Management
- IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management
- Journal of Business Ethics
- Journal of Business Research
- Journal of Management Inquiry
- Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal
- Strategic Organization

(d) C Level

A publication in a C level journal will count as .5 publication points toward tenure and promotion. C level journals may count for a total of 1 publication point towards tenure and promotion and 2 publication points towards promotion to Professor. A C level journal has some combination of the following characteristics: a) peer review, b) appears in surveys of

journal quality, c) has a quality editorial board, d) has reasonable acceptance rates and e) is indexed in Social Science Citations Index (SSCI). The number of times an article has been cited may also be used to establish research impact.

(e) D Level

For the purposes of promotion and tenure decisions, Level D articles may be used ONLY as evidence of "ongoing" research activity.

Level D journals are broadly defined as those publications that are recognized as being of lesser quality and visibility than those publications that count towards tenure and promotion.

While not possessing the visibility and impact of higher level publications, Level D publications may count towards ongoing scholarly activity.

Alternate Scholarship. Not all high impact scholarship appears in management journals. Publications such as textbooks, educational journals, academic books, book chapters, high quality practitioner journals that are not peer reviewed (such as Harvard Business Review) or other types of publications not specifically identified as research in the quality classifications above can still count towards promotion and tenure in a limited fashion. However, it is incumbent on the faculty member to clearly demonstrate the impact of this alternate work.

Alternate scholarship activities, together with C level journals, will count at most as one publication point for tenure and promotion to associate and two publication points for promotion to full.

Ongoing Scholarship. In addition to journal articles, ongoing scholarship may also include authorship of scholarly or practitioner books and book chapters that have limited national impact and visibility, authorship of papers that are distributed in the form of the proceedings of professional meetings, and/or unpublished meeting presentations as well as (a) invited presentations at professional meetings, workshops, seminars, or training programs, (b) the writing of research grants, (c) professional development through formal course work, and (d) consulting activities.

Ongoing scholarship may also include published instructional material (text books, case studies, etc.) that do not have national impact and visibility, or that do not require the level of effort and review/quality control process comparable to publications that meet the Alternate Scholarship level.

(c) Request for Individual Publication Classification

As was noted in the introduction, it would be preferable to evaluate publications rather than journals. Therefore, if a faculty member has a publication that they believe merits greater consideration than the journal it appears in they may

request that the PAC make a determination on its quality.

This request is not to be taken lightly and the faculty member must provide documentation to support the request for classification. Such documentation may include: a letter or statement from the journal's editor indicating the profound impact of the article, awards the article has received, citations of the article, or similar information regarding impact obtained from appropriate sources. The PAC will provide a written ruling on the article in question, with a copy to the AUH, on a case by case basis.

Note that this is done at the level of the article and does not impact the standing of the journal. Subsequent articles from the same author appearing in the same journal must undergo this process in order to count for more than the journal level would suggest. (but see Request for Journal Classification)

(d) Request for Journal Classification

The PAC and AUH will jointly maintain a list of journals that have been previously classified but do not appear in this document. This list will be made available to all faculty.

If a faculty member requests, the PAC may, at its option, evaluate a journal. The faculty member must provide documentation to support the request for classification. This may be done as part of the annual evaluation process.

c. Service Criteria

Regarding professional service activities, the Faculty Handbook (III.E.2.b) stipulates that *evaluation of activity in this area shall include committee service and leadership at James Madison University or in professional or educational organizations, or service otherwise enhancing the profession, academic unit, college or university.*

The Management Department expects all faculty members to perform their professional service duties effectively and reliably, assuming an equitable share of the departmental tasks that fall outside teaching and scholarship responsibilities. Faculty members are encouraged, based on their individual expertise and areas of interest, to offer assistance to their colleagues in these tasks whenever possible. Faculty members are also encouraged to participate in service activities that enhance the visibility and reputation of the department, college, and university.

Faculty members are encouraged to seek out increasingly challenging and meaningful service opportunities as they grow and develop as academicians, increasing the scope of their service throughout their careers.

The following elements will be taken into consideration in an evaluation of a faculty member's performance in the service area as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or excellent.

- (1) Conduct, effort and accomplishments in providing service to the department, college, university, and professional organizations
- (2) Professionally related service to the community (e.g., guest speaker for the Small Business Development Center as opposed to coaching a local youth soccer team)
- (3) Breadth and depth of the service commitment
- (4) Amount of time required for the service activity
- (5) Level of responsibility involved (e.g., chair of a committee versus member)
- (6) Visibility of the activity (e.g., service that enhances the visibility or reputation of the department or college such as editor of a professional MGT journal)
- (7) Equitable/comparable participation in service activities in relation to other faculty members

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

Excellent Service Rating: 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.

d. Professionalism

The behavior of any single faculty member reflects on the entire department, college, and university. Therefore, it is essential that all faculty continuously conduct themselves in accord with the highest expectations of professional behavior. Irrespective of other factors, if a faculty member has engaged in misconduct, abusive or inappropriate conduct towards their students or colleagues, or other JMU stakeholders, or any behavior unbecoming to the profession, they may receive a lower evaluation or recommendation for tenure or promotion in any one of the above performance categories or overall.

3. Procedure and Timeline

The policies and procedures that must be followed when applying for promotion are clearly explained in the Faculty Handbook, section III.E.6.b. Important dates that are included in that information are as follows:

- September 1 – written nomination of candidate due to AUH or PAC
- October 1 – summary of activities and accomplishments (informally referred to as the promotion and tenure packet) due to AUH and PAC
- November 15 – written recommendations of AUH and PAC due to the COB Dean
- November 15 – copy of written recommendations by AUH and PAC provided to faculty member
- December 15 – recommendations of AUH, PAC, and COB Dean submitted to Provost and VP for Academic Affairs
- February 1 – official written notification of recommendation to grant or deny promotion sent to faculty member
- February 15 – official written notification if president recommends denial of promotion
- 15 days following Board of Visitor’s spring meeting – official notification of faculty that promotion is granted
- March 1 – Submission of written notice of appeal if appropriate (FH III.E.6.b.(9))

B. Tenure

As stated in the Faculty Handbook in Section III.E.7.e:

*The award of tenure is based on the qualifications, performance and conduct of individual faculty members and the long-term needs, objectives and missions of the academic unit, college and university. To be awarded tenure, the faculty member must meet performance and conduct standards required for promotion to associate professor and should enhance the academic environment of the academic unit and the university. Length of service is not a sufficient basis for recommendation for tenure. **Tenure may be denied on any legitimate grounds including the lack of need for a faculty member in the particular academic unit or academic specialization, program reduction or elimination, financial exigency, or conduct.** Problems with a faculty member’s conduct may disqualify a candidate for tenure. Teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service shall be used in evaluating the performance of a candidate for tenure. A faculty member’s pattern of prior annual evaluations should be carefully considered in the analysis of an application for tenure, but each administrator and committee should use judgment and discretion in making recommendations on tenure.*

1. Standards and Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty Seeking Tenure

The standards and criteria used in the comprehensive evaluation for the tenure process in the MGT Department are the same as those used in the promotion process for the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement, and service. However, as noted in the Faculty Handbook (III.E.7.e), candidates for tenure will be evaluated based on their professional conduct as well as their performance during the probationary

period. Additionally, the AUH and PAC members may take into consideration whether or not the candidate is perceived as enhancing the academic environment of the department and the university. These are important subjective assessments of the candidate that help to complete the evaluation of the candidate's qualifications and performance.

2. Procedure and Timeline

The policies and procedures that must be followed when applying for tenure are clearly explained in the Faculty Handbook (III.E.7.f.). The timeline is identical to that noted in the section above in the section on Promotion Procedure and Timeline.

3. Early Tenure

The COB has a process-based system for awarding early tenure/promotion. At the time of, or subsequent to, the intermediate review the PAC, in consultation with the AUH, will invite faculty who may have a "compelling case that far exceeds the standard required for tenure/promotion" to apply for tenure/promotion before the end of their probationary period. Invited faculty will be eligible for early tenure/promotion one year early, i.e. their application for early tenure/promotion will be submitted in the fall of their fifth year of service. The PAC and AUH must both agree that the candidate (invited faculty) may be considered for early tenure/promotion.

Appendix 1: Merit Procedure



Management Department Procedure for Allocation of Merit Pay Revised as of 9/11/2015

Management Merit Allocation Procedure – Current Year Policy (to be used when merit pay was allocated in the previous year)

- 1) Faculty members receive an overall annual performance rating between 1 and 7.
 - 2) Average performance rating for the department is calculated.
 - 3) Each faculty member's rating is divided by the mean score to arrive at the amount which that faculty member's score differs from the mean.
 - 4) The calculation from the preceding step (rating/ mean) is multiplied by the merit allocation % (i.e., .04 for this year).
 - 5) The figure resulting from the previous step is then used as a multiplier of the faculty member's current salary, which determines the dollar amount of merit pay.
- Please see example below:
 1. Joe Smith receives a performance rating of 6.0
 2. The average performance rating for the department is 4.5.
 3. Joe's score differs from the mean by 1.33 ($6.0/4.5 = 1.33$).
 4. $1.33 * .04 = .053$.
 5. Joe's current salary is \$92,000. Joe's merit increase in dollars is $92000 * .053 = \$4876.00$.

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

Management Merit Allocation Procedure – Multi Year Policy (to be used when there have been multiple years since the last merit allocation)

** Revised and approved at September 11, 2015 meeting by a faculty vote of 16 yes, 2 abstentions, and 2 absent.**

In the event there are multiple years in which no merit raises are offered the procedure above will be modified as follows.

The current year evaluation will be averaged with the prior year(s) evaluation(s), up to three years, for all faculty members. This will give a two or three-year *multi-year average evaluation score* (MYAES) that takes the place of the current year overall performance rating as noted above.

Example: Applying the multi-year policy:

There have been three years without any raises. Sam, Michelle, and Max are long serving faculty members with the following weighted annual evaluations scores and resulting MYAES:

	Y _x	Y _{xx}	Y _{current}	MYAES	
Sam	5.0	4.0	6.0	5.0,	Current salary \$30,000
Michelle	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.0,	Current salary \$25,000
Max	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0,	Current salary \$35,000

Liz was hired two years ago:

			Y _{xx}	Y _{current}		
Liz	--	xx	5.5	6.5	6.0,	Current salary \$32,000

Departmental AVERAGE(MYAES) = 5.5
Merit allocation is 3% .

Allocation computation:

Sam:	$5.0/5.5 = .91 \times .01 = .0091 \times \$30,000 = \$272.72$
Michelle:	$4.0/5.5 = .73 \times .01 = .0073 \times \$25,000 = \$181.81$
Max:	$7.0/5.5 = 1.27 \times .01 = .0127 \times \$35,000 = \$445.45$
Liz:	$6.0/5.5 = 1.09 \times .01 = .0109 \times \$32,000 = \$349.08$