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PART I: RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Responsibilities of the Candidate

Tenure-track faculty will be evaluated by the Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC) during their first and third years (or as specified in their contracts) and when they go up for promotion and/or tenure (P&T). Revolving-term appointment (RTA) faculty will be evaluated during their first and third year (mandatory), and sixth year if requested by the PAC. Each member of the faculty is expected to contribute to the achievement of the University’s mission through his or her teaching and academic advising; research and/or scholarly achievement; and service. Faculty who are candidates for review or promotion and/or tenure are expected to document these contributions by compiling and submitting a dossier according to the guidelines specified in Part III of this document to the CIS & BSAN Academic Unit Head (AUH) and to the PAC. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure are expected to submit the dossier by October 1 or other date as specified by the JMU Faculty Handbook. Deadlines for all other types of review are given in Part IV of this document.

B. Responsibilities of the Personnel Advisory Committee

The PAC shall be involved in the evaluation of a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure, interim evaluation of untenured and RTA faculty, and an appeal of the initial evaluation of a faculty member. The PAC is expected to provide the Dean with a written evaluation of the candidate's teaching, research, and service performance over his or her evaluation period. This evaluation should include a discussion of trends in performance (if any); a recommendation as to whether the candidate's performance in each of these areas should be rated excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory; and statements supporting each rating. Adhering to the criteria described in Part II and the procedures described in Part IV, the PAC will carefully consider each candidate for tenure and/or promotion and render a recommendation, by November 15, to the Dean of the COB as to whether that candidate should be tenured and/or promoted. A copy of the letter must be provided to the candidate at that time. For all other reviews, a letter from the PAC will be provided to the candidate and a copy will be given to the AUH, and, as appropriate, provided to the Dean’s office for inclusion in the faculty member’s CoB personnel file.

C. Responsibilities of the CIS & BSAN AUH

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

PART II: CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION, PROMOTION AND TENURE

A. Overview

The purpose of evaluation of faculty members at James Madison University is to promote professionalism, 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. The department values activities that support the mission and strategic goals of the university.

The current 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, research, or service) and at least satisfactory in the other two areas. The Handbook also states that Promotion to Professor requires that a candidate's performance be evaluated as excellent in at least two of the functional areas and at least satisfactory in the third area. At a minimum, a candidate must meet the responsibilities of a faculty as defined by the JMU Faculty Handbook Section on Faculty Employment Policies and Procedures.

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

B. Teaching Criteria

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

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

Learning/value added
Providing instruction at a rigorous and challenging level.
Stimulating learning and interest in the subject matter.

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

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

Evaluation
- Maintaining fair and impartial grading standards.
- Providing timely feedback on progress.
- Assessing students’ mastery of subject matter with appropriate tools.

Curriculum and course content
- Staying current with the subject matter.
- Participating in department activities to assess and update the curriculum.

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

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. Additional examples of possible indicators of excellent teaching include:

- Publication of widely-adopted and/or acclaimed instructional materials.
- Development of innovative pedagogical methods and materials.
- Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses.
- Publication in refereed education journals.
- Teaching awards.
- Outstanding student evaluations.

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

C. Research and/or Scholarly Activity Criteria

C.1. Definition by Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)
The following paragraphs reflect the broad dimensions of research/scholarly accomplishments and intellectual contributions as defined by the AACSB.

1. **Basic or Discovery Scholarship**: The creation of new knowledge.

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

2. **Applied or Integrated/Application Scholarship**: The application, transfer and interpretation of knowledge to improve management practice.

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

3. **Teaching and Learning Scholarship**: The enhancement of the educational value of instructional efforts of the institution or discipline.

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

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

C.2. **Criteria for Promotion and Tenure**

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

Only articles in A or B level journals presently on the CIS & BSAN Department or another COB Department’s journal level lists will be counted toward tenure and/or promotion. Procedures for adding a journal to the A or B lists are described in Exhibit 1.
Candidates for promotion or tenure who publish in journals not rated by the CIS & BSAN Department or another COB Department must ask the CIS & BSAN PAC to make a journal level determination, as described in Exhibit 1, prior to application for promotion or tenure. The candidate must provide justification for the rating of the journal and follow the CIS & BSAN Department’s journal level determination process outlined in Exhibit 1.

A journal under consideration by the PAC must be approved by the majority of voting PAC members who have cast their vote in order to be added to the CIS & BSAN publication level list.

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

- A minimum of four peer-reviewed journal articles in the A or B category plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort that meets the AACSB Scholarly Academic (SA) requirements.

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

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

- A minimum of seven peer-reviewed journal articles in the A or B category plus evidence of a sustained record of accomplishment while holding the position of Associate Professor and ongoing scholarly effort that meets the AACSB Scholarly Academic (SA) requirements.

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

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

- A minimum of six peer-reviewed journal articles in the A or B category plus evidence of sustained and ongoing scholarly effort that meets the AACSB Scholarly Academic (SA) requirements.

Each candidate seeking promotion to rank of associate professor and/or tenure may substitute one B equivalency item for one of the six peer-reviewed journal articles.
The **minimum** requirement for an excellent evaluation in the area of research/scholarly accomplishments for promotion to the rank of Professor is the following:

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

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

**D. Service Criteria**

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

Some examples of Level 3 service activities:

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

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

Some examples of Level 2 service activities:

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

**Definition of Level 1 Service:** Level 1 service is defined primarily as activities that involve a very significant time commitment. Secondary indicators of Level 1 service are 1) a high level of personal responsibility; 2) involvement in activities that are critical to the mission of the department, 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 uses one’s
professional knowledge, skills, and talents; 5) “making a difference” in those areas in
which one has chosen to serve; 6) being widely recognized as one who has an exemplary
attitude towards service commitments and who serves as a role model for other faculty;
and 7) receiving a professional service award. 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.

Some examples of Level 1 service activities:

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

Satisfactory Service: A necessary, but not sufficient, condition for an evaluation of
satisfactory in the area of service is participation in activities that are basic to the
responsibilities of a faculty member. These are defined as activities in which faculty
members are expected to participate without having been specifically assigned or
designated, to do so. Examples of such service activities include 1) attending Spring
commencement exercises; 2) attending department meetings; and 3) participating in peer
evaluation of faculty in one’s department. 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
assumining one’s “fair share” of the tasks required to support the operation of a large
university and, where appropriate, contributing to one’s profession and/or the external
community. A “fair share” is defined as a reasonably steady stream of service activity,
such as

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

Service for which a faculty member is compensated, either by dollar payment or reduced
teaching load, should be at least partially discounted. In cases of significant
compensation, such activities may be fully discounted.
In all cases it is expected that a faculty member will 1) seek out opportunities to serve rather than expect others to identify those opportunities; 2) take an active role in committees and departmental efforts, participate in college and university events where faculty visibility is important, support one’s profession in various ways, and provide timely delivery of required commitments; 3) demonstrate an attitude that encourages others to seek one’s assistance on important projects; 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. Some examples of excellent service are:

- A yearly average of one Level 1 activity plus two Level 2 activities plus a representative mixture of Level 3 activities
- A yearly average of five Level 2 activities plus a representative mixture of Level 3 activities.

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

In addition, excellent performance requires 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.

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

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

**A. Overview**

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

B. Teaching

The Promotion and Tenure dossier should provide a comprehensive self-evaluation of the
faculty member’s effectiveness as a teacher in any course taught by a faculty member as
part of their regular teaching load, regardless of the department or college within JMU.
Courses taught on overload, for extra pay, or other benefits will not be included for
evaluation by the PAC. The summary document must include the following information:

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Course Number/Section Number</th>
<th>New prep.? Y/N</th>
<th>Ending Enrollment</th>
<th>Class Grade Distribution (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Supplementary material must include:

1. For each course taught during the evaluation period, submit a complete set of the
following from a most recent semester:
   - syllabus
   - examinations, tests, and quizzes
   - assignments
   - in-class exercises
   - handouts
   - other items specific to the course such as list of outside readings

The material provided should be organized by course (only one set per course) and
identified by semester and year.
2. Student evaluations
   a. Provide a copy of the student evaluation form used.
   b. For all sections of all courses in the last two academic years (excluding summers), provide the following:
      • copy of the summary sheet for numerical student evaluations
      • grade distribution
      • original handwritten comments on all student evaluations
       The material provided should be organized and tabbed by course, section, semester and year in the same order as presented in the summary document.

3. Optionally, other evidential information may be included, as appropriate. Examples of additional evidence might include the following:
   • new courses developed
   • development of instructional materials
   • interdisciplinary and team teaching projects
   • publications in teaching journals
   • active participation in conference presentations and workshops devoted to the enhancement of teaching
   • involvement in teaching continuing education courses
   • reviews of textbook chapters
   • independent studies and/or honor theses supervised/read
   • other documentation to support teaching effectiveness

C. Research and Scholarly Activity

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

1. Refereed journal articles
2. Refereed book chapters/books/cases
3. Refereed journal articles under review
4. Refereed proceedings articles
5. Refereed proceedings articles under review
6. Presentations at professional meetings not included in proceedings
7. Non-refereed publications
8. Work In Progress
9. Competitive grants received
10. Honors and Awards
11. Professional contributions
12. Professional development activities
13. Paid Outside consulting
For items 1 through 8, provide (where applicable), the names of authors (in order on publication), title, name of journal/publisher/organization, volume/number, year, page numbers.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Provide the following information in the summary document:

1. An overview of the various service activities. Give an assessment of both the quantity and quality of efforts, and describe plans for continuing service contributions.

2. For each academic year, list of service activities in each of the following areas:

   a. JMU service, grouped by
      - University
      - College of Business
      - Department(s)
      - Student organizations

   b. Service to professional organizations

   c. Community service (if applicable)

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

Supplementary materials should include supporting documentation (if available) of the service activities listed in the summary document. The supporting documents should be in the same order as in summary document. Examples of supporting documentation include thank you notes, appointment memos, letters of acknowledgement, copies of citations/awards, and excerpts from written reports.

**PART IV: PAC PROCEDURES**

A. The PAC will consist of all full-time CIS & BSAN Department faculty tenured at JMU. Each untenured faculty will be invited to observe the PAC’s deliberations on a promotion and/or tenure decision, providing an opportunity exists. Faculty cannot discuss or vote on applications for promotion to rank higher than the one they hold. While the PAC may consult with the AUH or the Dean, the PAC and the AUH will make independent evaluations and submit independent recommendations.

B. All PAC promotion and tenure recommendations and all other issues will be decided by majority vote (except as noted below). The PAC chairperson is a voting member.
C. A member of the PAC will be elected to chair the committee for the academic year. If
the PAC chair is not a full professor, a full professor will serve as the chair for the
review of candidates for promotion to full. The role of the chairperson will be to:

- Invite untenured faculty to observe when appropriate
- Convene PAC meetings
- Prepare an agenda for each meeting
- Conduct each meeting in a professional manner
- Capture the salient features of discussions
- Write letters that include the salient points and, for P&T matters,
  - Circulate the letters to voting members of the PAC for feedback in a
timely manner
  - If necessary, convene additional meetings
  - Deliver the letters to the appropriate individuals in person
- Draft changes to this document.

D. First Year Evaluations: All new tenure-track and RTA faculty will submit their
complete dossiers for consideration by the PAC by the first Monday of their second
academic semester at JMU. These dossiers must be compiled according to the
guidelines described in part III of this document. No later than the third week of the
faculty’s second semester, the PAC will provide him/her with an evaluation, in
writing, of their first year’s performance based on the criteria described in part II.
The evaluation will be limited to feedback regarding teaching, research, and service.
A copy of the letter will be given to the AUH.

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

F. All RTA faculty will submit their complete dossiers by March 15 of their third year.
The PAC may also conduct a sixth year review; if so, the candidate will be informed
upon completion of the third year review. These dossiers must be compiled
according to the guidelines described in part III of this document. No later than April
25, the PAC will provide each faculty with an evaluation, in writing, of their teaching,
research, and service. The evaluation will include suggestions for improvement. A
copy of the letter will be given to the AUH, and, as appropriate, provided to the
Dean’s office for inclusion in the faculty member’s CoB personnel file.
G. Non-Renewal of Appointment:

Untenured faculty members have no right to renewal of their appointments. Non-renewal of tenure-track faculty before undergoing tenure or of RTA faculty may be initiated by the PAC or AUH and conducted per Section III.F.3 of the Faculty Handbook. The PAC will review pertinent facts and make independent recommendations with justification. These written recommendations will be submitted to the Dean within 30 days of receiving notice that nonrenewal is to be considered except in the case of a first-year faculty member, in which case the letter will be submitted within 7 days. After the Dean has received both recommendations, a copy of the PAC’s letter will be provided to the AUH.

H. Tenure and/or Promotion Decisions:

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

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

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

- PAC members will vote by secret ballot on the candidate’s performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. A PAC member not present at the meeting is expected to provide a ballot to the PAC chair prior to the voting.

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

- When all the ballots have been received, the ballots will be counted by the chairperson and one other member of the PAC, in the presence of the other members.
For each area, the majority vote will be determined and the resulting rating will be
incorporated into the letter by the PAC chairperson, along with the appropriate
justification.

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

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

Certain special cases are noted for the second ballot:
   i. 44% votes for Excellent, 44% votes for Satisfactory, and 12% for
       Unsatisfactory will be recorded as Satisfactory;
   ii. 22% votes for Excellent, 33% votes for Satisfactory, and 45% for
       Unsatisfactory will be recorded as Satisfactory.

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

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

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

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

PART V: ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS

All annual evaluations should be on a scale of 1-9 (1-3 for unsatisfactory, 4-6 for satisfactory, and 7-9 for excellent) and include three sections. The first section provides the evaluation and the justification for that evaluation in the area of teaching. The second section addresses research and/or practice, and the third service. When performance in an area is less than excellent, suggestions for improvement should be given.

The annual evaluations will be conducted by the AUH and the AUH will send a signed copy of the evaluation to the Dean, according to the specifications of the Faculty Handbook. A well-designed and well-administered annual evaluation process should result in promotion, tenure, and/or contract renewal decisions that are reasonably well anticipated by the candidate. While one cannot expect to completely eliminate the element of surprise from P&T and contract renewal processes, the objective should be to keep this element as small as practicable. To achieve this, annual faculty evaluations will be based on the criteria described in Part II of this document, and these criteria will be applied consistently and uniformly across ranks and from year to year. For example, a faculty member who satisfactorily performs three level-two plus requisite level-three service activities in one year should receive a satisfactory overall rating in service for that year. A faculty member who exhibits all of the indicators for satisfactory teaching performance and a reasonable number of the indicators for excellent teaching performance should receive an excellent overall rating in teaching for that year.

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

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

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

If a faculty member is recommended by the AUH to undergo remediation due to unsatisfactory annual evaluations, the PAC will follow the procedure detailed in Section III.E.8 in the Faculty handbook.

PART VI: DETERMINING MERIT PAY

If merit pay has not been received continuously for one or more years, merit pay is then determined by an average of annual evaluations over the number of years since the last merit pay period (if less than 5 years) or five years since the last merit pay period (if 5 or more years).

DEPARTMENT OF CIS&BSAN PERSONNEL ADVISORY COMMITTEE:
PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION
EXHIBIT 1
PUBLICATION LEVELS

Determining Publication Level for Journals Not Currently on List

For a journal not currently on the CIS & BSAN or another COB Department’s lists, a candidate for tenure and/or promotion must request that the CIS & BSAN PAC make a determination of the specific journal’s level and the candidate must submit appropriate documentation to the PAC chair at least three months prior to submitting application for tenure and/or promotion.

A-Level Journal Criteria

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

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

b. BSAN A-level journals must be highly ranked within published surveys of journal quality, reputation, and visibility.

When publishing in a journal not currently on the CIS & BSAN Department or other COB Department’s A-level journal lists or in a journal in an area outside of CIS or BSAN, a faculty member must provide evidence that the journal meets standards comparable to those given above. In particular, if widely accepted, discipline specific, published journal rankings based on journal quality, reputation, and/or visibility exist in the other discipline, they must be provided.

A-Level Journals

Based on the above criteria, the following are alphabetical lists of A-level journals in the CIS & BSAN Department.

CIS A-Level Journals
- Communications of the ACM
- Communications of the Association for Information Systems
- DATA BASE
- Decision Sciences
- Decision Support Systems and Electronic Commerce
- European Journal of Information Systems
- Harvard Business Review
- IEEE Transactions (all)
- Information and Management
- Information Systems Research
- International Journal of Electronic Commerce
- Journal of the Association for Information Systems
- Journal of Management Information Systems
- Management Science
- MIS Quarterly

BSAN A-Level Journals
- Decision Sciences
- European Journal of Operational Research
- IEEE Transactions (all)
- IIE Transactions
- Interfaces (Articles section only)
- Journal of the American Statistical Association
- Journal of Operations Management
- Management Science
A journal article is considered to be published in a B-level journal if the journal article meets all of the following criteria.

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

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

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

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

- Behavior and Information Technology
- Computers and Human Behavior
- Computers Informatics Nursing
- Expert Systems with Applications
- Human-Computer Interactions
- Information and Software Technology
- Information Management and Computer Security
- Information Resource Management Journal
- Information Systems Frontiers
Information Systems Management
Information Technology and People
Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal
International Journal of Healthcare Information Systems and Informatics
International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction
International Journal of Human-Computer Studies
International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education
International Journal of Innovation and Learning
International Journal of Mobile Communications
International Journal of Network Management
International Journal of Services and Standards
Journal of Computer Information Systems
Journal of Database Management
Journal of End User Computing
Journal of Global Information Technology Management
Journal of Information Technology
Journal of Information Systems Education
Journal of Information Technology Management
Journal of International Information Management
Journal of International Technology and Information Management
Journal of Organizational and End User Computing
Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce
Journal of Strategic Information Systems
Journal of Systems and Software
SIGCHI Bulletin
Telecommunications Policy

BSAN B-Level Journals (include but are not limited to the following)
Annals of Operations Research
Central European Journal of Operations Research
Computers and Industrial Engineering
Computers and Operations Research
Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education
Decision Support Systems and Electronic Commerce
INFORMS Transactions on Education
Interfaces
International Journal of Information Technology and Decision Making
International Journal of Operations and Production Management
International Journal of Production Economics
International Journal of Production Research
International Journal of Productivity and Quality Management
Journal of Business Logistics
Journal of Combinatorial Optimization
Journal of Global Optimization
Some publications that do not meet the criteria for B-level journals may be considered as B-equivalent publications and may substitute for a B-level journal article. A limited number of such substitutions are allowed, as outlined in our promotion and tenure document. The following publications may be considered as B-equivalent.

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

Publications that are not counted as A- or B-level journals are counted as C-level publications.

C-Level Publications

The following are examples of CIS and BSAN C-level publications.

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

- BYTE Magazine
- Coastal Business Journal
- Computerworld
- Datamation
- Decision Line
- Dr. Dobb’s Journal
- Information Week
- Issues in Information Systems
- OR/MS Today

Journals Not in CIS or BSAN Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Name</th>
<th>Date of PAC Decision</th>
<th>Publication Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Publications Category Process

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