

Guidelines for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion  
Adopted April 24<sup>th</sup>, 1985 and amended  
March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2009  
September 12<sup>th</sup>, 2011  
December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2017  
August 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018  
April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019  
May 27<sup>th</sup>, 2021

All procedures and policies relating to decisions affecting tenure-track faculty in the Kenan-Flagler Business School are intended to conform to University policies and procedures. In case of conflict, University policies and procedures takes precedent. The following criteria and guidelines do not repeat these policies and procedures; they are intended to conform to them. Each faculty member has a responsibility to become familiar with the provisions of these guidelines in addition to University policies and procedures.

These guidelines govern tenure and promotion decisions at the Kenan-Flagler Business School. The philosophy motivating the guidelines is reviewed below, as our key criteria and procedures on which decisions are to be based.

### **1. General Principles**

The Kenan-Flagler Business School must be strong in the present and prepared to meet future challenges. This requires high standards for faculty performance - and that all faculty continued to grow professionally and make contributions towards the work, the intellectual life, and the mission of the school. Individual faculty members contribute to the mission of the school through effective performance in research, teaching, and service.

Personnel decisions related to reappointment, tenure, or promotion must be guided by evaluation of performance of the individual faculty member. In all cases, the overriding factor should be the individual's total contribution to the school's mission. Ultimately, sustained faculty accomplishment should be the hallmark of readiness for promotion and tenure at Kenan-Flagler Business School.

It is an important responsibility of the tenured faculty at the Kenan-Flagler Business School to provide advice on tenure and promotion decisions within the school. Faculty members who participate in this process must maintain high standards of responsibility in ethical behavior. Responsibility includes the obligation to give careful attention to the materials of a promotion or tenure case. Ethical behavior includes a responsibility to maintain the confidentiality of the proceedings in the documents, such as external letters associated with the process since confidentiality makes possible open and honest discussion.

Process Goals: Both the school and individual faculty member are served well by a process of personal and institutional planning and feedback that leads to an allocation of effort and skill to valued activities and areas. Thus, these guidelines should help establish a process and reward system that do the following:

1. Indicate what faculty activities are valuable and contribute to the school

2. Provide regular feedback during annual reviews to individual faculty members about the extent of their contributions
3. Reward activities that contribute to the school's mission
4. Explicitly acknowledge individual faculty members who agree to perform duties that are important for the school, but that involve some opportunity costs with respect to individual external reputation.

#### **A. Reappointment**

The reappointment evaluation affords an opportunity to assess a candidate's trajectory towards tenure. While the reappointment review occurs relatively early in a candidate's career, a positive outcome requires concrete evidence of progress towards tenure and is not automatic. In terms of research, candidates should be reappointed only if it seems reasonably likely that they will ultimately have a tenurable research record, recognizing the relatively short time between the reappointment and tenure decision, and the long lags typical in a publication process. One example of evidence of solid progress towards tenure would be one or more publications in recognized, high-quality refereed journals, as well as a pipeline of papers under review, and working papers. However, a publication is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for reappointment.

In addition, candidates for reappointment should have demonstrated, or demonstrate, the potential for effective teaching and be on a trajectory towards a tenurable teaching record. Working with the Area Chair, candidates should have a teaching plan at the time of the appointment that will allow the candidate to demonstrate an ability to contribute to the school's current and future teaching needs.

Service requirements at reappointment are expected to be minimal and will not factor significantly into the reappointment decision.

#### **B. Tenure**

Tenure decisions are by their very nature different from any other personnel action. Tenure reviews are the most important personnel decisions made in the school. They represent a commitment of the school to employ a faculty member for the remainder of his or her professional career, subject to satisfactory periodic post-tenure reviews. Organizationally, tenure decisions limit flexibility because they represent a willingness on the part of the school to forgo hiring of alternative faculty in the future. As a consequence, faculty members must understand that tenure is granted, not merely earned. Accomplishments by itself does not justify tenure. A tenure recommendation should only be made when the trade-off between the flexibility of future hiring and the expectation of on-going significant contributions to the school is in the best long-term interest of the school.

More specifically, a positive tenure recommendation should only be made when there is reasonable confidence that a faculty candidate is one of the best obtainable individuals now or in the foreseeable future to meet the long-term needs of the school. For example, one indicator of this would be if this person was applying for a new tenured position at the school, they would be among the top candidates applying.

Only an individual who has already made significant contributions to knowledge should be considered as a serious candidate for tenure; a tenure recommendation should not be made solely on the presumption that an individual will ultimately make contributions in the future. On the other hand, the

candidate's potential for long-term contributions to the school must be significant, and the likelihood for the candidate to realize that potential must be high for a favorable tenure decision.

No one should construe performance appraisal feedback as an untenured faculty member in the school as implying a set of preconditions that will ensure a positive tenure decision. Performance feedback is part of a constructive process to help guide development of individual faculty members and the school. It is intended to help a tenure candidate identify ways of contributing to the school, thereby increasing the probability of being offered a tenured faculty position at the school. In that sense, the ongoing performance appraisal process is designed to serve the school and the candidate - in to recognize and communicate the concerns in interest of both. In contrast, the tenure process in the school is designed to generate informed discussion in feedback from a broad group of stakeholders, including internal and external reviewer's, on the total contribution of the candidate; that contribution is considered in the context of the needs and objectives of the school. Following a recommendation from the school, the case proceeds to the University and Board of Trustees for consideration before the University grants the candidate tenure.

### **C. Promotion**

Associate Professor: A promotion to associate professor from assistant professor within the school is intertwined with a tenured decision. That is, it is not possible to promote a faculty candidate within the school from assistant professor to associate professor unless tenure is granted. Promotion at this level must be based on the tenure criteria. These criteria should also apply to promotion decisions for full or chaired professors when the promotion is accompanied by tenure.

Full Professor: Promotion to full professor formally recognizes accomplishments in in contributions to research, teaching, in service - in furthering the study and practice in the individuals chosen discipline and enhancing the ability of the school as a whole to contribute in these areas. Promotion to a higher rank is a symbol both inside and outside the school of professional stature. On-going professional growth, development, and contributions to the school are expected of all faculty. Beyond that, a positive promotion recommendation should only be made when a faculty member has demonstrated significant growth, development, and commitment since appointment to his or her currently held rank. Relative to tenure, promotion to full professor generally entails higher expectations on research, teaching, in service dimensions. Candidates for full professor are expected to have made significant contributions in research, teaching, in service following promotion to their current rank, although the relative weights of these three components may vary across cases based, for example, on school needs and the candidate's relative strengths. Candidates for full professor are expected to have at least a national and possibly an international reputation in their chosen field of research.

Chaired Professor: Criteria for awarding chairs will be governed by the document "Process for Endowed Chair Consideration at the Kenan-Flagler Business School".

## **II. Research and Research-Related Activities**

A basic obligation of the University is the development and dissemination of new knowledge. As a major unit within the broader University, the Kenan-Flagler Business School has as a central mission the development of new knowledge relevant to the study in practice of disciplines related to management. This includes (but is not limited to) be discovery of new principles, tools, theories, and insights that

relate to the environment in which managers operate as well as evaluation of current management practice in mentoring of other scholars.

Effective performance on the research dimension is a necessary precondition to a positive tenure or promotion decision. The focus of appraisal on the research dimension is the significance of the contribution to knowledge made by the individual faculty member. Gauging this contribution may include, but is not limited to, examining the following elements:

1. Demonstrated individual ability to do effective research on topics judged to be significant.
2. Demonstrated individual ability to publish one's research in a high-quality forum that will further the potential acceptance, diffusion, and impact of the research.
3. Demonstrated contribution to the research effectiveness of other faculty in doctoral students in the school or other colleagues in the profession (i.e. "research leadership").
4. consistent evidence of ability and motivation to maintain and enhance a high level of research productivity

An appraisal of an individual's research contribution includes consideration of the significance of the questions and topics of study as well as the extent in quality of the work itself. For tenure or promotion, a candidate must have demonstrated significant contribution to the research literature in the candidates chosen discipline. One potential indicator of research contribution is that the faculty member is recognized as being among the leading researchers in a topic area so that the candidate is identified with that area, although faculty may also contribute by having an impact on the research literature in a particular discipline more generally. although collaboration in co-authorship with internal and external colleagues is encouraged, the individual faculty members contributions are central to this research appraisal.

Both the quality of individual contributions and the quantity of those contributions are relevant. Simple "line counts" of the number of research projects in publications are to be avoided. A large quantity of research may not result in a significant contribution if the quality is not good. On the other hand, the quantity of high-quality contributions affects the likely impact of a faculty member's research.

The potential contribution of an individual research project is sometimes difficult to assess - in part because the impact of a research topic may be long term in cumulative. Moreover, the nature of the contribution to different audiences may vary.

These are, however, several relevant indicators of the likely impact of the faculty members research. These include (but are not limited to) the following:

1. Evaluations of the likely impact of the research by senior faculty members in the school and faculty at other research institutions who have established records for scholarship and expertise in the area of the research.
2. The extent and nature of reference to the work in other published materials, when sufficient time has passed for this do you have occurred as reflected in, for example, citation counts.
3. The reputation of the publication in which the research appears, including consideration of the procedures used in selecting manuscripts for publication, and the competition for space.
4. The breadth and depth of the research contribution and the significance of the audience for the research.

5. Evidence that the research has had a significant impact on managerial practice or how scholars view an area of research inquiry.
6. Cohort analyses of productivity in leading journals relative to the candidates peer group.

It is not the intent of these guidelines to suggest that any of these indicators be used in isolation or as a sole surrogate measure of the quality of their research, but rather that the school evaluate the quality and likely impact of the candidate's total research performance in as complete a fashion as is possible.

Other features relevant to the assessment of an individual's research contributions are as follows:

First, the refereed Journal is the traditional publication vehicle for research contributions targeted to the scholarly community. Publication in high-quality refereed journals that reach relevant scholarly audiences is important and necessary. Given the various disciplines in which research occurs inside of a Business School, the school has developed a list of top scholarly outlets in each of the areas within the school, including top core disciplinary journals, top field journals, in other high-quality outlets. This list is included in Appendix A of this document. The purpose of this list is to provide untenured faculty members guidance around high-quality publication outlets, as well as aid faculty members who work in other disciplines an assessment of the quality of the work in another area. As with the other indicators mentioned above, this journalist is not intended to imply that a simple count of articles in this, or any, set of outlets is sufficient to evaluate an individual's research record.

Second, it is important to acknowledge that management professionals are and must continue to be an important audience for the school. Thus, articles that appear in outlets which target important professional audiences are positive elements of a faculty member's research portfolio, and positive contributions to the school's mission. However, publications targeted to management professionals are not a substitute for research in high-quality refereed journals.

Third, the school values interdisciplinary research. Interdisciplinary research provides opportunities for creating knowledge in new and unanticipated ways, and can constitute cutting-edge scholarship. A faculty member whose research is interdisciplinary can declare that his or her work is interdisciplinary and formally request that the promotion and tenure evaluation process take this into account. At the discretion of the school, this may include seeking input from outside evaluators from the major disciplines in which the faculty member's work touches, to ensure that the breadth of their work is represented. In some cases, it might be advisable to seek additional external reviewers. Faculty members whose research does not include interdisciplinary research will not be penalized or denied tenure or promotion on these grounds.

Fourth, the school is open to new forms of communicating scholarly contributions, such as the creation of databases, blogs, websites, and other online scholarly resources. The school encourages research innovation and experimentation, and acknowledges that digitally communicated work may not always be peer reviewed prior to publication and dissemination.

However, as with all forms of scholarly contributions, the impact of online scholarly work must be considered. As appropriate, measures of the quality and impact in digital contributions may be determined through feedback from faculty at peer institutions, end users, and other audiences. As with articles targeted to management practitioners, significant and relevant online scholarly contributions are viewed as a positive aspect of a faculty members research portfolio, but do not substitute for research in high-quality refereed journals.

In accordance with University policies, the school also considers “engaged scholarship” in the tenure and promotion process. In the school, “engaged scholarship” refers to scholarly efforts that are directed towards persons or groups outside the University, which addresses business and management issues of public and policy importance. Examples of engaged scholarship may include research papers published based on work conducted during an engaged activity, and publications of articles or books on issues of societal, public, and policy importance whose contributions can be assessed using accepted measures of impact. As with all research activities, the quality of engaged contribution is important and will be assessed by metrics that measure external impact using publications in high-quality journals and external funding.

Faculty whose work does not include engaged activities will not be penalized or denied tenure or promotion on those grounds. In all cases, “engaged scholarship” needs to supplement but not substitute publication in high-quality refereed journals.

It has been a rare event for promotion to occur in less than four years after achieving one’s current rank (packet submitted before the fourth year). Historically at Kenan-Flagler, the typical amount of time in rank has been six years (packet submitted during the sixth year).

However, unusually high levels of accomplishment may be considered in the timing of promotion or tenure review at any time. For example, a candidate who has been at Kenan-Flagler the entire time of their current rank and where their record justifies promotion. Examples of this would be a research record justifying promotion and tenure in the faculty member’s 5th instead of 6th year, or promotion to Full Professor in less than six years at the Associate rank. Competitive external offers that convey higher rank or tenure might be a rationale for a promotion or tenure review.

When a faculty member joins Kenan-Flagler after first being employed as a faculty member at another institution, and where their research record justifies promotion, they may be considered for promotion review at any time. An example of this would be a faculty member who served on the faculty of another university for three years prior to joining Kenan-Flagler (at their current rank).

In all promotion cases irrespective of timing, the same criteria will be applied as a normally timed promotion decision. In other words, the criteria for promotion are the same for all promotion cases.

## **REMOVED NOTES ABOUT EARLY PROMOTION**

### **III. Teaching and Teaching-Related Activities**

Effective teaching, which includes the transfer of relevant knowledge and expertise from the faculty to various student groups, is a fundamental responsibility of the school. Effective teaching is essential; a faculty member must be an effective teacher in the school's degree programs to receive further consideration for a favorable promotion or tenure recommendation. In addition, faculty members seeking promotion and tenure are expected to have demonstrated teaching competence that indicates an ability to contribute to the school's current and future teaching needs. Faculty members should work with their area chair and Associate Deans of individual programs to demonstrate successful contributions to the school's teaching mission. These successful contributions could include the design and delivery of content in either asynchronous or synchronous forms, deep investment into one of our

key programs, teaching across multiple programs, or demonstrations of contributions to key teaching needs.

As with research, appraisal of effective teaching is complex. However, the school will evaluate a number of different elements of teaching contributions in assessing this dimension of a faculty member's performance. Major elements to consider are as follows:

1. Course content and design, including development of new courses.
2. Development of effective new teaching materials - including those which are used by other faculty at this and other institutions.
3. Personal contributions to the development of effective teaching by other faculty (i.e. building the teaching skills of other faculty members).
4. Skills in classroom presentation and discussion, as based both on student assessment in peer evaluations.
5. Contributions to the development of individual students outside of the classroom.
6. Consistent evidence of motivation and ability to maintain and enhance these factors.

Teaching in executive development programs is also an important part of the school's mission. Faculty members are encouraged to share their research and teaching expertise with non-degree constituencies throughout the school's ongoing non-degree programs or through a management program designed for a specialized market. Successful contributions in this area can enhance the assessment of a faculty member on the teaching dimension and can therefore enhance the overall assessment of a faculty member's performance. However, lack of involvement or an assessment of inadequate teaching performance in executive development programs should not be a reason for a low assessment of teaching.

Executive development teaching is an example of an "engaged activity," defined as work that influences, enriches, and improves the lives of people in the community beyond the University. Other examples of engaged teaching are corporate teaching or training provided outside of UNC's Executive Development program, community teaching (e.g. public schools, nonprofits), advising a student team consulting project, teaching a course or supervising a project in which students work to benefit a community group or organization. This list is designed to be illustrative rather than definitive. Any teaching endeavor whose primary beneficiary is outside of the UNC community could be a potential form of engaged teaching. As with executive development teaching, successful examples of engaged teaching can enhance the assessment of a faculty member's teaching performance. However, successful engaged teaching does not substitute for effective teaching in a degree program within the school. Further, the lack of involvement or success an engaged teaching should not detract from the overall assessment of a faculty members teaching.

As with interdisciplinary research, the school values interdisciplinary teaching. Interdisciplinary teaching crosses boundaries and brings together perspectives from new and traditional disciplines. However, lack of interdisciplinary teaching should not be a reason for a low assessment in teaching.

It is not necessary for an individual to be an effective teaching contributor to all of the school's degree programs to receive a favorable assessment on the teaching dimension. However, the ability and willingness to make versatile contributions across programs or formats is encouraged and valued, particularly as one advances in rank from Assistant to Associate and to Full Professor. This versatility among the tenured portion of the faculty adds to the long-term flexibility of the school to meet the

challenges and needs of future teaching environments. Such successful diversity can reflect favorably on the potential of the faculty member to meet the long-term teaching needs that may arise in the school.

#### **IV. Service Contributions to the School, University, and External Constituencies**

Accomplishment of the school's missions requires a number of essential and significant activities beyond the areas of teaching and research. Important aspects of this citizenship dimension include the following:

1. Service within the school on individual assignments, committee assignments, and administrative positions.
2. Contributions to a positive culture of collegiality within the school, including mentoring of junior faculty and students, and professional behavior consistent with the core values of the school.
3. Work representing the school in the University and to other significant external constituencies.
4. Participation in and leadership of professional associations involving significant external constituencies of the school.
5. Service as an editorial board member, Associate Editor, Department Editor, or Editor of high-quality publication outlets; frequent or notable service as a referee for such outlets.
6. Consistent evidence of ability and motivation to maintain and enhance these aspects of service.

Each tenured faculty member should expect to be asked to perform a variety of support activities ranging through committee assignments, special assignments, and administrative post. Moreover, each tenured faculty member is expected to share meaningfully in the load of day-to-day and special activities that are necessary to the maintenance and development of quality in the school. A failure to contribute equitably to the citizenship dimension may result in an unfavorable overall assessment of performance of a faculty member.

Except in extraordinary circumstances, untenured faculty will not be asked to take on more than minor service roles.

As with teaching, service can take the form of "engaged activities" which are business related activities furthering the mission of the school and benefiting the public outside the traditional scholarly community. Examples of engaged service include, but are not limited to, advising government officials and testifying before governmental bodies, serving in non-academic professional associations, speaking to non-academic audiences, assisting not-for-profit organizations with business issues. Engagement may play a more prominent role in different phases of a faculty member's career and would typically be more common among senior faculty than junior faculty.

Consulting with, or teaching for, external constituencies on a compensated basis within limits specified by University policy is certainly acceptable and encouraged, provided that such consulting does not have a negative impact on a faculty member's obligations to the school. However, such consulting and teaching will not be considered as part of the citizenship dimension or as part of the overall performance evaluation of an individual within the school, except of course as it results in other desired benefits which accrue directly to the school - such as through more effective teaching in more significant research output.



## **V. Overall Evaluation Process**

The reappointment, promotion and tenure process within the school consists of a multi-level process of evaluation, including:

- Within the disciplinary area (i.e. academic area within the school)
- By independent external evaluators
- By the school's Promotion and Tenure committee
- By the Associate Deans of the programs in which the candidate has taught
- By a full faculty meeting consisting of all voting eligible faculty (those faculty at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks promotion)
- And finally, by the Dean

Cases that receive the Dean's recommendation are then forwarded to the Provost. This section describes the stages of the process which are internal to the school.

## **VI. Reappointment**

Candidates for reappointment must submit a packet for review that consists of the following materials:

1. The candidate's most recent curriculum vitae
2. Copies of all publications and any working papers that the candidate wishes the school to consider
3. A set of all teaching evaluations from classes conducted in the school
4. A Research, Teaching, and Service statement

The school does not seek external evaluations of a candidate's scholarly work at reappointment prior to consideration for promotion and tenure.

## **VII. Tenure and Promotion**

Candidates for promotion or tenure must submit a packet for review that consists of the following materials:

1. The candidate's most recent curriculum vitae
2. Copies of all publications and any working papers that the candidate wishes the school to consider
3. A set of all teaching evaluations from classes conducted in the school
4. A Research, Teaching, and Service statement

In addition to these materials, promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, promotion to Full Professor, and promotion to Distinguished Professor requires solicitation of input from external reviewers.

The school seeks letters from external reviewers who are recognized thought leaders in the candidate's discipline and who have scholarly expertise to judge the candidate's research contributions. These external evaluations provide insight into the depth and breadth of the research contribution made by the candidate over and above the internal assessment made by the eligible faculty in the school. Each of these letters is not considered in isolation; rather, faculty in the school consider the collective

information that they provide as one input into their assessment. The goal is to be systematic and rigorous in collecting information that helps to benchmark each candidate's research record against high external standards

### **VIII. Procedure for External Reviewers**

Each candidate for promotion or tenure will supply the Senior Associate Dean with a list of 12 potential external reviewers. The candidate may also request that specific individuals not be asked to serve as a reviewer. The candidate's area chair will also supply a list of 12 names, at least five of which do not overlap with the candidate's list. Perspective external reviewers are not to be contacted in advance, or during the process, by either the candidate or the area.

Any individual nominated to serve as an outside reviewer must not have a conflict of interest in providing an evaluation. Examples of such a conflict include co-authorship with the candidate, serving as a mentor to the candidate (including serving on a dissertation committee of the candidate), sharing a grant with the candidate, etc. in addition, outside reviewers should meet one or more of the following criteria:

1. Hold a full-time tenured appointment as a faculty member at a peer school (see attached list in Appendix B).
2. Hold a full-time tenured appointment in a department externally recognized for leadership in the candidate's sub-specialty.
3. Have served or currently serves as an Editor or Associate Editor of a leading scholarly Journal in the candidate's general field.
4. Have been selected as a research fellow (or similar major career research recognition) by a major professional association in the candidate's field.

At least nine reviewers on the candidate's list and nine reviewers on the area list should be from peer institutions.

In addition, outside reviewers must be individuals at rank equal to or higher than the rank for which the candidate is being considered.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee, whose composition and function are described in section XI, has the responsibility of ensuring that the list of outside reviewers received from the area chair and the candidate meet these criteria. The committee has the discretion to ask for additional names from either the candidate or the area chair.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee then submits the list of external reviewers to the Senior Associate Dean.

The Senior Associate Dean's office will contact 10-12 potential letter writers (taken from the list provided by the candidate in the area) by email to request a response, positive or negative, on their willingness to participate. If less than 10 indicate a willingness to write a letter, additional names from the list will be added until 10 indicate a willingness to write. The goal is to receive at least 8 letters, recognizing that unforeseen circumstances may prevent some previously committed letter writers from providing letters.

## **IX. Report from Area**

For any faculty members seeking reappointment, promotion or tenure, faculty who work in the candidate's area are an important source of expertise for the evaluation of the quality of the candidate's scholarly work (based on the portfolio of work as well as the letters from external reviewers), the assessment of the rigor and quality of the candidate's teaching assignment and judgment on the candidate's contribution to the school's intellectual life and service to the discipline. As a consequence, one of the inputs to the process is a report from the area that evaluates the candidate on three dimensions of performance: research, teaching, and service. In addition to a narrative description of the contributions that the candidate has made, each eligible faculty member in the area will rate each candidate on each dimension (Distinguished, Excellent, Effective, or Inadequate). Faculty members may abstain, but abstentions on any of the dimensions should occur only rarely, and it must be explained. Eligible faculty members in the candidate's area will submit a confidential vote on the candidate in the full faculty meeting along with all other faculty at the meeting.

## **X. Report from Associate Dean**

The Associate Deans of the programs in which the candidate has taught are asked to provide additional detail on the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's teaching to supplement course evaluations in peer evaluations conducted by the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

## **XI. Report from Promotion and Tenure Committee**

The Promotion and Tenure Committee is comprised of Full or Chaired Professors from multiple disciplinary areas in the school and serves several important roles in the promotion and tenure process. First, the committee serves as an independent check on processes inside the disciplinary areas. Second, the committee members conduct peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching performance through classroom visits, to supplement the course evaluations in the report from the Associate Deans of the programs in which the candidate has taught. Third, the committee ensures that the materials collected for each candidate are complete, and that the guidelines have been met in a consistent manner across candidates. As a consequence, the Promotion and Tenure Committee gathers all pertinent information, including letters from external reviewers, area reports, and reports from the Associate Deans, and prepares a report for the eligible faculty members. Finally, the committee advises the voting-eligible faculty by carefully evaluating all of the evidence assembled about a candidate in each of the three categories of research, teaching, and service, and then provides summary ratings in these categories.

Specifically, each committee member will rate each candidate on each dimension (research, teaching, service) with one of four levels of evaluation: Distinguished, Excellent, Effective, or Inadequate. Abstentions on any of the dimensions should occur only rarely and must be explained. For example, a faculty member may abstain if they have a conflict of interest with the candidate.

These inputs are advisory in nature: it remains the responsibility of the Dean to synthesize the inputs and make a recommendation to University officials. Faculty members on the committee will submit a confidential vote on the candidate in the full faculty meeting along with all other faculty members at the meeting.

## **XII. Full Faculty Meeting**

Once all materials for the candidate have been assembled, they are available for eligible faculty to review. Following the review period, eligible faculty members assemble to discuss the case.

This meeting allows for a discussion of the candidate's existing record among eligible faculty members inside and outside of the candidate's discipline, including the nature and impact of the scholarly work, the quality of the teaching record, service to the school and to the discipline, and an assessment of the likely future contributions of the individual to the school's long-term needs. Eligible faculty members who do not have the benefit of this discussion may wish to abstain from voting, although they are not required to do so if they have sufficient knowledge of the candidate's qualifications to cast an informed vote. Eligible faculty members may also abstain if they have a conflict of interest with the candidate.

Following this discussion, eligible faculty members will vote on the candidate, including assessments of each of the three components of performance, as well as an overall vote. Assessments of each component will consist of one of four levels of evaluation: Distinguish, Excellent, Effective, or Inadequate. Overall votes should be either yes, no, or abstain. Votes of 'no' or 'abstain' should be accompanied by a reason for that vote. It is encouraged that an explanation accompany positive votes, but it is not required.

Voting via a secure, electronic medium with restricted access will be encouraged.

Several points concerning the overall assessment should be emphasized. First, a rating of "Inadequate" on any individual performance dimension should generally result in an unfavorable overall assessment. Moreover, merely achieving an effective performance across the board on each of the three dimensions should generally result in an unfavorable overall assessment for a candidate seeking tenure. Absent any other compelling considerations, for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, the candidate should be judged as having at least an excellent research record. For promotion to Full Professor, a candidate should generally be considered as having a distinguished research record or judged to have excellent performance in both teaching and research.

Beyond that, the probability of a favorable decision should increase with higher evaluations on and across the individual dimensions.

A similar evaluation will be conducted for an external candidate who is being considered for a new faculty position. In particular, any candidate being considered for an appointment which confers tenure or an advanced rank will be expected to meet the same performance criteria as faculty whose previous service has been at the school.

### XIII. Conclusion – Integration of Various Inputs

In making the school's recommendation, the Dean shall consider all of the internal and external evaluations of research, teaching, and service, the discussion in the full faculty meeting, the overall faculty vote and associated ballot comments, the likely future contributions of the faculty member relative to the longer-term needs and mission of the school, and any other relevant information. Thus, as noted above, decisions involving a tenure commitment are based not only on an evaluation of the performance of the faculty member in isolation; rather, the decision is also dependent on strategic considerations at the school level, such as the importance of the research area to the school, changes in the external environment faced by our students, and other changes in the focus and direction of the school's mission, and is of necessity a matter of discretion.

## Appendix A – Top-Tier Journal List

Title	"Old" Category	January 2016 Category
Academy of Management Journal	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Academy of Management Perspectives	not on list	selected other
Academy of Management Review	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Administrative Science Quarterly	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
American Economic Journal	not on list	selected other
American Economic Review	B: Core Journal	core discipline
American Journal of Sociology	B: Core Journal	core discipline
American Sociological Review	B: Core Journal	core discipline
California Management Review	A: Top Journal	Top Practitioner
Communications of the ACM	B: Core Journal	core discipline
Contemporary Accounting Research	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Decision Sciences	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Decision Support Systems	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Econometrica	B: Core Journal	core discipline
Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
European Journal of Operational Research	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Financial Analysts' Journal	not on list	Top Practitioner
Harvard Business Review	A: Top Journal	Top Practitioner
IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
IIE Transactions	B: Core Journal	core discipline
Information Systems Research	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Interfaces	C: Selected Other Journals	Top Practitioner
International Journal of Research in Marketing	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Journal of Accounting & Economics	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Journal of Accounting Research	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Journal of Applied Probability	B: Core Journal	core discipline
Journal of Applied Psychology	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Journal of Business	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Journal of Business and Economic Statistics	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Journal of Business Ethics	not on list	leading field
Journal of Business Finance and Accounting	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Journal of Business Venturing	B: Niche Journal	leading field
Journal of Computing	not on list	selected other
Journal of Consumer Psychology	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Journal of Consumer Research	A: Top Journal	Top Academic

Journal of Econometrics	not on list	selected other
Journal of Economic Theory	B: Core Journal	core discipline
Journal of Economics and Management Strategy	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Journal of Experimental Social Psychology	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Journal of Finance	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Journal of Financial Econometrics	not on list	selected other
Journal of Financial Economics	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Journal of Financial Intermediation	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Journal of International Business Studies	B: Niche Journal	leading field
Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Journal of Management	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Journal of Management Accounting Research	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Journal of Management Information Systems		
Journal of MIS	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Journal of Marketing	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Journal of Marketing Research	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Journal of Monetary Economics	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Journal of Money, Credit and Banking	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Journal of Operations Management	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology	A: Top Journal	core discipline
Journal of Political Economy	B: Core Journal	core discipline
Journal of Product Innovation Management	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Journal of Public Economics	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics	C: Selected Other Journals	leading field
Journal of Retailing	not on list	selected other
Journal of Service Research	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Journal of the American Statistical Association	B: Core Journal	core discipline
Journal of the American Taxation Association	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Journal of Urban Economics	B: Niche Journal	leading field
Leadership Quarterly	not on list	selected other
Management Science	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Manufacturing and Service Operations Management	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Marketing Science	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Mathematical Programming	B: Core Journal	core discipline
Mathematics of Operations Research	B: Core Journal	core discipline
MIS Quarterly	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
MIT Sloan Management Review	A: Top Journal	Top Practitioner
National Tax Journal	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other

Naval Research Logistics	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Naval Research Logistics Quarterly	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Operations Research	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Operations Research Letters	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Organization Science	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Organizational Research Methods	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Personnel Psychology	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Probability in the Engineering and Informational Systems	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Production and Operations Management	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Psychological Bulletin	A: Top Journal	core discipline
Psychological Methods	B: Core Journal	core discipline
Psychological Science	C: Selected Other Journals	core discipline
Psychometrika	B: Core Journal	core discipline
QME - Quantitative Marketing and Economics	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Quantitative Economics (Econometric Society Journal)	not on list	selected other
Quarterly Journal of Economics	B: Core Journal	core discipline
Queueing Systems	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
RAND Journal of Economics	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Real Estate Economics – AREUEA Journal	B: Niche Journal	leading field
Review of Accounting Studies	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Review of Asset Pricing Studies	not on list	selected other
Review of Corporate Finance studies	not on list	selected other
Review of Economic Studies	C: Selected Other Journals	core discipline
Review of Economics and Statistics	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Review of Finance	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Review of Financial Studies	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
SIAM Journal of Optimization and Control	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Sloan Management Review	A: Top Journal	Top Practitioner
Small Business Economics	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal	B: Niche Journal	leading field
Strategic Management Journal	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Supply Chain Management Review	C: Selected Other Journals	selected other
The Accounting Review	A: Top Journal	Top Academic
Theoretical Economics (Econometric Society Journal)	not on list	selected other

**Journals Dropped from List**

Psychological Review	A: Top Journal	not on list
Academy of Management Learning & Education	C: Selected Other Journals	not on list
Games and Economic Behavior	C: Selected Other Journals	not on list
INFORMS Journal of on Computing	C: Selected Other Journals	not on list
International Journal of Industrial Organization	C: Selected Other Journals	not on list
Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance	C: Selected Other Journals	not on list
Journal of Behavioral Decision Making	C: Selected Other Journals	not on list
Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control	C: Selected Other Journals	not on list
Journal of Economic Literature	C: Selected Other Journals	not on list
Journal of Economic Perspectives	C: Selected Other Journals	not on list
Journal of Management Studies	C: Selected Other Journals	not on list
Journal of Organizational Behavior	C: Selected Other Journals	not on list



## **Appendix B – Current List of Peer Schools**

1. Carnegie Mellon University - Tepper School of Business
2. Columbia University - Columbia Business School
3. Cornell University - Johnson Graduate School of Business
4. Dartmouth College - Tuck School of Business
5. Duke University - The Fuqua School of Business
6. Harvard University - Harvard Business School
7. INSEAD
8. New York University - NYU Stern School of Business
9. Northwestern University - Kellogg School of Management
10. Massachusetts Institute of Technology - Sloan School of Management
11. Stanford University - Stanford Graduate School of Business
12. The University of California, Berkeley - Haas School of Business
13. The University of California, Los Angeles - Anderson School of Management
14. The University of Chicago - Booth School of Business
15. The University of London - London Business School
16. The University of Maryland - Robert H. Smith School of Business
17. The University of Michigan - Ross School of Business
18. The University of Texas at Austin - McCombs School of Business
19. The University of Pennsylvania - The Wharton School of Business
20. The University of Southern California, Los Angeles - Marshall Business School
21. The University of Toronto - Rotman School of Management
22. The University of Washington - Foster School of Business
23. Yale University - Yale School of Management