

PROCESS FOR ENDOWED CHAIR-CONSIDERATION

AT THE KENAN-FLAGLER BUSINESS SCHOOL

Adopted May 4, 2007 and amended

February 2nd, 2021

March 19, 2024

The proposed process document for Endowed Chair nomination and evaluation is in four parts: (1) Objectives, (2) General Criteria, (3) Process Timetable/Design, and (4) Proposed Data to be Evaluated.

1. Objectives:

- a) To match internal chair openings with the **best Candidates on a school-wide basis**;
- b) To ensure that Internal Chairs are awarded to individuals who could achieve this **level at peer or better schools**;
- c) To **motivate high levels of performance** from all faculty members who may aspire to earn an Endowed Chair during their academic career;
- d) To increase the ability of KFBS to **attract and retain** faculty members who are indisputably leaders in their respective fields;
- e) To ensure equal access to Chair-consideration by all individuals whose records match **data-driven criteria**;
- f) To ensure that faculty perceive the Chair-consideration process as **fair** and will maintain the **positive work-attitudes** and behaviors that tend to accompany perceived fairness.

2. General Criteria

- a) The Candidate has a record of research-grounded scholarship that is widely recognized as clearly distinguished.

Distinguished research record

Substantial external evidence exists that the Candidate is a demonstrated leader in his/her field and has had a major impact on this field (e.g., the individual's publications are frequently cited in the scholarly literature, and/or the Candidate is regularly quoted in the national and international media pursuant to his/her scholarly work). Gauging the research record will include, but is not limited to, examining the following elements:

Count of publications in school's list of journals

Quality of publications

Number of Citations

Trajectory of publications and citations

Journal editorship

Special Issue editorship

Journal board/department editorships

Fellow of professional societies

Major research awards (e.g. best paper recognition, impact awards) from professional societies

Research grants from government agencies/private sector

Impact on managerial practice/ research with private/public sector agencies

Impact on public policy

Citations/articles in national media/news outlets

Translational articles for disseminating research

- b) Solid evidence exists that the Candidate would likely receive an Endowed Chair at a number of other peer business schools listed at the end of this document should that person be considered there.

This can be achieved by comparing records of chaired professors (at time of granting distinguished professorship) at peers schools using criteria specified above

- c) For the most part, chairs will be awarded on the basis of research and scholarship.
- d) Good teaching and a proven commitment to institution-building are expected, the absence of which will likely disqualify the candidate.

Gauging the teaching record will include, but is not limited to, examining the following elements:

Teaching awards

Teaching contributions and innovation

Executive Development

Candidates under consideration for endowed chair should have a demonstrated record towards institution-building and service to the school. Gauging the service record will include, but is not limited to, examining the following elements:

Program Dean
Director of large center
Area Chair

3. Process Timetable/Design

Process to be conducted every year in conjunction with the regular promotion and tenure process.

If there are fewer than three Chaired Professors on the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Dean will appoint enough additional ad hoc members to bring the total to at least three Chaired Professors. If a candidate is being considered for a Chair and there is not a Chaired Professor from the candidate's Area on the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Dean will appoint an ad hoc member who is a Chaired Professor in the candidate's Area. All ad hoc members will serve on all Chair cases in a given year for consistency across cases.

Phase 1: Start of Process:

- Send list of full professors without Chairs to the Chaired faculty along with a list of available unfilled chairs to solicit "names to look at."
- Nominations due by May 1.
- Area Chairs, Chaired Professors, and Dean's office can make nominations.
- All nominations are confidential. (Nominees are not aware that they have been nominated at this stage.)
- Individuals may not nominate themselves.

Phase 2: Preliminary Round of Data Compiling:

- Data that evaluates the scholarly record of the nominee as specified in section 2 General criteria should be collected.
- Chaired Professors on the Promotion and Tenure Committee summarize data on names suggested based on all information specified in General criteria .

Phase 3: First Chaired Professors evaluation meeting for preliminary nominees:

- Data compiled in Phase 2 discussed at meeting of the Chaired Professors.
- Chaired Professors take confidential advisory vote for Deans' Office on who will be moved forward to the next phase of the process.

Phase 4: Vetting of letter writers and preparation of packet:

- If the Dean's office decides to move forward with the case, candidate is informed of intention to proceed and prepares packet for submission. Candidate and candidate's area chair compile lists of potential reviewers in accordance with "Selection of External Referees for Promotion and Tenure" document (attached).
- Chaired Professors who are currently serving on the Promotion and Tenure Committee review the list of proposed letter writers, may add or delete names, and approve the final list.
- Letters and packets are sent to referees with October 15 due dates.

Phase 5: Final Round of Data Gathering:

- Chaired professors on Promotion and Tenure Committee gather final data. See Section 4 below for suggested data to be gathered. Chaired Promotion and Tenure Committee members write a report summarizing the case and recording votes (distinguished, excellent, effective or ineffective) on research, teaching and service.

Phase 6: Chaired Professors Advisory Vote: Included in the Promotion and Tenure Meeting or a separate meeting

- Chaired Professors meet to discuss data and to take advisory vote for Deans with response-options on the ballot being favor, oppose, 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.

4. Information and Data to be Evaluated.

- a) Comparison of Candidate's record to the record of Chaired-Professors (at the time of Chair-conferral) at peer- or better institutions in the Candidate's Discipline/Area;
- b) Impact of Candidate's research and scholarship evidenced empirically by citation-counts of candidate's publications in academic journals and candidates quotes or citations in the national and international press;
- c) Editor- and/or Associate Editor-positions held by the candidate;
- d) Research awards and grants received by the Candidate;
- e) Publications by the Candidate;
- f) Letters received from external reviewers who are Chaired Professors and who meet the criteria in the Selection of External Referees document. Letters received from Chaired Professors at peer- or better institutions should explicitly state, minimally, that the Candidate meets the general Chair-related criteria (listed

earlier in this document) and would likely receive an Endowed Chair at the letter writer's institution (with recognition of letter writer's business school ranking);

- g) Candidate's teaching- and institution-building-contributions (evidenced by a summary of teaching record and institutional service).
- h) Other criteria as specified in section 2 General criteria specified in this document.
- i) Other updates to information specified in section 2 as deemed appropriate by the Chaired Professors on candidates put forward.

Selection of External Referees in the Tenure and Promotion Process

In Spring, 2003, the faculty of the Kenan-Flagler Business School at the University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill voted to create a school-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee and elected a group of faculty peers to serve on it. The Committee recommends the following guidelines concerning external reviewers.

Premise and objective

Evaluation of each candidate for tenure or promotion should include inputs from a panel of external reviewers who are recognized thought leaders in the candidate's discipline and who have scholarly expertise to judge the candidate's research contributions. The goal is to be systematic and rigorous in collecting information that helps to benchmark each candidate's research record against high external standards.

Procedures

Each candidate for promotion or tenure will supply the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty and Research 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. Prospective 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 the Guidelines for Reappointment and Tenure, 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 for Faculty and Research.

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.

Current List of Peer Business 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

Note: Schools on this list are primarily those which are used by Kenan-Flagler for comparison of faculty compensation.