



Guidelines for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Middle Georgia State University School of Business

PREAMBLE

The faculty of the School of Business of Middle Georgia State University recognizes the importance of identifying and maintaining high standards of excellence in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Achieving that level requires every member of the faculty to understand and strive toward common goals, expectations, and levels of performance. Toward that end the following guidelines have been established.

Evaluation Categories

Faculty members in the School of Business will be evaluated annually on three primary areas: teaching, research, and service. These annual evaluations serve as a basis for retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty members. Below is a discussion of each of the evaluation categories.

Teaching

School of Business faculty members are expected to be excellent teachers. Instructional responsibilities include but are not limited to currency of knowledge in their field, accessibility to students, effective use of technology where appropriate, curriculum development, and strong communication skills. The following items may be considered when evaluating the performance of faculty members in the area of teaching:

- Level of the classes taught (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) and complexity of courses
- Students' evaluations (including comments)
- Design or development of new curricula or new courses.
- Use of innovative teaching methodologies
- Number of course preparations
- Number of new course preparations
- Course content (quantity of content, work necessary to maintain currency of content (e.g. new accounting standards))
- Grade distributions (in conjunction with students' evaluations)
- Teaching awards
- Accessibility to students (face-to-face or via electronic means)
- Evidence of currency of teaching materials

Research

Research will be measured in terms of quality and quantity. In each discipline, certain outlets for research are considered to be more prestigious and to demonstrate higher standards of scientific merit than others. Publication and presentation through these outlets will be recognized as demonstrating a high standard of scientific merit. Factors taken into account when assessing the quality of an intellectual contribution are listed in the “Factors Considered when Assessing the Quality of Intellectual Contributions” section below.

To be considered an intellectual contribution for the purposes of faculty members’ evaluation of performance, the contribution must be related to the faculty member’s field of expertise. Cross-discipline research is encouraged. However, for publications outside a faculty member’s primary area, the faculty member must show how the article or their contribution to the article (in the case of multiple authors) relates to their field of expertise.

The following list contains items with the potential to be considered intellectual contributions. The inclusion or lack of inclusion of any items in the list below is not necessarily an indication of good or bad quality or acceptability of an effort as an intellectual contribution. Note that the burden of proof for the quality of an intellectual contribution is on the faculty member. However, the Dean of the School of Business makes the final determination of acceptability (see “Prior Assessment of the Acceptability of a Publication Outlet” below).

- Papers published in a peer reviewed journal or well-respected editorial journal.
- Presentations or published proceedings at professional international, national, or regional conferences.
- Research monographs published.
- Textbooks and textbook chapters
- Serving as a reviewer of manuscripts submitted to journals.
- Serving as a reviewer of manuscripts submitted to conferences for presentation.
- Seminar presentations.

Factors Considered when Assessing the Quality of Intellectual Contributions

General factors. The type of research may be basic, applied, learning, or pedagogical depending on the area of expertise and preference of each faculty member. Multi-authored papers are acceptable.

Referred journal articles. Items that may be taken into account for this assessment may include those listed below. Discretion must be exercised when using these criteria. For example, Cabell’s data (e.g. acceptance ratio) is self-reported and not independently verified. Additionally, there are reports of Impact Factors being manipulated by journal editors. Thus, the suitability of a journal should not be based solely on any one criterion.

- Universally accepted reputation: for example, Management Science.
- Publisher of the journal: for example, academic institution, INFORMS, DSI, Elsevier, Springer, Palgrave, Inderscience, etc.
- Journal listed or not in Cabell.
- The journal's Impact Factor (average number of citations per article).
- Journal rankings: for example, Thomson ISI(r) from the Journal Citation Reports (JCR).
- Journal rejection/acceptance ratio or percentage.
- Rankings at other peer-level or higher and appropriately accredited institutions
- Relatedness to faculty member's field

Conference proceedings/presentations.

- Conference reputation
- Geographical scope (i.e. is conference considered statewide, regional, national, or international)
- Relatedness to faculty member's field

Research monographs, textbooks, textbook chapters, other non-refereed publications.

- Reputation and size of publisher
- Uniqueness of contribution (i.e. was the contribution something many individuals in the field could have produced or something based on the faculty member's unique expertise)
- Level of contribution (i.e. section, chapter, group of chapters, book)
- Faculty member's role (i.e. author versus editor)
- Relatedness to faculty member's field

Reviewer for journal or conference.

Serving as a reviewer for a journal or conference is not a substitute for publishing in these outlets. Thus, credit for doing so is minor as compared to that given for actual publications. The quality of manuscript review by a faculty member is based on the following:

- Quality of the journal or conference (using criteria above)
- Extensiveness of the feedback to the author(s)
- Relatedness to faculty member's field

Seminar presentations.

- Geographical scope (i.e. department, school, college, area, statewide, regional, national, or international)
- Size of audience
- Relatedness to faculty member's field

Prior Assessment of the Acceptability of a Publication Outlet

A non-mandatory process for having a publication outlet approved before submission of a manuscript is available. The purpose of this policy is to allow a faculty member who is

considering publishing in a journal that has not previously been used to receive a decision from the Dean (after a recommendation from a faculty committee) as to whether the publication will or will not count toward the faculty member's intellectual contribution requirements. This non-mandatory process should not be construed as to infringe upon the academic freedoms of any faculty member. Faculty may publish anywhere they see fit. This process is only being made available so that faculty members can determine in advance whether a particular research outlet will count as an intellectual contribution on their annual evaluation of performance.

Each year the Dean will appoint a committee which will receive such requests from faculty members and make a recommendation to the Dean. However, the Dean will retain the authority to overrule this committee's recommendation. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide the committee with verifiable documentation concerning the quality of the publication outlet. In particular, documentation addressing some or all of the assessment items 1.A.i – 1.A.vii should be provided.

Progression of Research

Research efforts by faculty are expected to progress toward the ultimate goal of having a published article in a peer reviewed academic or practitioner journal or well-respected editorial journal. For example, a faculty member may have a research paper on a particular topic accepted for presentation at a respected conference one year. The next year it is expected that the research in that area will have progressed to the point of having a paper under review at a journal. Following that year, the research should produce an accepted journal article.

Definition of Acceptance

For the purposes of faculty members' annual evaluation of performance, a manuscript or presentation shall be considered and counted when it has been fully accepted with no more requirements for changes (notwithstanding reviews of proofs prior to publication). A "revise and re-submit" is not considered accepted.

Multi-year Perspective

The evaluation of intellectual contributions of faculty should have a multi-year perspective. Research activities may extend for some time without a publication and then produce multiple publications. Additionally, there are varying lengths of review processes at different journals. This may lead to a faculty member having low research productivity (in terms of publications) in one year and very high productivity in the subsequent year. Thus, the Dean should consider not just the number and quality of intellectual contributions within a single year, but should consider the varying stages of intellectual contributions and the faculty member's progression of their scholarly work throughout those stages. The following stages of publication shall be used to classify manuscripts in process:

Stage	Support Documentation Needed
In-preparation	Description of research Targeted journal(s) and/or conference(s)
Submitted/under review	Journal or Conference Submission cover letter/email
Revise/Resubmit	Journal or Conference Revise/resubmit letter/email Revision number
Accepted	Journal or Conference Copy of acceptance letter/email (with date)
Published	Full bibliographic citation

Service

While service is, like teaching and research, a required component of the professional life of a faculty member, the type and amount of service a faculty member engages in will vary from year to year. For tenure-track faculty, service is not a substitute for the establishment and maintenance of a solid record of independent research and/or quality instruction. Acceptable service activities may be at the College/School level, Professional level, and Community level. The following lists examples in each of these areas:

- Service to the **College and/or School** includes, but is not limited to the following:
 - Participating as an academic advisor
 - Participating on College-wide committees (with special emphasis on such factors as being chair or recorder)
 - Participating on School of Business committees (with special emphasis on such factors as being chair or recorder)
 - Participating on School of Business special task force committee (with special emphasis on such factors as being chair or recorder)
 - Advising a School of Business Registered Student Organization
 - Assisting with student activities
 - Arranging lectures for the School of Business
- Service to the **Profession** includes, but is not limited to the following:
 - Participation in conferences as a reviewer, session chair, discussant, expert panel, or other substantive position
 - Active service in leadership structure or on a committee of a professional organization
 - Service on the editorial board of a journal
 - Service as a reviewer for a journal or university press
- Service to the **Community** includes, but is not limited to the following:
 - Professional service to the community that involves using one's professional talents

- Non-professional service that includes promoting MSC
 - Making presentations to recruit MSC students
 - Serving on community organizations/committees that promote economic development in the central Georgia region
- Coordinating/judging pre-collegiate competitions

Relative Emphasis

Primary emphasis is given to teaching, then research, then service. However, adjustments may be granted to faculty who are assigned special projects or duties.

Methods of Evaluation

Teaching

1. Examination and evaluation of course syllabi and examinations
2. Evaluation of teaching materials which should reflect the currency of the faculty member’s knowledge in the field and the use of technology.
3. Qualitative and quantitative analysis of student evaluations.
4. Evaluation of other supporting evidence which may be submitted by the faculty member.
5. Evidence of accessibility to students and a willingness to be helpful to students.

The following performance standards for teaching are expected:

Year	Performance Standard
1	Evidence of promising teaching activity.
2	Clear progress on improving and enhancing teaching effectiveness.
3	Teaching evaluation rating of “Meets Expectation” or “Exceeds Expectation” in one of the last three years.
4	Teaching evaluation rating of “Meets Expectation” or “Exceeds Expectation” in two of the last three years.
5	Teaching evaluation rating of “Meets Expectation” or “Exceeds Expectation” in two of the last three years.
Tenure	Teaching evaluation rating of “Meets Expectation” or “Exceeds Expectation” in three of the last five years.
Promotion to Associate Professor	Teaching evaluation rating of “Meets Expectation” or “Exceeds Expectation” in three of the last five years.
Promotion to Full Professor	Teaching evaluation rating of “Meets Expectation” or “Exceeds Expectation” in three of the last five years.

Research

The following performance standards for research are expected:

Year	Performance Standard
1	Evidence of promising research activity.
2	Clear progress in research and publication activity. Evidence must include documentation of a revision and resubmission of at least one article to an acceptable (as defined above) peer-reviewed journal and initiation of other research projects in the faculty member's teaching field(s) or in cognate fields.
3	Publication or acceptance of an article in an acceptable peer-reviewed journal in the faculty member's teaching field(s) or in cognate fields and initiation of other research projects that may result in additional peer-reviewed journal articles.
4	Documented evidence of a revision and resubmission of a second article to an acceptable (as defined above) peer-reviewed journal and initiation of other research projects in the faculty member's teaching field(s) or in cognate fields.
5	Publication or acceptance of a second article in an acceptable peer-reviewed journal in the faculty member's teaching field(s) or in cognate fields and initiation of other research projects that may result in additional peer-reviewed journal articles.
Tenure	Evidence of a minimum of two published peer-reviewed journal articles, which the faculty member, who is applying for tenure, has published in the faculty member's field(s) of teaching, or in cognate fields and further evidence of an active research agenda. Exception for faculty hired prior to the academic year 2011/2012: clear evidence of faculty development activities and/or scholarly activities within the most recent five years of the application for tenure shall be deemed necessary and sufficient if tenure is applied for no later than academic year 2018/2019.
Promotion to Associate Professor	Evidence of a minimum of two published peer-reviewed journal articles, two of which must have been published by the faculty member within the most recent five years of the application for promotion. Further evidence of an active research agenda is also required.
Promotion to Full Professor	Evidence of a minimum of five published peer-reviewed journal articles, at least two of which must have been published by the faculty member within the most recent five years of the application for promotion. Further evidence of an active research agenda is also required.

Service

The following factors will be considered to evaluate the applicant's service.

1. Quality of service.
2. Quantity of service.
3. Variety of Participation.

Evidence of active participation is needed. The following performance standards for service are expected:

Year	Performance Standard
1	Evidence of promising service activity.
2	Clear progress on becoming involved in service activities.
3	Service evaluation rating of "Meets Expectation" or "Exceeds Expectation" in one of the last three years.
4	Service evaluation rating of "Meets Expectation" or "Exceeds Expectation" in two of the last three years.
5	Service evaluation rating of "Meets Expectation" or "Exceeds Expectation" in two of the last three years.
Tenure	Service evaluation rating of "Meets Expectation" or "Exceeds Expectation" in three of the last five years.
Promotion to Associate Professor	Service evaluation rating of "Meets Expectation" or "Exceeds Expectation" in three of the last five years.
Promotion to Full Professor	Service evaluation rating of "Meets Expectation" or "Exceeds Expectation" in three of the last five years.

Approved by Faculty

Faculty Meeting: February 22, 2012