

**Standards for Faculty Appointment, Tenure and Promotion Decisions,
and Annual Performance Review**
(As Approved by the Faculty Spring 2020 and revised in October 2020)

**Department of Management
Hankamer School of Business
Baylor University**

Revisions Approved by the Office of the Provost, February 17, 2021—James Bennighof

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MISSION	2
DIMENSIONS OF PERFORMANCE AND ANNUAL GOAL SETTING.....	2
STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE, TEACHING AND RESEARCH	3
SERVICE.....	3
TEACHING.....	3
SCHOLARLY RESEARCH	4
AACSB Guidelines for Intellectual Contributions.....	4
Departmental Interpretation of Intellectual Contributions	4
Categories of Faculty Scholarly Research	5
Faculty Scholarly Research Expectations	6
STANDARD AND PROCESSES FOR NEW APPOINTMENTS.....	6
STANDARD AND PROCESSES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, TENURE AND PROMOTION	7
TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	7
Annual Review	7
Second-Year, Fourth-Year Review	8
Tenure Review	8
Promotion to Associate Professor	9
TENURED FACULTY	10
Annual Review	10
Promotion to Professor	10
Endowed Positions	12
AACSB ACCREDITATION EXPECTATIONS.....	12
SUPPORT MECHANISMS.....	12
APPENDIX 1: Department of Management Target Journals	13
APPENDIX 2: Benchmarking Department Standards and Processes	15
APPENDIX 3: External Review Process to Support Tenure and Promotion Decisions.....	17

MISSION

The mission of Baylor University is to educate men and women for worldwide leadership and service by integrating academic excellence and Christian commitment within a caring community. The culture of the Hankamer School of Business is guided by Christian commitment and champions life-long learning, highly-regarded scholarship, and service to others as its highest ideals. The School seeks to produce business leaders with recognized integrity, superior theoretical knowledge, and practical skills of modern global business developed through an experiential learning environment. We engage a diverse group of undergraduate, graduate, and executive students and alumni in a curriculum that produces graduates of value to business organizations and to their communities.

The mission of the Department of Management is to

- motivate our students to become life-long learners by challenging them intellectually with state-of-the-art concepts and ideas;
- provide our students with a foundation upon which to build dynamic careers that add value to their companies and communities;
- fully support the creation, application, and dissemination of knowledge by attracting outstanding scholars who embrace both teaching and research; and
- maintain a strong commitment to the missions of Baylor University and the Hankamer School of Business.

The Department of Management is committed to developing and maintaining a collegial faculty composed of teacher-scholars who firmly support the distinctive missions of Baylor University, the Hankamer School of Business, and the department. This requires faculty to demonstrate a charitable commitment to service and exhibit a sense of departmental collegiality and courtesy when dealing with all Baylor stakeholders. Faculty shall also actively support the importance of teaching and scholarly research as part of our goal to maintain an excellent department. The purpose of this document is 1) to identify the processes designed to support annual reviews and hiring/tenure/promotion decisions, and 2) to describe the standards for teaching and scholarly research that fully support the mission of the department.

DIMENSIONS OF PERFORMANCE AND ANNUAL GOAL SETTING

Annual reviews and tenure/promotion decisions are based on a faculty member's performance in the primary areas of teaching, scholarly research, service, and collegiality. Faculty with administrative responsibilities will also be evaluated on the performance of their administrative duties.

At the beginning of each calendar year, each faculty member will prepare a goals statement that outlines goals for teaching, scholarly research, service, and collegiality as well as administrative duties, if appropriate. Since each faculty member is not expected to pursue each of these five areas in the same proportions that apply to others, the goals statement should reflect the specific interests of the specific faculty member. The goals statement should include measurable outcomes that will indicate the degree of goal achievement. The faculty member and department chair will discuss the

appropriateness of these goals for the coming year during the annual performance evaluation review.

STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE, TEACHING, AND RESEARCH

It is important to note that there are differing expectations in the areas of service and scholarly research due to course load and tenure status. It is expected that the service responsibilities will be primarily carried by the tenured and clinical faculty. It is also expected that faculty who have teaching load reductions for scholarly research will contribute significantly to achieving our department's research goals. Finally, it is expected that all faculty members will uphold the departmental tradition of excellent teaching regardless of rank, tenure status, or course load.

SERVICE

Service is the giving of oneself for the good of others. All faculty are expected to joyfully provide service accordingly to their talents and interests. This service may be provided to a wide variety of areas, including students and student organizations, the Department of Management, the Hankamer School of Business, Baylor university, academic academies, the church, the professional community, and the community at large. Each faculty member is expected to be an active member of a local faith community. Collegiality, referring to collaboration and constructive cooperation among faculty members, is also an important component of service.

TEACHING

Our department's reputation of excellence in teaching is essential to achieving our stated goals. The department considers high-quality teaching to be a minimal requirement for continued appointment to the faculty. High-quality teaching is characterized by academic rigor, technical currency and competence, and effective classroom delivery. In addition, students should be challenged to think critically, enhance their problem-solving skills, work effectively with peers, and take responsibility for their learning process. We expect this approach will result in the following student outcomes:

- Mastery of management knowledge: Understanding fundamental management concepts, theories, and principles across the subject matter areas of general management, human resource management, and supply chain management.
- Development of Management skills: Leadership, teamwork, and decision making.
- Application of Management skills: Applying the knowledge and skills of management to ethically meet the challenges of the marketplace.

With respect to teaching, the faculty affirms our responsibilities as outlined by the AACSB. Specifically, we recognize our responsibility to:

- Ensure that adequate time is devoted to learning activities for all faculty and students.
- Ensure adequate student-faculty contact across the learning experience.
- Set high expectations for academic achievement and provide leadership toward those expectations.
- Evaluate instructional effectiveness and overall student achievement.
- Continuously improve instructional programs.
- Innovate in instructional processes.

As individual faculty members, we also agree to:

- Operate with integrity in all dealings with students and colleagues.
- Keep our own knowledge within our teaching discipline current.
- Actively involve students in the learning process.
- Encourage collaboration and cooperation among participants.
- Ensure frequent, prompt feedback on student performance.

Evidence of teaching excellence may be demonstrated in multiple ways including student evaluations; complete and creative course syllabi; completed student projects; new curriculum development; development of new and/or innovative teaching materials; mentoring students; peer review assessments per the approved department peer-review teaching policy; and honors, awards, and other special recognition.

SCHOLARLY RESEARCH

AACSB Guidelines for Intellectual Contributions

According to AACSB guidelines, producing intellectual contributions (scholarly research) represents a core set of responsibilities of higher education for business. Such intellectual contributions improve management theory and practice, and also support the present and future quality of instruction. Intellectual contributions may be categorized as basic or discovery scholarship, applied or integrative/application scholarship, and/or teaching and learning scholarship. To be recognized as an intellectual contribution, the output of such work should be available for public scrutiny by academic peers or practitioners.

Basic or Discovery Scholarship contributions add to the theory or knowledge base of the faculty member's field. Published research results and theoretical innovation qualify as basic or discovery scholarship contributions. Outputs from these scholarship activities include publication in refereed journals, research monographs, scholarly books, chapters in scholarly books, proceedings from scholarly meetings, papers presented at academic meetings, and papers presented at faculty research seminars.

Applied or Integrative/Application Scholarship influence professional practice in the faculty member's field. Articles in practice-oriented journals, creation and delivery of executive education courses, development of discipline-based practice tools, and published reports on consulting all qualify as applied or integrative/application scholarship.

Teaching and Learning Scholarship contributions influence the teaching-learning activities of the school. Preparation of new materials for use in courses, creation of teaching aids, and research on pedagogy all qualify as teaching and learning scholarship.

Departmental Interpretation of Intellectual Contributions

AACSB guidelines clearly indicate that faculty members should make intellectual contributions on a continuing basis appropriate to the school's mission. AACSB guidelines suggest that schools with a mix of undergraduate and graduate programs, but without doctoral programs, may pursue a balance

of basic or discovery, applied or integrative/application, and teaching and learning scholarship. Since the Hankamer School of Business most closely resembles this category, the Department of Management actively encourages scholarly activities in all three categories of intellectual contribution.

The Department of Management's specific guidelines for scholarly expectations, as described in this document, are fully consistent with AACSB guidelines for intellectual contributions. However, the department recognizes that academic reputation is largely a function of publications in refereed journals. Thus, basic or discovery scholarship published in refereed journals is emphasized, with special emphasis placed on premier journals. This emphasis is fully aligned with the department's goal of enhancing its academic reputation and attracting scholars who can help the department achieve its mission.

Categories of Faculty Scholarly Research

The Department of Management recognizes that the items described in the AACSB guidelines of intellectual contributions are all activities that contribute to sustaining excellence in classroom teaching and enhancing the academic reputation of the department and the business school. For ease of discussion, scholarly activities may be categorized as refereed journal articles, non-refereed journal articles, books, papers that appear in the proceedings and/or papers presented at academic meetings, and other scholarly activities that are available for public scrutiny.

Refereed Journal Articles

The top priority for faculty should be to publish full-length articles in refereed journals. Whenever possible, faculty should target their work for what are generally perceived to be premier journals. Such publications fall in the category of basic or discovery scholarship. Appendix 1 of this document contains a listing of some of the management-related journals considered by the Department of Management to be "target" (desirable) and "premier" (best) journals. By no means should the appendix be considered a complete list of "target" journals since it does not include all fields of business, niche-field journals, relatively new journals or numerous excellent journals in complementary disciplines such as finance, accounting, marketing, statistics, engineering, psychology, etc. Tenure-track faculty who intend to publish in journals not on the above-mentioned list should confer with their colleagues in order to confirm a shared understanding of the stature of the journals. Publication in premier general business and complementary discipline journals is clearly desirable and highly valued by the department.

Non-Refereed Journal Articles

Non-refereed journals typically fall under the AACSB category of applied or integrative/application scholarship and include numerous outlets such as professional journals, public/trade journals, and in-house journals. Publications in non-refereed journals are significantly less valued by the department than refereed journals and should not be a major emphasis for faculty.

Books

Publications in this category include books that generate new knowledge, applied texts, class oriented texts, book chapters, instructor manuals, test banks, study guides, and software and accompanying documentation. The top priority is on cutting-edge books with a secondary priority on applied texts, especially those published by the best-known publishing companies or University

Presses of Top Tier Universities. Such publications generally fall under the category of basic or discovery scholarship or applied or integrative/application scholarship and are assessed on a case-by-case basis founded on the quality and reputation of the publisher. Other publications in this category normally are instructional development and receive little weight in tenure and promotion decisions.

Conference Papers

Conference papers include papers published in conference proceedings and papers presented at meetings. However, full-length proceedings papers generate the greatest visibility and are more highly valued. In addition, activities at national and international meetings are more prestigious than regional meetings and are more highly valued by the department. However, since it is expected that most papers presented at academic meetings will be revised and submitted for publication in refereed journals, proceedings and presentations will receive little weight in tenure and promotion decisions.

Miscellaneous Publications

There are additional types of publications that may not fall neatly into one of the above categories, including monographs, book reviews, and written cases. Such activities marginally enhance the overall scholarly activity of the department.

Faculty Scholarly Research Expectations

Department of Management faculty are expected to support the departmental mission through the various intellectual contributions described above. Although the departmental emphasis is on journal publications in high-quality refereed journals, the department encourages faculty to contribute in all categories of basic or discovery scholarship, applied or integrative/application scholarship, and teaching and learning scholarship, consistent with their academic rank, tenure status, teaching load, interests, and abilities.

The scholarly expectations identified in this document are based on the assumption that the faculty member teaches a 2-2-0 load with two preparations per academic year. Of course, not all faculty will carry a 2-2-0 teaching load. Any faculty member securing additional release time beyond the standard 2-2-0 load with two preparations will assume increased expectations for research and publication relative to those described in this document. Conversely, faculty that carry heavier teaching loads than the standard 2-2-0 will have reduced scholarly expectations relative to those identified in this document.

When establishing the processes and scholarly standards contained in this document, the Management Department utilized data gathered from a survey of aspirant universities, information from journal impact factors, and the collective expertise of resident faculty to create our own tenure decision process and scholarly standards. Further detail on the process used to gather data is provided in Appendix 2.

STANDARDS AND PROCESSES FOR NEW APPOINTMENTS

The Hankamer School of Business “Standards” document emphasizes that “the appointment of highly qualified, promising scholars to tenure-track positions is the foundation for developing an

excellent faculty...” and provides the link between a school’s mission and its actions. Specifically, “a highly qualified, promising scholar is an individual who comes with substantial evidence of potential as both an effective teacher and a productive scholar.”

When evaluating a candidate for a faculty position, the evaluation mechanism should vary depending on the candidate’s experience. For candidates directly out of a doctoral program, their potential for scholarly activity may be based upon the reputation of the school and the department, the professors with whom they have worked, and their individual potential and desire to successfully conduct scholarly activity that results in publications in high-quality refereed journals. Experienced candidates should have an established record of basic and applied scholarship published in refereed journals. Their track record of scholarly activity should be consistent with their years of experience and the resources provided by their previous institution(s).

STANDARDS/PROCESSES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, TENURE AND PROMOTION

TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

The relevant processes for non-tenured, tenure-track faculty include an annual review (with the chair), the second-year review, the fourth-year review, and the tenure review (the sixth-year review) and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

Annual Review

Each year, the chair shall review the progress of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty toward achieving tenure. In addition to demonstrated teaching excellence and collegiality, tenure-track candidates should exhibit a commitment and passion for scholarly activity that leads to a significant level of intellectual contributions. This commitment is demonstrated not only by the candidate’s publication record, but also by the process of scholarly activities exhibited throughout the pre-tenure period. During each annual review, the chair will provide the tenure-track faculty member with a clear assessment of his or her progress with respect to the quantity of publications that apply to their situation as outlined below.

Tenure-track faculty should demonstrate a clear commitment to scholarly activity by establishing an ongoing program of research, writing, submissions, and publications in one or more active research streams. It is expected that tenure-track faculty will focus the majority of their research activities in the area of basic or discovery scholarship, as opposed to applied or integrative/application scholarship or teaching and learning scholarship. Tenure-track faculty should concentrate their efforts on activities that result in publications in refereed journals and should average at least one refereed article per year and at least one article every two years from the departmental list of target journals, with preference given to premier journals. Papers published in conference proceedings or presented at national or international meetings should have a reasonable likelihood of eventually being published in refereed journals.

Tenure-track faculty are encouraged to actively collaborate in scholarly research activities with colleagues within the department, in other departments within the school, and with faculty at major research universities. This collegial interaction and the development of research networks are

especially beneficial for junior faculty. It is also expected that tenure-track candidates will exhibit leadership in developing and pursuing research activities. This leadership is typically demonstrated by being either a solo author or the lead author on some co-authored articles.

Second-Year Review

At the second-year pre-tenure review, each tenure-track faculty member must be able to demonstrate promise for successful scholarly research and teaching. Given the significant lag times in the publication process, evidence of promise in scholarly research is not solely judged on publications at this stage, for example activities such as manuscripts under review, conference papers and revisions could demonstrate progress. The candidate must be demonstrating progress toward excellence in both teaching and scholarly research. Candidates who cannot demonstrate progress toward excellence may be given a terminal contract.

Fourth-Year Review

At the fourth-year pre-tenure review, each tenure-track faculty member must be able to demonstrate promise for successful scholarly research and teaching. Given the significant lag times in the publication process, evidence of promise in scholarly research is not solely judged on publications at this stage. However, by the fourth year, the expectation is that the candidate should have a minimum of two articles published or accepted for publication in journals on the department list (Appendix 1), a minimum of an additional three to four manuscripts either under review or expected to be under review by the end of the academic year at high quality journals (Appendix 1), and clear evidence of a promising research stream. The candidate must be able to demonstrate excellence in either teaching or scholarly research, with demonstrated effectiveness in the other. Candidates who cannot demonstrate such excellence may be given a terminal contract.

Tenure Review

The tenure review process normally occurs during the sixth year of faculty service, although individuals with previous academic experience may go up for tenure, if approved by a majority of departmental colleagues, chair, dean, and Provost, as early as their second year at Baylor. The granting of tenure is an acknowledgement of an individual's significant accomplishments during the early years of her or his academic career. It is also a signal that the university believes that the individual will continue to develop and grow as an excellent teacher and a productive scholar. The successful candidate for tenure will clearly demonstrate excellence in teaching and scholarly activities, an appropriate commitment to service, and a professional collegiality commensurate with the mission of the school and the expectations of the department.

By the time of the tenure review, the tenure candidate is expected to have demonstrated excellence in scholarly activities. In addition to the guidelines described in the above section on the annual review, the successful tenure candidate will have generated significant publications in the form of refereed journal articles and other outputs as described in the AACSB guidelines in line with the department list (Appendix 1). Moreover, a majority of these publications should be based upon

research related to the tenure candidate's primary area of academic expertise.

The department has established minimum publication standards for tenure that are adjustable according to the candidate's assigned course load and number of preparations as stipulated in their initial contract. The assumed standard teaching load for newly-hired tenure-track candidates is 2-2-0 with two preparations a year. (It is assumed that non-tenured, tenure-track faculty will receive summer research sabbaticals for at least the first three years during the pre-tenure period predicated on available funds. Unless evidence to the contrary is presented to demonstrate significant differentiation, it is also assumed that when a faculty member teaches the same course at the undergraduate and graduate level, it is counted as one preparation.)

Based on the standard 2-2-0 teaching load, the minimum publication standard is one refereed article per year. Since a candidate up for tenure in their sixth year will have completed five years, this translates to a minimum of five refereed articles published or accepted for publication. In all cases, it is expected that the successful tenure candidate will have at least three publications from the department's list of "target journals" or in journals that are clear equivalents, with at least one of these being a "premier journal." The actual number of refereed publications deemed appropriate for tenure is a function of the quality of the journals in which the publications appear. For example, at one extreme, five publications is appropriate for those who have published exclusively in target journals and primarily in premier journals. At the other extreme, eight publications is appropriate for a candidate who only has the minimum of three target journal publications, including one premier journal. It is also expected that the tenure candidate will have demonstrated academic leadership by publishing one or more sole-authored refereed articles or by being lead author on at least two refereed articles.

Tenure candidates who have been assigned heavier teaching responsibilities, either in terms of the total course load or number of preparations, beyond what is typically required will be evaluated in light of these additional responsibilities. Conversely, any tenure candidate who has been granted additional release time will be subject to higher publication expectations.

The publication standard described above is a guideline in the sense that publication productivity is only one (albeit an important one) consideration in the tenure review process. Moreover, publications that do not fall in the category of refereed articles, but are consistent with AACSB guidelines of scholarly output are not unimportant and will be considered as part of a tenure candidate's overall publication record. Further, acquisition of external funding merits consideration as scholarly output. Assuming that the minimum publication standard described above is achieved, such additional scholarly output further elevates the level of the candidate's overall program of research and publication. It is important to note that satisfying the minimum publication standard is not a guarantee that publication productivity is sufficient to warrant the granting of tenure. The minimum publication standard identified is simply a guideline for the tenure candidate.

Following University policy, a tenure candidate's research/publication dossier will be submitted to three qualified external reviewers for evaluation. While the opinions of persons external to the University cannot and should not override the opinions of Baylor faculty and administrators, outside individuals can provide additional valuable insights to the evaluation process. The external review process for tenure as well as promotion decisions is described in Appendix 3.

Promotion to Associate Professor

Faculty who begin their academic career at Baylor will be promoted from assistant professor to associate professor once they receive tenure; these faculty members need not apply for this promotion separately from the tenure process. However, for experienced faculty who come to Baylor from other universities, the promotion decision may precede the tenure decision.

TENURED FACULTY

The relevant processes for tenured faculty include an annual review (with the chair), promotion to professor, and selection for an endowed position.

Annual Review

Once tenure has been granted, a faculty member will receive an annual review from the chair of the Department of Management. The chair will provide an assessment of the contributions that the faculty member is making in support of the missions of the department and the Hankamer School of Business. That assessment will be primarily based on the faculty member's level of scholarly output as indicated on their activity report and their teaching portfolio, including student evaluations, but will also include some consideration of service activities.

Tenured faculty members should be responsible for maintaining an atmosphere conducive to the pursuit of scholarly activities as defined by AACSB guidelines. Thus, based on a teaching load of 2-2-0 with two class preparations, faculty should average at least one refereed article per year and at least one article every two years from the departmental list of target journals, with preference given to premier journals. However, it is appropriate that a tenured faculty member's interests may expand beyond publishing in refereed journals to include additional contributions such as writing textbooks, serving as journal editor, editorial review board member, association officer, etc.

Performance appraisals will be conducted annually. Considering the lengthy publication lead times typical of many premier journals and the considerable amount of time and effort required to design and complete significant research projects, scholarly activity is recognized according to the year an article is first accepted for publication.

Promotion to Professor

According to the University's Promotion Policy Document, a faculty member promoted to the rank of Professor

“should have established a distinguished record of excellence in teaching and mentorship, and should also have produced a body of research and/or creative work that is recognized as excellent by authorities in the field who are in highly esteemed programs at notable institutions. Moreover, the faculty member should have compiled an appropriate record of activity in pertinent professional organizations and service to the university and community.”

The Hankamer School of Business “Standards” document also states that the rank of Professor

should be limited to faculty who have “continued to distinguish themselves as teacher-scholars and can be expected to progress even further in the future.” In addition, demonstrated significant academic leadership is expected of candidates for the rank of Professor. However, the document also indicates that no amount of leadership, service, or collegiality will offset substandard teaching or scholarly activity.

The Department of Management stipulates that the rank of Professor should be granted only in cases in which a faculty member has clearly demonstrated outstanding performance as a teacher-scholar. In terms of scholarly activity, for faculty who typically carry a 2-2-0 load with two preparations per year, the minimum requirement should be an average publication rate of at least one refereed article per year and at least one article every two years from the departmental list of target journals, with preference given to premier journals.

As in the procedure for tenure candidates, the dossier for a candidate for promotion to Professor will be submitted to three qualified external reviewers for evaluation. While the opinions of persons external to the University cannot and should not override the opinions of Baylor faculty and administrators, outside individuals can provide valuable insights to the evaluation process. The external review process for tenure and promotion decisions is described in Appendix 3.

With respect to leadership, a candidate for Professor will be evaluated by the current professors in the department on his/her academic leadership within the department. While administrative leadership is clearly important to the functioning of the University, such service per se will not be sufficient to warrant promotion to professor. Thus, in the event an associate professor is asked to serve as department chair, associate dean, or in some other major administrative capacity, he/she should be provided a sufficient reduction in teaching load (beyond that necessary to carry out administrative duties) to permit time for continued research and other scholarly activities necessary to earn the rank of professor.

Continuing scholarship within the discipline is expected but not sufficient to earn the rank of professor. Additional evidence of academic leadership is necessary and may include, but is not limited to, the following two groups of activities. These activities are divided according to their relative importance for enhancing the academic reputation of the department.

Primary Importance:

- Generating an outstanding record of scholarly output, including receiving awards or other recognition for notable research.
- Focusing on a particular area or “niche” of scholarly activity, where the intent is to develop a “center of excellence” that contributes to the department’s reputation.
- Procuring significant external funding to support scholarly activity.
- Serving as an editor or editorial board member of an academic or professional journal.
- Serving in a leadership position in a national/regional academic or professional organization.
- Mentoring junior faculty in scholarly activities.

Secondary Importance:

- Receiving awards or other recognition for outstanding teaching.
- Procuring significant external funding to support pedagogical activities, including

- integrating technology in the classroom and developing curriculum.
- Initiating and/or overseeing a specific academic program.
- Chairing university, school, or department committees or task forces concerned with curricular or other academic matters.
- Serving as a manuscript reviewer for an academic or professional journal.
- Coordinating a seminar series.

Endowed Positions

Faculty members who have demonstrated an exceptional research record or research potential may be awarded an endowed position in support of that research effort. Endowed positions will be reviewed every five years by the Department Chair and the Dean.

Holders of endowed research positions are expected produce an average of at least one publication per year in journals appearing on the list of target journals (or clear equivalent). Ideally, most of the research should appear in premier journals consistent with the mission of the endowed position, as established by the Dean and the Department Chair.

AACSB ACCREDITATION EXPECTATIONS

All tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to maintain their AACSB qualification status as “academically qualified based on the expectations set forth in the Hankamer School of Business Faculty Standards Document (August 3, 2007). Non-tenure-track faculty members are expected to maintain their AACSB qualification status as “professionally qualified” based on the expectations set forth in the Hankamer School of Business Faculty Standards Document.

In the event a faculty member fails to remain academically qualified or professionally qualified as appropriate, his or her overall evaluations will be rated as “does not meet standards” until the qualification is re-established. In addition, after consultation with the Department Chair and the Dean, the faculty member will develop a formal plan for regaining his or her qualification status.

SUPPORT MECHANISMS

To facilitate and monitor the non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member’s development of a program of scholarly activity, at least one tenured faculty member will be assigned as a faculty mentor. The role of the mentor is to guide and advise the non-tenured professor as well as provide specific feedback to the tenured faculty throughout the pre-tenure period. The mentor(s) should assess the quality of scholarly activity by reading drafts and published papers and by evaluating the candidate’s commitment to scholarship as demonstrated by on-going research activities and submissions.

Sufficient budget should be made available so that faculty with papers accepted for presentation at academic meetings can travel to these conferences. National meetings should receive top priority. However, given Hankamer’s emphasis on globalization, reasonable travel requests to international

meetings should also be funded.

Statistical sophistication is increasingly important in the premier journals. All appropriate and reasonable statistical research resources should be available for research projects.

Appendix 1 Department of Management Journal Recommendations

The primary source of journal ranking will be the Academic Journal Guide (AJG) provided by the Chartered Association of Business Schools. <https://charteredabs.org/academic-journal-guide-2018/>

The information below is to provide a guideline for the categorization in alignment with the wording of the standards for faculty appointment, tenure, and promotion decisions and annual performance review for the Department of Management:

Premier – journals ranking a 4 or 4* equivalent on the AJG list at the time of acceptance

Target – journals ranking a 3 or 3* equivalent on the AJG list at the time of acceptance

Qualified – journals ranking a 1, 1*, 2, 2* equivalent on the AJG list at the time of acceptance

Notes:

1. Journals from the Australian Business Deans Council List (ABDC) <https://abdc.edu.au/research/abdc-journal-list/> or the Financial Times (FT) list <https://www.ft.com/content/3405a512-5cbb-11e1-8f1f-00144feabdc0> will also be taken into consideration when they misalign with the primary AJG list. For example: ABDC A* is a premier and ABDC A is a target and ABDC B or C are considered. If these lists are not consistent then they should be averaged. The FT list might give a journal a boost of a half of a rank so from a 3 to a 3* but not a full category. In case of misalignment it is up to the candidate to make an argument for why a journal should be considered higher than the current AJG rating.
2. While the focus of publications should be on premier and target journals in the candidate's field there are times when journals from other fields outside of the scope or the AJG are appropriate. For example, journals from interdisciplinary research not on the list will be evaluated using the same criteria as the AJG list (i.e., blind review, rigor of review process, citation impact, acceptance rate). This evaluation criteria and its recommended AJG equivalent (rating definitions as provided by the CABS methodology – page 8) needs to be provided by the tenure/promotion candidate. Additionally, practice and/or pedagogical oriented journals may receive credit provided the faculty member provide evidence that publication in the journal represents a significant or equivalent scholarly contribution as evidenced by the AJG criteria mentioned above or is clearly linked to advancing the Hankamer school of business mission and vision for learning and scholarship.
3. The AJG, ABDC, and FT50 lists do not necessarily reflect the conventions of all possible disciplines in the Department of Management. In such cases, where discipline-specific convention and journal ratings do not align (see Note 1), candidates may also use widely accepted and endorsed discipline-specific lists to argue for a “Premier” categorization of their published article(s). Two specific examples:
 - a. In supply chain management, the *Journal of Business Logistics* is considered a leading empirical journal in the field (The SCM Journal List, 2019) and was a “Premier” journal in the Department’s 2015 standards document. Yet, the journal is currently rated AJG 2 (Qualified) and ABDC “A” (Target). Given this gap, individuals could argue for a “Premier” categorization for the *Journal of Business Logistics*.

- b. In the business ethics field, the *Journal of Business Ethics* is considered a top tier journal in the discipline (Albrecht et al., 2010; Beets et al., 2016), and it is listed in the FT50. Yet, the journal is rated AJG 3 (Target) and ABDC “A” (Target). Given this gap, individuals could argue for a “Premier” categorization for the *Journal of Business Ethics*.

Other departmental disciplines (current and future) can draw upon these examples to state their case.

Note 3 References:

Albrecht, C., Thompson, J. A., Hoopes, J. L., & Rodrigo, P. (2010). Business ethics journal rankings as perceived by business ethics scholars. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(2), 227-237.

Beets, S. D., Lewis, B. R., & Brower, H. H. (2016). The quality of business ethics journals: An assessment based on application. *Business & Society*, 55(2), 188-213.

The SCM Journal List. Retrieved on January 11, 2019, from <http://www.scmlist.com/>.

APPENDIX 2: BENCHMARKING DEPARTMENT STANDARDS AND PROCESSES

In an effort to develop the appropriate research process and standards for our own tenure decision process and scholarly standards, a number of steps were taken. In 2005, the Management department chair surveyed the department chairs of five aspirant universities - Boston College (US News rank #30), Boston University (#38), Notre Dame (#23), SMU (#29), and Wake Forest (#28). The purpose of the survey was to identify the processes and standards utilized at these universities to support their own individual tenure decision process and to determine how a target journal list was developed and utilized. Each of the department chairs provided detailed responses to the following seven questions.

Question 1. What are the research expectations for someone to get tenure at your school (e.g., required number of total publications? Required number of "A" publications?)

Question 2. Do you use a "list" of what you consider to be A level journals, or "acceptable" journals for faculty members to publish? If so, how did you determine this list?

Question 3. If your school does use a journal list to evaluate publication success, will you please share the journals on your list? How often is this list revised?

Question 4. Is there any consideration given to co-authored vs. single-authored pieces?

Question 5. What are the standard teaching loads for your untenured faculty? How do you adjust scholarly expectations for different teaching loads?

Question 6. How much summer support do your untenured faculty members receive? How many summers of release time do they typically receive before the tenure year?

Question 7. Do you provide graduate student support to your faculty to assist them in their research efforts? If so, how much support is provided?

The Baylor University Management Department tenured faculty utilized the information gleaned from these surveys to provide benchmarks for creating the scholarly standards and processes described in this document. In addition to surveying aspirant schools, an internal committee consisting of tenured faculty representing each of the major disciplines represented in our department examined journal impact factors and utilized their collective experience to help create our scholarly expectations standards and our department's target journal list. Based on the information gathered, the tenured faculty developed our standards document.

In 2010, a committee consisting of three of the department's full professors and the department chair developed a more formal set of guidelines to determine the journals that are to be included on the department's target journal list. The primary decision criteria developed was that to be considered for the list a journal should have an impact index above 1.0 and a reputation index (ABS) of 3 or 4. The criteria were consistently applied across all areas within the department.

As a department, the target list identifies the journals that we should collectively aspire to. However, there are journals that meet or exceed the decision criteria threshold that did not make the list. These journals would be considered as niche or special interest journals. For tenure and promotion decisions, faculty that publish in such journals can present the data to make the case that a given journal is a "clear equivalent" to a target journal if it meets or exceeds the minimum

criteria. Moreover, all publications in refereed journals enhance one's research portfolio and are considered in the tenure and promotion decisions.

The target journal list should undergo a thorough formal review every five years (2015, 2020, etc.). However, there is the possibility that a rising journal may sufficiently improve its impact and reputation indices prior to the next five year review that it would warrant special consideration for inclusion on the target list. In such cases, it is incumbent upon one or more faculty members to (1) compile the data that shows that the journal currently meets the minimum decision criteria threshold and (2) present a convincing argument as to why the journal should be included on the list (for example, the focus of the journal dovetails with a research emphasis of the department). Any such request should be submitted to the department chair who will determine if the above two conditions are met, and in such case, will ask the committee to consider the request.

APPENDIX 3: External Review Process to Support Tenure and Promotion Decisions

Several months prior to the due date for the candidate's tenure notebook, the department chair shall appoint a committee consisting of two tenured members of the Management faculty for the purpose of developing a list of potential external reviewers. The committee will review the candidate's scholarship and meet with the candidate. At this meeting, the candidate will be given the opportunity to provide the committee any additional input, including names of potential reviewers. After meeting with the candidate, the committee shall prepare a list of six prospective external reviewers and present the list in rank order of preference to the department chair. If the committee is unable to agree on a list of prospective reviewers, a new committee will be formed to generate the prospective list. If the second committee fails to generate a list, the department chair, after consulting with the candidate and tenured members of the department, will determine the list of prospective external reviewers.

The chair will present the list without rankings to the candidate and give the candidate the opportunity to veto one person from the list. Starting at the top of the list, the department chair will contact prospective reviewers until three individuals agree to serve as external reviewers. If all prospective external reviewers have been contacted without securing agreement from three, the process shall be repeated until three external reviewers have been secured. In any case, the tenure candidate will not be notified as to the identity of the actual external reviewers.

Care should be taken when selecting external reviewers to ensure that (1) they are leading scholars in their disciplines and especially knowledgeable about the candidate's research areas of expertise; (2) they are persons whose objectivity is not open to challenge, such as co-authors, longtime personal friends, dissertation advisors, former mentors, or former students; (3) they hold at least the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered.

The department chair shall provide the following information to each of the external reviewers: (1) the candidate's vita, (2) a dossier of the candidate's research, (3) a copy of the *Management Department's "Standards" document*, and (4) any other information that may be relevant to the review. In the cover letter accompanying these materials, the department chair will summarize the candidate's teaching load and describe how it relates to the standards identified in the department's "*Standards*" document. The chair should then request each reviewer to evaluate the candidate's record as it relates to the department's scholarship standards and provide an evaluation of the significance of the candidate's scholarship.

The reviewers should be advised that their letters will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by Texas law. Review letters are to be sent to the Department Chair, who will place them in the candidate's tenure/promotion notebook.