

Standards for Annual Performance Review, Tenure and Promotion

Revised: 10/2020

Department of Information Systems and Business Analytics
Hankamer School of Business
Baylor University

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

Each department in the Hankamer School of Business has been directed to develop, with the approval of the Dean, guidelines for scholarly work consistent with the missions of the Department and School. Additionally, each department must also establish expectations for teaching, service, and collegiality. This document sets forth those guidelines.

Because the Department of Information Systems and Business Analytics is a unit of both Baylor University and the Hankamer School of Business, this guidelines document should be followed in concert with Baylor University's BU-PP 702 *Promotion for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty (5/3/07)*, BU-PP 704 *Policy for Tenure at Baylor University (revised 5/1/2017)*, the *Statement on Scholarly Expectations* (approved February 1998 by the President and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs), BU-PP 716 *Lecturers and Senior Lecturers (revised 6/15/2011)*, BU-PP 719 *Policy on Clinical Faculty at Baylor University (8/15/2013)*, and Hankamer School of Business *Standards for AACSB Faculty Qualifications (5/11/16)*.

I. DEPARTMENTAL MISSION

The Department of Information Systems and Business Analytics upholds as its mission the pursuit of excellence in scholarly exploration, transformational education, and service to others in three academic areas: information systems, quantitative business analysis, and business communication. The department encourages impactful scholarship, innovative learning methods using the latest technologies, and engagement in our professions and communities. Our goals are twofold: (1) to prepare and inspire students for professional careers, principled leadership, and a desire for life-long learning and service and (2) to make an impact in the world.

II. DIMENSIONS OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Annual reviews and tenure and promotion decisions are based on performance evaluation in four areas: teaching, scholarship, service, and collegiality.

HANKAMER SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND BUSINESS ANALYTICS
One Bear Place # 98005 · WACO, TEXAS 76798-8005 · (254) 710 2258

III. ANNUAL GOAL SETTING

At the beginning of each calendar year, each faculty member will prepare a set of goals in the “Planning for the Year Ahead” document in each of the four evaluation areas, as applicable to that individual faculty member’s work load assignment. These goals should include measurable outcomes that will indicate 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.

IV. STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The educational process is intimately involved in the creation and dissemination of knowledge, which involves fostering an effective learning environment. Creating this environment requires that our faculty members are current on changes in the business environment that affect their fields (i.e., Information Systems, QBA, or Business Communications) and can adapt to new teaching methods and technologies.

Thus, faculty must continually update their knowledge and skills, especially in the areas related to their primary teaching responsibilities. For example, as the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data becomes increasingly important for business, faculty instructing students in the domain of business analytics must stay abreast of technological and methodological developments to best serve students. Faculty engaged in teaching business communication should remain current on trends and best practices for professional communication, such as resume writing and expressing messages on behalf of an organization. Faculty who teach information systems should stay abreast of contemporary information systems topics and needs that include, but are not limited to, data warehousing, security, and systems development, among others.

All faculty members are expected to be effective teachers. High quality teaching is characterized by academic rigor, technical currency and competence, and effective course delivery. While effective course delivery may take various forms (e.g., lecture, team work, hands-on training, online training, flipped classroom), students should graduate from our program with the following:

- Mastery of information systems content: Understanding fundamental information systems and cybersecurity concepts, theories, and principles in their application within organizations.
- Application skills: Applying the knowledge, concepts, and tools of information systems to meet the realities and demands of the marketplace.
- Creative problem solving: Developing creative, innovative solutions to emerging information systems and cybersecurity problems.

Faculty teaching is evaluated using a range of criteria. The following examples are consistent with teaching **effectiveness**:

1. High level of scholarly course content and instructional skills, rigor in grading, and above-average teaching, as reflected by:

- Student course evaluations that include
 - A majority of student course evaluations at “AGREE” on the Baylor University scale,
 - Rigor of the instructor in grading based on the type of course by considering grade distributions, student comments, and other evaluative methods of course instruction, and
 - Mostly positive qualitative comments provided by the students regarding the course and the instructor
 - The faculty member’s self-evaluation of teaching and plan of action for improvement as specified in the Hankamer School of Business Policy for Peer Review of Teaching¹
 - Evaluations by students in exit interviews, exit surveys, or alumni surveys
 - Recommendations by current and/or former students, particularly when unsolicited
 - Actions taken to create realistic learning experiences through activities and/or projects that include partnering with organizations or practitioners, using real-world case studies or data, and securing industry speakers in the classroom.
2. Attendance or participation in programs or workshops of our industry academic alliances (e.g. Microsoft, IBM, SAP, and Oracle), industry national professional organizations (e.g. AITP, SIM), top employers, Baylor’s Summer Faculty Institute, and/or Baylor’s Academy of Teaching and Learning.
 3. Completing programs or workshops to improve technical and profession skills to share with students (e.g. taking an online course) or reading books on pedagogy and incorporating new teaching methods in the classroom.
 4. Development of new courses or major revisions to existing courses.
 5. Development of instructional cases or other materials made available through publication in acceptable outlets (refer to the Standards for Evaluation of Scholarship).
 6. Serving as a member on students’ thesis or dissertation committees.

The following examples are indicators of teaching **excellence**:

1. High level of scholarly course content and instructional skills, rigor in grading, and above-average teaching, as determined by:
 - Majority of student course evaluations’ including ratings of “STRONGLY AGREE” on the Baylor University scale, rigor in grading, and qualitative comments from students denoting excellence in the course and/or instructor
 - Exceptional peer evaluation of classroom teaching
 - Exceptional evaluations by students in exit interviews, exit surveys, or alumni surveys

¹ See Appendix A for the Hankamer School of Business peer review and evaluation of teaching policy.

- Partnering with businesses and/or potential employers to create engaged learning experiences for students
2. Receipt of professional, University, or School teaching awards.
 3. A significant leadership role in major curriculum changes and other instructional programs.
 4. Publication of textbooks widely adopted or acclaimed.
 5. Publication of instructional cases or other materials made available through publication in acceptable peer-reviewed journals.
 6. Serving as an advisor on students' thesis or dissertation committees.

V. STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP

The Department of Information Systems and Business Analytics expects that faculty will engage in scholarly activity that is consistent with their role and academic discipline. Minimally, a faculty member is expected to engage in a level of academic scholarly activity that is required for maintaining academic qualifications per AACSB guidelines. For faculty seeking (1) tenure and promotion to Associate Professor; (2) promotion to Professor; (3) promotion to Clinical Associate Professor; or (4) promotion to Clinical Professor, there are additional expectations for scholarship.

For a faculty member seeking a tenure or promotion decision, the burden is on the candidate to demonstrate his or her contribution to the department's pursuit of excellence through scholarship.

❖ Definitions of Scholarship

Information Systems (IS) considers the intersection of information technology and people. As information technology becomes ubiquitous, the field of information systems emphasizes the development, management, use, and impact of information technology on individuals, groups, organizations, and societies. Because information technology continues to evolve, the scope of information system scholarship is broad and faculty are expected to adapt to ensure that their scholarship remains relevant and impactful. These characteristics differentiate the field of information systems from other academic disciplines.

The Department of Information Systems and Business Analytics also has faculty within the disciplines of Business Communication and Quantitative Business Analysis. Business Communication focuses on how to share information effectively among people within and outside an organization. Quantitative Business Analysis leverages statistical techniques to investigate business issues and discover solutions through the analysis of business data.

Scholarly activities include a range of intellectual contributions that may include peer-reviewed publications in journals or conferences, pursuit of funding for scholarly research, publication in professional magazines or journals, and/or involvement in professional organizations or consulting. The IS department's definition of scholarly activities is consistent with the definition of intellectual contributions provided by the AACSB. In the review of a faculty member's scholarly activities, consideration is given

to the quantity and quality of intellectual contributions as well as their impact as defined by AACSB.

The types of scholarly activities and their impacts vary according to the type of faculty. For the purposes of promotion and tenure for tenured or tenure-track faculty, we define scholarly activities as peer-reviewed creative works that are publicly disseminated. For non-tenure-track faculty (lecturers, senior lecturers, or clinical faculty not on the scholarship track), a variety of professional-development and other types of intellectual activities may be suitable for attaining promotion to the ranks of Senior Lecturer, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Professor and for maintenance of Instructional Practitioner status per AACSB.

The IS department adopts the following AACSB definitions of intellectual contributions and the three categories of contributions:

Intellectual contributions are original works intended to advance the theory, practice, and/or teaching of business and management. They are scholarly in the sense that they are based on generally accepted research principles, are validated by peers and disseminated to appropriate audiences. Intellectual contributions are a foundation for innovation. Validation of the quality of intellectual contributions includes the traditional academic or professional pre-publication peer review, but may encompass other forms of validation, such as online post-publication peer reviews, ratings, surveys of users, etc.

Intellectual contributions may fall into any of the following categories:

- *Basic or discovery scholarship (often referred to as discipline-based scholarship) that generates and communicates new knowledge and understanding and/or development of new methods. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the theory or knowledge of business.*
- *Applied or Integration/application scholarship that synthesizes new understandings or interpretations of knowledge or technology; develops new technologies, processes, tools, or uses; and/or refines, develops, or advances new methods based on existing knowledge. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to contribute to and impact the practice of business.*
- *Teaching and learning scholarship that develops and advances new understandings, insights, and teaching content and methods that impact learning behavior. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the teaching and/or pedagogy of business.*

Impact of intellectual contributions is the advancement of theory, practice, and/or teaching of business through intellectual contributions. Impact is concerned with the difference made or innovations fostered by intellectual contributions—e.g., what has been changed, accomplished, or improved.

❖ **Focus of Intellectual Contributions**

The Department of Information Systems and Business Analytics seeks to advance knowledge as well as enhance the reputation of the department and university through scholarship. Scholarly activities are recognized through the publishing of research in a journal or conference (both print and electronic) in any of the three AACSB categories of intellectual contributions defined above. Furthermore, as faculty engage in research efforts that require funding, the procurement of internal or external funding is a form of scholarship that is recognized and valued.

Scholarly Academics and Scholarly Practitioners will focus their primary attention on publishing in mainstream peer-reviewed journals and conferences within their respective disciplines. Premier journals and conferences are weighted more heavily than other outlets. Publication in mainstream journals and conferences outside of one's academic discipline is also encouraged when those journals and conferences are logical outlets for particular research streams and when they support the mission of Baylor University and the Hankamer School of Business. The onus is on the candidate to show the quality of journals and conferences outside the IS discipline. Consistent publication in premier IS journals would warrant an appropriate reduction in teaching load to facilitate continued scholarly efforts.

❖ **Outcomes/Measures**

The outcomes below serve as a guide for evaluating the quality of a faculty member's intellectual contributions. In choosing a publication outlet, faculty should consider the perceived quality of the journal and how publication in the journal would enhance the reputation of the Department of Information Systems and Business Analytics. Faculty should consider three different systems of journal rankings in selecting outlets for their research: the ABS journal rankings, the AIS Senior Scholar's Basket of Journals, and the *Financial Times Journal Rankings*.

The Hankamer School of Business has adopted the journal rankings from the Chartered Association of Business Schools (ABS) to assist faculty in evaluating the relative quality of publication outlets. Journals are ranked on a five-point scale:

- 4* - Journals of distinction, the highest category
- 4 – Top journals in the field
- 3 – Highly regarded journals
- 2 – Well regarded journals
- 1 – Recognized journals but with limited impact

Faculty in the Department of Information Systems and Business Analytics are strongly encouraged to publish in the top journals, typically those rated by ABS as 4* or 4.

In an attempt to identify the most prestigious journals in the discipline of Information Systems, the Association for Information Systems (AIS) has endorsed the "Senior Scholars Basket of Journals²" (Appendix B) to provide tenure candidates a list of IS journals perceived as among the most exclusive. Of the eight journals listed, *MIS*

² An external review of Information Systems programs in Spring 2009 indicates that the Senior Scholars Basket of Journals is commonly used in our field to assess journal quality.

Quarterly and Information Systems Research are widely regarded as #1 and #2 respectively, and are the two IS journals ranked by ABS as 4*. Tenure-track faculty are encouraged to target their research toward one or more journals in the Senior Scholars Basket of Journals, with an emphasis on those at the 4 and 4* level. Publication exclusively in journals from this list rated as 3 by ABS could put a tenure candidate at risk. While this list identifies the most highly ranked IS publication outlets, there are other highly regarded journals in which faculty may publish. At tenure review time, it is incumbent on the candidate to document the quality of alternative outlets using the rankings of the Chartered Association of Business Schools (ABS).

The *Financial Times Journal Rankings* (Appendix C) is another means to identify the most prestigious journals in the business disciplines. This list includes high-impact publication outlets for basic scholarship and applied scholarship.

Faculty publishing their research in disciplines outside the scope of the above journal rankings should consider how another discipline's journals are ranked by the respective department at Baylor University. The burden is on the faculty member to demonstrate the quality of the publication outlet using criteria consistent with the ABS Academic Journal Guide. For journals not included in the ABS rankings, a determination of journal quality should be based on agreement with tenured departmental colleagues prior to pursuing publication in these outlets.

The receiving of grants is also considered a demonstration of intellectual contribution. Faculty who receive external funding to pursue a scholarship goal should provide documentation and/or other supporting material to rate their external funding on the same scale used by the ABS Journal Ranking Guide. As a means to evaluate external funding grant applications, faculty should consider the degree of competitiveness for receiving funding for a proposal, the size of the award, the number of primary investigators, and the role of the faculty member within the proposal. Higher priority and ranking would be given to faculty who (1) play a significant role on the project, (2) are primary investigators, and/or (3) receive funds. We consider the acquisition of external funding much more significant than the acquisition of internal funding.

Finally, while participation on thesis and dissertation committees is considered an aspect of teaching and service, it is also regarded as scholarship when the active involvement of the faculty member through co-authorship results in publication(s) in quality conferences and/or journals.

Faculty may demonstrate the impact of their scholarship through appropriate mechanisms including journal rankings, citation count, and recognition in the popular press or news outlets, among others.

VI. STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION, UNIVERSITY, CHURCH, AND PUBLIC

While not included in the work load specifications, service activities are expected of all faculty members. In performing service activities, all faculty are required to adhere to the Baylor University Faculty Conflict of Interest Policy BU-PP 700.

- As a key component of SERVICE, each faculty member is expected to be an active member in a local faith community.

The following are examples of indicators of **effective** service. This list is not intended to be an exhaustive list of indicators of effective service.

- Effective performance of duties while serving in an administrative role for the University, Hankamer School or Department of Information Systems and Business Analytics
- Leadership role in a regional academic, professional, or philanthropic organization
- Active membership on a university, school, departmental, business, or philanthropic committee
- Advising a student organization
- Outside reviewing for promotion and tenure decisions at other institutions
- Reviewing for academic journals
- Serving as session chair, reviewer, or discussant for academic or professional meetings
- Having a major role at a regional or local conference
- Serving as minitrack chair or other supporting role at a major national or international conference
- Membership on dissertation committees (internally and externally)
- Supervision of doctoral student research apprenticeships
- Giving guest presentations at other institutions
- Writing of recommendation letters for student jobs
- Nominating colleagues for major awards
- Membership on selection committees for awards
- Organization of pre/post-conference workshops at major international conferences

The following are examples of indicators of **excellent** service. This list is not intended to be an exhaustive list of indicators of excellent service.

- Major editorial role (AE, SE, EIC) at an international journal
- Major role at an international conference (track chair, doctoral consortium chair, program chair, conference chair)
- Supervision of doctoral dissertation or masters' thesis
- Serving as an uncompensated director of a program
- Being the keynote speaker at conferences or pre/post-conference workshops
- Leadership role in a national or international academic or professional organization
- Serving on a board of directors or advisory board for a business, community, education, philanthropic, or religious organization
- Chairing a significant university, school, or departmental committee
- Obtaining significant external resources for the department or university to support non-scholarship activities (e.g. resources to support teaching, service activities, or program accreditation).

- Exceptional service on a university, school, or departmental committee
- Building strong relationships with important constituents such as employers or funding agencies
- Service award presented by academic, professional, religious, or civic organization
- Leadership role in a faith community

VII. STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION OF COLLEGIALITY

A strong sense of collegiality is one of the most cherished characteristics of the Department of Information Systems and Business Analytics. The importance of maintaining collegiality in the department should not be minimized. Collegiality is exemplified when faculty exhibit charity, respect, and courtesy towards students, colleagues, and others. Additionally, it should be evident that a faculty member is committed to the mission of the ISBA department as well as the department's efforts to fulfill Baylor University's distinctive mission.

VIII. FACULTY EXPECTATIONS

❖ AACSB Accreditation Expectations

All faculty members are expected to maintain their AACSB qualification status as a Scholarly Academic (SA), Practice Academic (PA), Scholarly Practitioner (SP), or Instructional Practitioner (IP) based on the expectations set forth in the Hankamer School of Business Standards for AACSB Faculty Qualifications document (May 11, 2016).

In the event a faculty member fails to maintain AACSB qualification status, the overall annual evaluation will be rated as "does not meet standards" until the qualification is re-established. The faculty member must prepare a development plan to regain qualification status and discuss this plan with the department chair and dean.

❖ Annual Performance Reviews: All Faculty

All full-time Information Systems faculty (lecturers, clinical, tenured, tenure-track) will undergo annual performance reviews as required by Baylor policy. The annual performance review provides faculty with feedback regarding performance as it relates to their specific workload responsibilities. For tenure-track faculty, it should be noted the annual performance review is used as a basis for pay/merit increases, and this process is distinct from the annual tenure review.

In preparation for the annual performance review, faculty are required to provide the following to demonstrate their efforts related to teaching, scholarship, and service:

- Updated data in Digital Measures
- Annual Planning for the Year Ahead document³

³ Goals are input into Digital Measures.

❖ **Annual Performance Review: Tenured Faculty**

For tenured faculty, the annual review provides feedback on performance in the four areas covered during the tenure process: teaching effectiveness, scholarship, service, and collegiality. Scholarship activities may encompass the range of scholarly activities defined by AACSB: Basic or Discovery Scholarship, Applied or Integrative/Application Scholarship, or Teaching and learning Scholarship. Tenured faculty with teaching loads above or below the standard 2-2 teaching load, or with abnormally large numbers of course preparations will have their research expectations adjusted accordingly in consultation with the department chair and dean.

❖ **Tenure Review: Tenure-Track Faculty**

The department chair and the tenured professors will review the performance of each tenure-track faculty member in the second and fourth years. The review will encompass the four areas evaluated during the tenure process: teaching effectiveness, scholarship, service, and collegiality. As part of the review process, the tenured faculty will provide the candidate a clear assessment of progress with respect to scholarship expectations and the other three elements. Deficiencies in any of these areas will be noted and discussed so they may be adequately addressed prior to the tenure review year. As part of this discussion, tenured faculty will clearly explain to the candidate the specific nature of any deficiencies.

By the fourth-year review, a tenure-track faculty member should demonstrate promise for successful scholarly research and effective teaching. Given the significant lag times and occasional arbitrariness in the publication process, evidence of promise is not solely judged on publications at this stage. Evidence of promise at the fourth-year review would include at least three completed manuscripts submitted to high-quality journals, at least two publications (or acceptance for publication), and at least one manuscript in development. Further evidence of promise includes revise-and-resubmit requests and paper presentations at major conferences. The faculty member should also demonstrate at least effective teaching, service⁴, and collegiality.

Peer Teaching Review. There will be a peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness for each non-tenured professor every other year as specified by the Hankamer School of Business Peer Teaching Review policy (Appendix A).

❖ **Five-Year Review: Endowed Positions**

Faculty members who have demonstrated an exceptional research record or research potential may be awarded an endowed position in support of their research efforts. Because appointments are temporary, each endowed position holder will be evaluated no less frequently than every five years by the dean and the department chair to ensure that the use of position resources is consistent with the mission of the endowed position.

⁴ Tenure track faculty are normally exempt from serving on University-level committees during their first three years of service.

Holders of endowed teaching positions do not typically receive a course reduction; therefore, these positions are evaluated on the basis of continued excellent teaching, as previously defined. Holders of endowed teaching positions are expected to mentor other faculty members in the area of teaching and are encouraged to produce at least one pedagogical publication acceptance during the three-year review period.

❖ **Third-Year Review: Clinical Faculty**

Policies related to Clinical Faculty are detailed in the Hankamer School of Business Clinical Faculty Expectations document dated January 20, 2015.

Each Clinical Assistant Professor will undergo a third-year review with the tenured faculty and the Clinical Associate Professors and Clinical Professors within the department. This review will encompass the four areas evaluated during the promotion process: teaching effectiveness, scholarship (if on the scholarship track) or professional engagement (if on the professional track), service, and collegiality. As part of this review process, the tenured faculty and Clinical Associate/Full Professors will give the candidate a clear assessment of progress with respect to scholarship or professional expectations as well as the other three elements. Deficiencies in any of these areas will be noted and discussed so they may be adequately addressed prior to the promotion year. As part of this discussion, tenured and Clinical Associate/Full faculty will clearly explain to the candidate the specific nature of any deficiencies.

By the third-year review, each Clinical Assistant faculty member should demonstrate promise for successful scholarly research or professional engagement, and teaching. For those on the scholarship track, evidence of promise is not solely judged on publications at this stage. Expectations for the third-year review include at least one completed manuscript submitted to a good-quality peer-reviewed journal or conference, at least one publication (or acceptance for publication) or conference presentation, and at least one manuscript in development. Further evidence of promise includes revise-and-resubmit requests and paper presentations at major conferences in the field.

For those on the professional track, there should be evidence of active involvement in some of the following: professional associations (with possible leadership roles at state or regional level), achieving and/or maintaining relevant professional certifications, completion of relevant continuing professional education experiences, involving professionals in the classroom, consulting with industry, and serving on the board of for-profit or non-profit organizations.

All clinical faculty should demonstrate at least effective service⁵ and collegiality.

❖ **Promotion & Tenure Review: Assistant to Associate Professor**

High quality teaching, service activities, and collegiality, while required for tenure and promotion, will not be sufficient to obtain tenure and promotion absent evidence of sufficient scholarly activity. Likewise, high quality scholarship will not be sufficient for tenure and promotion without high quality teaching, appropriate service

⁵ Clinical track faculty are normally exempt from serving on University-level committees during their first three years of service.

and collegiality. Tenure is granted based on a candidate's potential for future high-quality scholarship, teaching, service, and collegiality. Therefore, tenure is not a reward for a faculty member's past accomplishments. Tenure and promotion are awarded for faculty possessing a strong potential for continued excellence in scholarship, teaching, service, and collegiality.

Information Systems assistant professors on the tenure track are expected to perform well in the areas of teaching, service, and collegiality. In addition, they are expected to conduct research and submit the results for publication in scholarly journals and academic conferences. It is expected that discipline-based research would be the primary focus of research and publication efforts at this point in the assistant professor's career. Faculty members on a 2-2-0⁶ course teaching load are expected to concentrate their efforts on building a national reputation for high quality research in the IS field. By the time a candidate goes up for tenure, there should be evidence of significant progress toward obtaining a national reputation in the candidate's area(s) of focus. The preferred strategy for building a national reputation is to publish in prestigious IS journals. Candidates should review departmental expectations for scholarship in section V. STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP.

A tenure and promotion candidate may also demonstrate excellence in scholarship by receiving external research funding grants. The candidate should provide evidence as to how the grant is equivalent to an ABS journal rating (using the same five-point scale) based on criteria of the funding award. For example, the candidate may demonstrate the value and quality of the scholarship for a funded effort by providing information about the competitiveness of the funding agency, the role of the investigator of the project, the size of the award, among other relevant criteria.

In order for the tenured departmental colleagues to assess a tenure candidate's future research potential, it is important for the candidate to demonstrate the ability to initiate and drive a research project. Evidence of the candidate's ability may be demonstrated by authorship. Thus, the candidate and faculty evaluators should consider the number of papers for which the candidate is lead author or sole author, and on research with multiple authors, the candidate's position in the list of authors. Regarding conference presentations and publications (proceedings), it is recommended for assistant professors to produce one or more conference proceeding papers at an international conference (e.g. ICIS, AMCIS, HICCS, Academy of Management).

In summary, assistant professors are expected to make steady progress toward building a national reputation as an IS scholar. Thus, they are encouraged to publish in the IS journals that will help achieve this goal. The ABS rankings, Senior Scholars Basket, and *Financial Times* list should help guide tenure-track faculty in identifying appropriate publication outlets. Publication in IS journals not on these lists as well as in journals from other disciplines is encouraged provided the research facilitates progress toward building a national reputation in the IS field. When the tenure notebook is submitted in the sixth year, there should be unequivocal evidence the faculty member has the ability to perform research and publish in high quality IS journals. Furthermore, there should

⁶The assumption here is that a new faculty member will come into Baylor with a teaching load of two courses each semester, and guaranteed summer support for of the first three summers prior to tenure.

be equally strong evidence that a high level of research productivity will be sustained well beyond the tenure decision.

The tenure and promotion decision involves an assessment of a candidate's future trajectory for scholarship, teaching, service and collegiality based on past activities. Thus, a candidate's full record, including research published prior to joining the Baylor faculty, can be considered part of the candidate's tenure and promotion portfolio. The candidate's pre-Baylor scholarship may provide insight related to the candidate's future potential. Thus, prior work may be used to evaluate a candidate's (a) ability to publish and continue to publish high quality research; (b) establishment of a national reputation within the IS discipline; and (c) future potential as an IS researcher.

This document specifies no set quantity of journal articles pre-tenure candidates must achieve for a successful tenure decision. This is consistent with many of our peer and aspirational institutions who likewise provide no set quantity of publications. However, to provide guidance to tenure-track faculty, attaining 5-8 journal publications while on the tenure track with some in the highest ranked IS journals (ABS 4 and 4*) is suggested, although this range is merely a guide. Meeting this number does not confirm tenurable scholarship; nor does publishing in any particular journal. Rather, the primary consideration for scholarship evaluation will be the extent to which the candidate's scholarship supports progress toward building a national reputation and the likelihood of high-quality research continuing beyond the tenure decision.

For pre-tenured professors with teaching loads above or below the standard 2-2-0 course teaching load, abnormally large numbers of course preparations, or other extenuating circumstances (e.g. research sabbatical), research expectations will be adjusted accordingly in consultation with the department chair and tenured faculty members in the department. Under no circumstances will a pre-tenured faculty member be given a teaching load that prevents him or her from demonstrating the ability to perform tenurable scholarly research at an appropriate pace.

To obtain an impartial assessment of a candidate's scholarship, the department will request external reviews of the candidate's tenure application. Each external reviewer will be asked to evaluate the candidate's scholarship through a review of the candidate's curriculum vitae, copies of articles, and a copy of faculty scholarship expectations as contained in this document. The candidate's teaching load and/or other factors affecting the candidate's scholarship over the pre-tenure period may also be provided. These evaluations and a copy of each reviewer's CV will be returned to the department chair and forwarded to the University Tenure Committee. The candidate will not have the opportunity to see the external reviews.

External reviewers should be tenured, hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, and be regarded as established IS scholars. External reviewers should have no personal or professional relationship with the candidate. The chair will seek a minimum of three reviewers. The process and criteria for selection of external reviewers will follow Baylor procedures as outlined in the most recent version of the Tenure Procedures document. Tenure candidates may submit a list of potential reviewers to the department chair and may provide input into the selection of external reviewers (e.g. nominating and/or commenting on possible reviewers). When doing so, each candidate must disclose any relationships with reviewers who are discussed. The department chair, at his or her discretion, may seek the advice of other tenured faculty

in selecting the final list of external reviewers. Per Baylor tenure procedures, candidates will not be involved in the final decision, told the identity of the selected reviewers, or permitted to read the submitted reviews.

Peer Teaching Review. There will be a peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness every other year as specified by the Hankamer School of Business Peer Teaching Review policy (Appendix A), and these evaluations will be incorporated into the pre-tenure reviews as specified in the University's Tenure Procedures document.

❖ **Promotion Review: Associate to Professor**

Promotion to the rank of Professor is restricted to Associate Professors who have continued to distinguish themselves as teacher-scholars after the tenure decision. These individuals are expected to continue in their academic, administrative, and/or teaching leadership with the goal of furthering the mission of Baylor University and the Hankamer School of Business. The candidate should demonstrate leadership in the Baylor community, academic community, and other relevant communities (e.g., professional, philanthropic, among others).

Academic leadership is demonstrated by high-quality publications, a reputation in an area of research, and formal or informal mentoring of tenure-track faculty and/or PhD students. Faculty who continue to publish in journals in the Senior Scholar's Basket, *Financial Times* list, and ABS 3, 4, and 4* ranked journals have a strong case for promotion to Professor. The degree to which a candidate has attained a national or international reputation may be demonstrated by citations, invited research presentations, and recognition of scholarly efforts through awards, the popular press or news outlets, and others. It is encouraged, but not required, for faculty seeking promotion to engage in interdisciplinary research or in securing significant funding through research grants. Further evidence of academic leadership may be demonstrated through journal editorships, journal editorial review board memberships, and national or international leadership roles in academic and/or professional organizations. In addition, it is expected the candidate would actively maintain scholarship skills and knowledge via professional development activities.

Administrative leadership is demonstrated by chairing university, school or department committees, directing an academic program, initiating curriculum revision and course development activities, or coordinating a seminar series.

With respect to teaching, candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must continue to be effective in the classroom, as evidenced by student evaluations, peer evaluations and course innovations. Candidates should be active in curriculum development projects in their specialty area including the design and implementation of new course offerings, as appropriate.

The candidate's promotion package will be submitted to at least three outside reviewers for external evaluation. The department chair will select outside reviewers in consultation with the candidate and the Professors in the ISBA department. External reviewers should hold the rank of Professor, be highly regarded scholars in the IS discipline, and have no conflict of interest with the candidate. Each external reviewer will be asked to evaluate the candidate's scholarship through a review of the candidate's curriculum vitae, copies of articles, and a copy of faculty scholarship

expectations as contained in this document. These evaluations and a copy of each reviewer's CV will be returned to the department chair and submitted as part of the candidate's promotion packet to the evaluating faculty, the dean, and the provost. The promotion candidate will not be permitted to view the letters provided by the external reviewers.

The ISBA department will support a request for early promotion for candidates who have demonstrated exceptional scholarship, teaching, and leadership abilities.

❖ **Promotion Review: Assistant to Associate Clinical Professor**

For promotion in year six, candidates on the scholarship track should have published at least two papers (one discipline-based and one discipline-based, practitioner, or pedagogical) in good quality journals (ranking of ABS 2 or higher); made presentations at regional, national, or international conferences; and demonstrated involvement in the scholarship culture of our department and the broader academy.

Faculty publishing their research in disciplines outside the scope of the journal rankings on page 6 of this document should consider how another discipline's journals are ranked by the applicable department at Baylor University. The burden is on the faculty member to demonstrate the quality of the publication outlet using criteria consistent with the ABS Academic Journal Guide.

Candidates on the professional track should show evidence of involvement in several of the following: professional associations (with possible leadership roles at state, regional, or national level), achieving and/or maintaining relevant professional certifications, completion of relevant continuing professional education experiences, involving professionals in the classroom, consulting with industry, and serving on the boards of for-profit or non-profit organizations.

Additionally, high-quality teaching, effective service, and collegiality are expected for the promotion of candidates in the scholarship track and professional track.

Peer Teaching Review. There will be a peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness for each clinical faculty member every other year as specified by the Hankamer School of Business Peer Teaching Review policy (Appendix A), and this will be incorporated into promotion reviews as specified in the University's Clinical Faculty Procedures document.

❖ **Promotion Review: Associate to Full Clinical Professor**

Promotion to the rank of Clinical Professor will require, to quote the HSB Clinical Faculty Expectations document: "Faculty members must demonstrate seasoned leadership in teaching, must have produced a distinguished record of contributions to scholarship or practice, and must be recognized as leaders within the scholarly and/or practitioner's organizations in their field. Leadership should be manifested in the scholarship culture of the department and the broader academy through activities such as directing research workshops and brown bag series,

mentoring clinical assistant professors and/or clinical associate professors, serving as a reviewer for conferences and journals, and directing honors/masters theses.” Excellence in teaching and collegiality, and quality service, are also expected.

❖ **Promotion Review: Regular Lecturer to Senior Lecturer**

During the sixth year of appointment, Regular Lecturers will be reviewed for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer. In making the recommendation for the promotion, the department chair will consider the candidate’s past five annual reviews. To be considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer, the candidate must consistently demonstrate effective teaching as defined previously in this document. Additionally, the candidate must consistently demonstrate effective service and a positive attitude of collegiality. As outlined in BU-PP 716, the department chair will provide a letter of recommendation to the dean.

Peer Teaching Review. There will be a peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness for each lecturer every other year as specified by the Hankamer School of Business Peer Teaching Review policy (Appendix A) and this will be incorporated into the promotion review as specified in the University’s Lecturer and Senior Lecturer Procedures document.

Appendix A

Policy for Peer Review & Evaluation of Teaching

Visitations and Discussions of Teaching and Pedagogy

In order to shape and monitor the progress of lecturers and tenure-track and clinical faculty with respect to teaching, this document outlines the processes for departments to provide mentoring and evaluation from tenured faculty. Importantly, this process is intended to provide information beyond student evaluations that will aid tenured faculty in guiding and evaluating teaching performance.

Process & Timing. The teaching performance of lecturers and tenure-track and clinical faculty will be observed for five semesters prior to the end of the faculty member's first three years. Faculty members will be observed at least annually in years four through six in a tenure-track position. The following outlines the process:

- For each of the first five semesters, the department chair will appoint a senior departmental faculty member (a different senior faculty member each term) to observe the junior faculty member.
- The senior faculty member will meet with the instructor to discuss class objectives for a specific class date for one course and to arrange to visit that class.
- The junior faculty member and departmental colleague will meet prior to the class visit to discuss pedagogy, syllabi, objectives, and planned activities (see attached form).
- During the teaching of the class, the senior faculty will use the attached evaluation form to record his/her remarks.
- Immediately or shortly after the class visit (within three days), the instructor and faculty colleague will meet to discuss their respective thoughts and comments regarding the class under discussion.
- The first three semesters are developmental in purpose. From that point forward, the colleague review process is used by the chair for evaluative purposes.

Note: Faculty hired with credit toward tenure will be treated as if they have served those years at Baylor and have already passed through developmental stages. Consequently, all colleague visitations for such faculty are evaluative in nature.

Key Summary:

--One peer evaluation in each of the first 5 semesters.

--One peer evaluation per year thereafter until tenure review.

Optional Student Input into Evaluation

A junior faculty member may request that the senior faculty member collect the following information from students on the day of the evaluation.

At the end of each class at which a visitation occurs, students will be asked to write a “one-minute paper” using the following questions as a framework:

- a) To what new concepts (ideas, skills) were you introduced as a part of today’s class?
- b) What were the most important concepts (ideas, skills) covered in today’s class?
- c) What concepts, ideas, skills did you find unclear or puzzling and why?
- d) Did you prepare for class before coming to class? If so, how?

Time of Colleague Review	Purpose	#
Fall 1 st year	Developmental	1
Spring 1 st year	Developmental	2
Fall 2 nd year	Developmental	3
Spring 2 nd year	Evaluative	4
Fall 3 rd year	Evaluative	5
Fall or Spring 4 th year	Evaluative	6
Fall or Spring 5 th year	Evaluative	7
Fall 6 th year	Evaluative	Final

If requested, these papers may be collected and reviewed by the senior

faculty member for the purpose of completing the evaluation and to serve as a balanced check on one’s observation. The student responses will also be made available to the junior faculty member in the following semester if requested. The junior faculty member may choose to have the student responses filed with the evaluation for the chair to review.

Key points:

Class input (1) is used to balance perceptions of the senior faculty member (2) provides information different from student evaluations and (3) may be available for departmental review.

Annual Conference and Goal Setting

Years 1-2

- **Annual conference.** At the end of each of the first two years of a given three-year evaluation period, the instructor, colleagues participating in visitations, and the chair will meet to discuss the instructor’s pedagogy as well as his or her teaching experience of the past year.
 - During the conference, participants will identify the instructor’s strengths and will discuss goals for the continued development of the instructor’s teaching during the coming year.
- The purpose and content of this conference are to be developmental, rather than evaluative, in nature.

Year 3

- At the conclusion of the fifth semester of colleague reviews, colleagues participating in visitations and the chair will meet to discuss the instructor’s pedagogy and teaching effectiveness.
 - During the conference, participants will identify the instructor’s strengths and will discuss goals for the continued development of the instructor’s teaching during the coming year.

- The goal of this conference, while still meant to aid in developing teaching expertise, is primarily evaluative in nature.
- The chair submits the colleague evaluation reports and a summary evaluation that becomes part of the tenure review notebook.
- The junior faculty member may also choose to submit statements to the chair regarding the evaluation process and the outcomes.

Years 4-6

- The same process is followed as in year three, but only one colleague evaluation per year is required.
- The chair annually submits a colleague evaluation report (Departmental Evaluation Form(s)) and a summary evaluation that becomes part of the tenure review notebook.

Assessment of the Evaluation Policy

Department members will review the effectiveness of the evaluation policy and the policy's implementation throughout the process. We will explore strengths and weaknesses of the existing policy and process at each annual meeting with the junior faculty, as well as the ways in which both can be improved.

Departmental Teaching Evaluation Form (Faculty Peer Evaluation)

(Part One: to be completed by the instructor)

Instructor Name:

Date:

Course Name:

Course Type (i.e., GE, Business Core, Major Core, Electives)

Course Enrollment:

Topic for the Day:

Pedagogical Goals:

1. What do you intend for your students to learn today?
2. How do today's objectives fit into the overall course?
3. How important are these objectives relative to the goals sought for the degree?
4. How should students be able to apply or utilize this concept?

Methods:

1. What techniques will you use to achieve your goals?
2. What activities will you employ to achieve your goals?
3. How will you assess your success at achieving your goals?

(Part Two: to be completed by the faculty colleague)

Colleague Name:

1. What strengths did you perceive and observe
 - a) With regard to the instructor's goals?
 - b) With regard to the instructor's methods?

2. What are the points for development and improvement?
 - a) With regard to the instructor's goals?
 - b) With regard to the instructor's methods?

Overall evaluation:

Does not meet minimal expectations

Meets some minimal standards but is performing at less than satisfactory level

Is satisfactory

Is clearly above satisfactory level

Is superior

Departmental Teaching Evaluation Form (Student Input)

Please take a minute or two to tell us about today's class. Your responses will not be available to the instructor of this course until the following term.

a) What new concepts (ideas, skills) were you introduced to in today's class?

b) What were the most important concepts (ideas, skills) covered in today's class?

c) What concepts, ideas, skills did you find unclear or puzzling and why?

d) Did you prepare for class before coming to class? If so, how?

Appendix B
Senior Scholars “Basket of Journals”⁷

1. European Journal of Information Systems
2. Information Systems Journal
3. Information Systems Research
4. Journal of AIS
5. Journal of MIS
6. MIS Quarterly
7. Journal of Strategic Information Systems
8. Journal of Information Technology

⁷ Listed alphabetically, not in order of quality.

Appendix C
Financial Times 50 Journal List (alphabetical order)
(as of September 2016)

1. Academy of Management Journal
2. Academy of Management Review
3. Accounting, Organizations and Society
4. Administrative Science Quarterly
5. American Economic Review
6. Contemporary Accounting Research
7. Econometrica
8. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice
9. Harvard Business Review
10. Human Relations
11. Human Resource Management
12. Information Systems Research
13. Journal of Accounting and Economics
14. Journal of Accounting Research
15. Journal of Applied Psychology
16. Journal of Business Ethics
17. Journal of Business Venturing
18. Journal of Consumer Psychology
19. Journal of Consumer Research
20. Journal of Finance
21. Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis
22. Journal of Financial Economics
23. Journal of International Business Studies
24. Journal of Management
25. Journal of Management Information Systems
26. Journal of Management Studies
27. Journal of Marketing
28. Journal of Marketing Research
29. Journal of Operations Management
30. Journal of Political Economy
31. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science
32. Management Science
33. Manufacturing and Service Operations Management
34. Marketing Science
35. MIS Quarterly
36. Operations Research
37. Organization Science
38. Organization Studies
39. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes
40. Production and Operations Management
41. Quarterly Journal of Economics
42. Research Policy
43. Review of Accounting Studies
44. Review of Economic Studies
45. Review of Finance
46. Review of Financial Studies
47. Sloan Management Review
48. Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal
49. Strategic Management Journal
50. The Accounting Review