

Merit, Promotion, Tenure, and Workload Guidelines

Preamble

The Department of Management seeks to support the missions and objectives of the University and the College of Business by providing an environment for the continuous improvement of faculty and programs. The Department can succeed only to the degree that its faculty are successful in discharging their roles in the areas of teaching; scholarly, creative, and professional activities; and service to the University, the public, and the profession. To measure progress toward the departmental goal of continuous improvement, a framework for the evaluation of the professional performance of individual faculty members must be provided. This evaluation document serves as that framework.

The evaluation philosophy of the Department of Management consists of three major cornerstones. First, the Department believes that policies, guidelines, and procedures relating to annual merit evaluation, promotion and tenure, and workloads must be consistent. Second, the Department believes also that faculty should be allowed the greatest degree of latitude possible in developing their academic careers and that the evaluation process should accommodate this latitude. Third, there is the belief that professional performance cannot be measured on an interval scale; that no quantitative metric can consistently and reliably measure the values of the disparate activities in which academic professionals are involved. Consequently, the Department of Management places great faith in the professional judgments of the members of the Personnel Affairs Committee, Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Department Chair to determine levels of professional performance.

The Department of Management faculty performance evaluation process provides a structure for differentiating among levels of faculty performance and, at the same time, allows the evaluators to exercise their professional judgment in determining appropriate levels of performance. Within each of the three performance factors, anchor statements describe a profile of the type of faculty member represented by each level of performance. Following the anchor statements are examples of activities that might be found at that level. These examples are offered to guide the PAC/PAT members and the Department Chair in their discussions regarding the performance of individual faculty members and are not meant to be used to dictate the placement of a given individual at a specific level. In their deliberations, the PAC, PAT, and the Department Chair must consider the totality of a colleague's activities at every level of performance. Therefore, achievement of one or more of the examples in a performance level does not mean that the PAC, PAT, and Chair will necessarily award that level. Faculty should not consider items to be additive or multiplicative.

Those faculty in the department who have less than 100% FTE administrative appointments will be evaluated according to the COB Dean's guidelines relative to teaching, research, and service. It is the responsibility of the Chair of the Department to obtain the Dean's guidelines to evaluate performance of these individuals. The Chair of the Department will be evaluated by the COB Dean as a 100% administrator. The PAC will write a letter to the dean providing an overall evaluation of the individual in his or her role as Chair of the Department. Lecturers of all ranks are evaluated according to the guidelines presented later in this document.

Revision May 2015

Merit Guidelines for Tenured & Tenure Track Faculty

Levels and Criteria for Teaching Evaluation

Even though the instructional activity is common to all faculty and serves as one of the cornerstones of our professional obligation, it is also one of the most difficult to measure. The Personnel Affairs Committee must be diligent, thorough, and flexible in measuring the quality of teaching performance.

Special Considerations

In its deliberations, the PAC should consider, at every level of performance, the special considerations related to the courses being taught by departmental faculty. Examples of special considerations include the level of courses taught (graduate or undergraduate), the number of students, the number of preparations, the availability of teaching assistants or graders, whether the course is taken primarily by majors within the department, and whether the course is newly developed and/or utilizes a new delivery approach for the first time. Special considerations should be listed in the FAR COVER SHEET. Above all else, the student's course experience is of highest priority. No other activity can be considered equivalent.

EXCEPTIONAL: Evaluation Range of 9 - 10

An "Exceptional" instructor would qualify as a master teacher whose instructional performance would be characterized by continuous improvement in course content and significant innovations in the delivery of course material. Specific characteristics of an instructor at this level include all of the attributes of an instructor classified as "Satisfactory" and may include, but not be limited to, some or all of the following:

- publication of a textbook, casebook, instructional software, or other equivalent instructional material
- case published in a journal of basic research
- instructional development research published in a journal of basic research
- student evaluation scores consistent with guidelines on page 6
- grading standards consistent with guidelines on page 6
- respectful written comments on student evaluations
- significant innovation in instructional techniques and methods
- supervision of doctoral dissertation(s)
- formal recognition of teaching excellence by departmental/college/university or other professional peer groups
- supervision of independent studies in the doctoral program
- accessible and responsive to students
- receipt of an internally or externally funded teaching grant

EXCELLENT: Evaluation Range of ≥ 8 and < 9

An “Excellent” instructor would qualify as a highly effective teacher who continuously improves the content and delivery of courses. Specific characteristics of an instructor at this level include all of the attributes of an instructor classified as “Satisfactory” and may include, but not be limited to, some or all of the following:

- instructional development papers presented at national or regional academic conferences
- cases published in casebooks, textbooks, or conference proceedings
- significant innovation in instructional techniques and methods
- student evaluation scores consistent with guidelines on page 6
- grading standards consistent with guidelines on page 6
- respectful written comments on student evaluations
- member of one or more dissertation committees
- formal recognition of teaching excellence by departmental/college/university or other professional peer groups
- supervision of independent studies in the doctoral program
- accessible and responsive to students
- receipt of an internally or externally funded teaching grant
- supervision of master’s theses

GOOD: Evaluation Range of ≥ 7 to < 8

A “Good” instructor goes beyond the minimum obligations associated with a faculty appointment. There will be evidence that this instructor systematically upgrades the content of courses and makes a conscientious effort to consistently improve the delivery of course material. Specific characteristics of an instructor at this level include all of the attributes of an instructor classified as “Satisfactory” and may include, but not be limited to, some or all of the following:

- systematic upgrading of course content
- departmental working paper or work-in-process regarding some aspect of instructional development
- student evaluation scores consistent with guidelines on page 6
- grading standards consistent with guidelines on page 6
- respectful written comments on student evaluations
- membership on dissertation committee outside of COB
- formal recognition of teaching excellence by departmental/college/university or other professional peer groups

SATISFACTORY: Evaluation Range of ≥ 6 to < 7

A “Satisfactory” instructor performs minimal obligations associated with the instructional role of a faculty appointment. This person performs adequately in the classroom. Specific characteristics of an instructor at this level include a majority, if not all, of the following:

- meets class as scheduled

- uses class time to cover relevant course material
- maintains adequate office hours for course load and number of students
- prepares and distributes a course syllabus which includes such topics as course objectives, topic and exam schedule, grade components, method of grade determination, and other specific course policies.
- student evaluation scores consistent with guidelines on page 6
- grading standards consistent with guidelines on page 6
- respectful written comments on student evaluations
- conforms to all university, COB, and departmental requirements pertaining to paperwork processing
- conscientious evaluation of students using high, but fair standards of performance
- reasonable attendance at dissertation proposal and final defense presentations

UNSATISFACTORY: Evaluation Range of < 6

An individual performing at this level does not conform to the instructional role of a faculty member in the Department of Management. Continual performance at this level might initiate the University Post Tenure Review policy and/or serve as grounds for dismissal regardless of tenure status.

Required Documentation

To properly evaluate instructional performance, the PAC must have pertinent documentation. Any accomplishments not supported by documentation will not be considered. Documentation will include:

Teaching Evaluation/Recognition

Evaluation or recognition of teaching performance might be done internally, as in the case of student evaluations, or externally in the form of an award or some other type of recognition. Documentation required will include the following information.

1. Student evaluation of teaching performance — The department receives a copy of teaching evaluations for each course taught by every instructor. The faculty member is required to have the evaluation administered in each class taught. Failure to do so will result in an evaluation of “Unsatisfactory” for that class.
2. Department/college/university or other professional peer group recognition — The faculty member should provide the appropriate letters, citations, or copies of the recognition of teaching performance.

Instructional Development

Each faculty member is required to submit copies of letters of acceptance or actual copies of all published material. The faculty member may have the publication counted when accepted, or when published, except for those items in textbooks or case books noted below. The Department will keep a record of when these are counted. These publications include:

1. textbooks (counted only when available for adoption);
2. cases published in journals;
3. cases published in text or case books (counted when book is available for adoption);
4. chapters included in other textbooks and properly cited (counted when book is available for adoption);
5. papers presented at professional meetings; and
6. instructional development articles.

Instructional Activities

The faculty member must provide evidence of proper conduct of classes and any teaching innovations or course improvement projects implemented. Such evidence will include:

1. syllabi for all classes taught;
2. descriptions of new course preparations or revisions;
3. full description of course innovations and results of a critical review of such innovations by departmental peers; and
4. statement of dissertation committee responsibility.

Guidelines for Grades

While the Department recognizes that the grades assigned in courses are the prerogative of the faculty member, and we recognize that individual classes may vary, the Department has an interest in upholding academic standards. Based on past departmental experience, we strongly encourage the faculty member to compare his or her grades with the guide below for level of course and grade point averages.

In the event that a faculty member consistently assigns grades well outside of these guides, the PAC and Department Chair will examine the situation to determine if there are valid reasons for such divergence. If there are no sound academic reasons for such grade averages, the faculty member should be counseled on the need to *maintain reasonable academic standards*.

CLASS LEVEL	GPA RANGE
1000	2.0 — 2.5
2000	2.0 — 2.5
3000	2.5 — 3.0
4000	2.5 — 3.0
5000	2.8 — 3.5
6000	3.0 — 3.5

Guidelines for Student Evaluations

While the department recognizes that student evaluations are important, they are not the only criterion of merit. In effect, these guidelines are provided to promote quality-teaching goals within a reasonable range of merit to support a more complete portfolio of activities the PAC and Department Chair will evaluate. Examples of those activities appear in the category levels of merit earlier in this document. In the event a faculty member falls below these guidelines, the Chair and PAC will examine collectively to determine if there are valid reasons for such divergence. If there are no sound academic reasons for being lower than recommended, the faculty member will be counseled on the need to *improve*. Significant improvement is expected in the next reporting period.

MERIT	APPROXIMATE SCORE
Exceptional	about 4.5
Excellent	about 4.0
Good	about 3.5
Satisfactory	about 3.0
Unsatisfactory	about 2.9 and below

The student evaluation scores for each level of merit are approximate in order to take into account special considerations noted earlier in this document on page 2. The PAC and Chair will avoid adherence to a strict metric score without taking special considerations into account including, but not limited to, the teaching experience of the faculty member.

Levels and Criteria for Scholarly, Creative and Professional Activity Evaluation

Scholarly, creative and professional activity is defined as the intellectual contribution of the Management faculty to either (a) the creation of new knowledge (basic scholarship) or (b) the application, transfer and interpretation of knowledge to the improvement of management practice (applied scholarship) (AACSB accreditation standards). The **desired** outcome of the research process includes publication in a basic research journal.

Each faculty member is required to submit copies of letters of acceptance or actual copies of all published material. The faculty member may have the publication counted when accepted or when published and it should be included in the FAR only under the year it is to be counted. (An exception is for scholarly books, monographs, and the like, which will be counted only after they are published.) Further, in order to properly classify the publication as either Class A or B, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to insure that the publication has been rated by the Graduate Programs Committee prior to submission of the FAR.

EXCEPTIONAL: Evaluation Range of 9 – 10

An “Exceptional” scholar would be involved in an ongoing program of basic research, characterized by an active record of publication; thus, both quality and quantity of research are considered. The threshold requirements of a researcher at this level include (1) basic research accepted/published in a Class A basic journal in at least one of the two previous evaluation periods and (2) a revise and resubmit at an A journal in the current calendar year or an acceptance at a B journal in the current calendar year. Sole and lead authorship will be considered to determine position in the range. “Exceptional” activities also may include, but are not limited to, some or all of the following:

- Externally funded research grant judged to be significant at this merit level
- Invited presentations that bring national recognition to our department
- Publication of a scholarly book (1st Edition)
- Editor – National or International Journal

EXCELLENT: Evaluation Range of ≥ 8 to < 9

An “Excellent” scholar is considered to be above average for the department and typically receives external validation of efforts through yearly journal publications. Threshold requirements for a score of 8 can come in the following ways. First, a journal publication record for a researcher at this level would be expected to include 1 manuscript accepted/published in a Class B basic or applied research journal *and* 1 Class A publication in at least one of the three previous calendar years in the evaluation period.

Second, although journal publications are typically expected at this level of evaluation, we recognize that acceptance of research for publication in the current calendar year of the evaluation period is not always under the full control of the scholar. When there is no journal

publication in the current calendar year, the researcher can receive an evaluation of “Excellent” under the following conditions: (a) the researcher has a Basic A publication in one of the three previous calendar years in the evaluation period; and (b) obtains a combination of 2 or more of the following activities in the current calendar year of the evaluation period, which may include, but are not limited to, some or all of the following: (the list is not exclusive and provides a reference for expectations at this level of evaluation)

- Research presented at prestigious (Class A) national meetings with sufficient quality to be developed into publications in major journals (Class A) and either published in the proceedings or placed on file for the PAC and Chair to review with letter of acceptance
- Published monographs
- Research award (for example, best paper from national meeting or class A journals, college- or university-level competitive award, PDI fellowship)
- Receipt of an externally funded competitive research grant judged to be significant at this merit level
- Publication in a Class B journal (multiple publications may be combined to reach the goal of 2)
- Revise and resubmit of basic research at a Class A journal during the current calendar year of the evaluation period and entered into the FAR under the appropriate year
- Manuscript reviews performed as a member of an editorial review board (must occur during the current calendar year of the evaluation period)
- Submission of a research grant proposal for a major government grant
- Manuscript reviews performed as an adhoc reviewer (must occur during the current calendar year of the evaluation period)

GOOD: Evaluation Range of ≥ 7 and < 8

A “Good” scholar goes beyond the minimum obligations associated with a faculty appointment. Evidence of research activity is provided through a variety of publication and research activities. Threshold requirements for a score of 7 can come in two ways. First, publication of a basic Class B journal article satisfies the requirement.

Second, at a minimum, a researcher at this level should obtain a combination of at least 2 of the following activities in the current calendar year of the evaluation period, which may include, but are not limited to, some or all of the following: (the list is not exclusive and provides a reference for expectations at this level of evaluation)

- Presentation at a prestigious national (Class A) or regional (Class B) meeting
- Receipt of a competitive University or COB funded research grant
- Submission of manuscript to a Class A or Class B basic journal (copy of manuscript and submission letter furnished to PAC)
- Submission of external research grant proposals

- Research award (for example, a best paper award from a national or regional meeting or Class A or B journal, college- or university-level competitive awards)
- Revise and resubmit of basic research at a Class A or Class B journal during the current calendar year of the evaluation period and entered into the FAR under the appropriate year
- Manuscript reviews performed as an adhoc reviewer (must occur during the current calendar year of the evaluation period)
- Paper discussant or session chair at a conference

SATISFACTORY: Evaluation Range of ≥ 6 to < 7

The “Satisfactory” scholar meets minimum expectations for intellectual contribution for a faculty member in the Department of Management. “Satisfactory” performance is evidenced by ongoing research and intellectual activity that peers believe to be worthy of publication in refereed journals and/or presentation at prestigious (Class A or B) meetings. Specific characteristics/activities include 2 or more of the following during the 3-year evaluation period, which may include, but are not limited to, some or all of the following:

- Published research
- Preparation and submission of research grant proposals
- Receipt of a funded research grant
- Manuscript(s) under review
- Research Award(s)
- Revise and resubmit of basic or applied research
- Conference Presentation(s)
- Manuscript reviews performed as an adhoc reviewer
- Work in progress that has not culminated in journal or meeting submission with clarification of progress if it is listed in more than one year

UNSATISFACTORY: Evaluation Range of < 6

The “Unsatisfactory” researcher fails to meet minimum expectations for intellectual contribution for a faculty member in the Department of Management. Improvements in both quality and quantity of research effort are required. Continual performance at this level will require a re-evaluation of workload distribution and initiate the University Post Tenure Review Policy.

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES AND CHARACTERISTICS

Unless noted otherwise, any list of research activities/characteristics used for evaluating Scholarly, Creative and Professional Activity should be not construed as the sole criterion. Rather, the Department of Management is obliged to weigh other activities/characteristics that are not explicitly identified in this document.

Required Documentation

To properly evaluate research performance, the PAC must have pertinent documentation. Any accomplishments not supported by documentation will not be considered. Documentation may include letters of acceptance and actual copies of all materials including: (a) work in progress, submitted research, published research; (b) conference paper submissions or acceptances; (c) research grant applications; (d) scholarly books (not included in the teaching category).

For research publications, the PAC would award credit based on the date of acceptance or publication, but not both. Thus, a letter of acceptance could be used as documentation.

A faculty member who plans to send a manuscript to an unrated journal has the responsibility to have the Graduate Programs Committee rate the journal prior to listing such publication in a FAR.

Levels and Criteria of University, Professional and Public Service Evaluation

An important aspect of the faculty member's responsibilities is service to the University, College, and Department; to the professional organizations in the faculty's discipline; and to the public. Service to the University, College, and Department is in the form of participation in the activities, which are necessary for any organization to operate, such as committee and task force assignments. Service to the profession includes working as an officer, attendance at meetings, etc. Service to the public includes serving in a pro bono capacity, and consulting. The COB views paid consulting as evidence that faculty are valued by the marketplace, although paid consulting is not required nor is it by itself sufficient for service. (The faculty member is reminded that University rules prohibit the use of state equipment, etc. for non-state activities. In addition, faculty must follow the UNT outside employment Policy 1.2.2.)

EXCEPTIONAL: Evaluation Range of 9 – 10

An “Exceptional” faculty member’s performance would be characterized by an extraordinary level of service to the University, the Department of Management, the member's profession, and the public. This level of service will typically have a significant impact on the department, college and/or university based upon the quality and quantity of the work. Specific characteristics of a faculty member achieving this level include the attributes of a “Satisfactory” faculty member and may include, but not be limited to, some or all of the following:

- Formal recognition of service by the University, College, Department, or professional group
- Major officer in a national organization
- President of a regional organization
- Involvement of broad-impact service to the University, College, or Department
- Extraordinary service to public organizations
- Significant fundraising
- Chair of a search committee
- Faculty sponsor/advisor of a student organization
- Program or track chair for a national conference
- Receipt of grants that fund departmental programs
- Election to and service on Faculty Senate
- Service on several committees or task forces (the specific role on the committee, such as chair, will be considered)
- Departmental Program Director

EXCELLENT: Evaluation Range of ≥ 8 to < 9

An “Excellent” faculty member’s performance would be characterized by a very high level of service to the University, the Department of Management, the member’s profession, and the public. Specific characteristics of a faculty member achieving this level of service include the

attributes of a “Satisfactory” faculty member and may include, but not be limited to, some or all of the following:

- Formal recognition of service by the University, College, Department, or professional group
- Major officer in a regional organization
- Election to and service on the faculty senate
- Program or track chair for a regional conference
- Faculty sponsor/advisor of a student organization
- Service on faculty senate committees
- Service on a search committee
- Participates in any activity that brings resources to the department
- Service on several major committees or task forces (the specific role on the committee, such as chair, will be considered)
- Editor of newsletter for a professional organization
- Service to public organizations
- Considerable consulting that brings departmental resources and/or recognition

GOOD: Evaluation Range of ≥ 7 to < 8

A “Good” faculty member’s level of service potentially would exhibit a moderate amount of work on committees and task forces, a moderate role in professional organizations, and a moderate amount of participation in consulting and service to the public. Specific characteristics of a faculty member achieving this level of service include the attributes of a “Satisfactory” faculty member and may include, but not be limited to, some or all of the following:

- Formal recognition of service by the University, College, Department, or professional group
- Officer or committee chair in an organization (e.g., track chair at a conference)
- Service on several minor committees or task forces (the specific role on the committee, such as chair, will be considered)
- Faculty sponsor/advisor of a student organization
- Service on public commissions or advisory boards
- Development/presentation of professional programs or workshops
- Considerable consulting activity
- Core course coordinator

SATISFACTORY: Evaluation Range of ≥ 6 to < 7

The member performing at this level would accomplish those professional duties expected as a minimum of any faculty. These are:

- Membership and service on at least one committee, task force, or other service related assignment
- Regular attendance at departmental faculty meetings

- Membership in a professional organization or engaged in a program of continuous development

UNSATISFACTORY: Evaluation Range of < 6

The faculty member at this level is not meeting the minimum expectations of the service role of a faculty, as expressed in the “Satisfactory” level. Continual performance at this level will require a re-evaluation of workload distribution and merit recommendations.

Required Documentation:

Documentation for the items varies. The necessary information may include: titles of offices, levels of organizations, dates and type of service to public organizations, membership and role on committees (including the scope of the committee and frequency of meeting). In any event, the documentation should be sufficient for a person not familiar with the member's contribution to make a judgment as to what level of service the activity justifies.

Merit Guidelines for Lecturers

Lecturers are faculty members whose primary responsibilities are related to teaching, student development, and service. Lecturers are not eligible to participate in the University's tenure system. A lecturer is appointed to one of the following classifications: lecturer, senior lecturer, or principal lecturer. Appointment contracts may be for one to three years annually renewable.

Review and Promotion: Lecturers will be reviewed annually by a department Personnel Affairs Committee (PAC) with recommendations for renewal and/or promotion made to the department chair. The dean will review recommendations and approve/disapprove. Promotion criteria are presented in the Dean's Guidelines for Promotion of Lecturers. Lecturers at all ranks are expected to be near the top of student evaluation scores for the department.

Lecturer: To be eligible for the classification of lecturer, the faculty member must demonstrate effectiveness in teaching, or in the case of a new appointment, show promise of effectiveness if the candidate has no prior teaching experience.

Senior Lecturer: To be eligible for the classification of senior lecturer, the faculty member must have a record of substantial and continued effectiveness in teaching and have the equivalent of three years (six semesters of full-time teaching) of college-level teaching and/or equivalent professional experience. Examples of teaching activities at this rank include course revisions, new course development, teaching grants, independent study, and internships. Examples of service activities include student organization sponsor, student recruitment, student mentoring, service to the business community, and service to the university.

Principal Lecturer: To be eligible for the classification of principal lecturer, the faculty member must have a record of sustained excellence in teaching and have the equivalent of five years (10 semesters of full-time teaching) of college-level teaching including at least two years (four semesters of full-time teaching) qualified at the senior lecturer rank, and/or the equivalent professional experience. Examples of teaching activities at this rank may include lecturer and senior lecturer activities as well as participation at regional or national meetings, instructional development publications, and/or formal recognition for quality teaching. Examples of service activities include lecturer and senior lecturer activities as well as editor of teaching publications, teaching committees, teaching advisory board memberships, major officer in teaching organizations, and presentations of teaching workshops or seminars.

Criteria: Lecturers, senior lecturers, and principal lecturers will be evaluated and recommended for teaching and service merit by the PAC and Chair based on the criteria presented in the following tables. The same numerical system as management tenured and tenure-track faculty will be used.

Special Considerations

In its deliberations, the PAC should review, at every level of performance, the special considerations related to the courses being taught by departmental faculty. Examples of special considerations include the level of courses taught (graduate or undergraduate), the number of students, the number of preparations, the availability of teaching assistants or graders, whether the course is taken primarily by majors within the department, and whether the course is newly developed and/or utilizes a new delivery approach for the first time. Special considerations should be listed in the FAR COVER SHEET. Above all else, the student's course experience is of highest priority. No other activity can be considered equivalent.

Levels and Criteria for Teaching Evaluation

EXCEPTIONAL: Evaluation Range of 9 – 10

An "Exceptional" lecturer, senior lecturer, or principal lecturer would qualify as a master teacher whose instructional performance would be characterized by continuous improvement in course content and significant innovations in the delivery of course material. Specific characteristics of a faculty member at this level include all of the attributes of a "Satisfactory" faculty member and may include, but not be limited to some or all of the following:

For Lecturer

- Significant innovation in instructional techniques and methods
- Respectful student comments
- Student evaluation scores consistent with guidelines on page 6
- Grading standards consistent with guidelines on page 6
- Formal recognition of teaching excellence by departmental/college/university or other professional peer groups
- Accessible and responsive to students

For Senior Lecturer

- Significant innovation in instructional techniques and methods
- Respectful student comments
- Student evaluation scores consistent with guidelines on page 6
- Grading standards consistent with guidelines on page 6
- Formal recognition of teaching excellence by departmental/college/university or other professional peer groups
- Supervises independent studies
- Successfully identifies student internship opportunities
- Applies for teaching grants
- Obtains teaching grants
- Accessible and responsive to students

For Principal Lecturer

- Significant innovation in instructional techniques and methods
- Respectful student comments
- Student evaluation scores consistent with guidelines on page 6
- Grading standards consistent with guidelines on page 6
- Formal recognition of teaching excellence by departmental/college/university or other professional peer groups
- Supervises independent studies
- Successfully identifies student internship opportunities
- Applies for teaching grants
- Obtains teaching grants
- Publishes in instructional development journals
- Accessible and responsive to students

EXCELLENT: Evaluation Range of ≥ 8 to < 9

An “Excellent” lecturer, senior lecturer, or principal lecturer would qualify as a highly effective teacher who continuously improves the content and delivery of courses. Specific characteristics of a faculty member at this level include all of the attributes of a “Satisfactory” faculty member and may include, but not be limited to some or all of the following:

For Lecturer

- Significant innovations
- Respectful student comments
- Student evaluation scores consistent with guidelines on page 6
- Grading standards consistent with guidelines on page 6
- Accessible and responsive to students

For Senior Lecturer

- Significant innovations
- Respectful student comments
- Student evaluation scores consistent with guidelines on page 6
- Grading standards consistent with guidelines on page 6
- Supervises independent studies
- Accessible and responsive to students

For Principal Lecturer

- Significant innovations
- Respectful student comments
- Student evaluation scores consistent with guidelines on page 6
- Grading standards consistent with guidelines on page 6
- Supervises independent studies

- Successfully identifies internship opportunities
- Applies for teaching grants
- Accessible and responsive to students

GOOD: Evaluation Range of ≥ 7 to < 8

A “Good” lecturer, senior lecturer, or principal lecturer goes beyond the minimum obligations associated with a faculty appointment. There will be evidence that this faculty member systematically upgrades the content of courses and makes a conscientious effort to consistently improve the delivery of course material. Specific characteristics of a faculty member at this level include all of the attributes of a “Satisfactory” faculty member and may include, but not be limited to, some or all of the following:

For Lecturer

- Systematic upgrading of course content
- Respectful student comments
- Student evaluation scores consistent with guidelines on page 6
- Grading standards consistent with guidelines on page 6

For Senior Lecturer

- Systematic upgrading of course content
- Respectful student comments
- Student evaluation scores consistent with guidelines on page 6
- Grading standards consistent with guidelines on page 6
- Provides student mentoring

For Principal Lecturer

- Systematic upgrading of course content
- Respectful student comments
- Student evaluation scores consistent with guidelines on page 6
- Grading standards consistent with guidelines on page 6
- Provides student mentoring
- Successfully identifies internship opportunities

SATISFACTORY: Evaluation Range of ≥ 6 to < 7

A “Satisfactory” lecturer, senior lecturer, or principal lecturer performs minimal obligations with the instructional role of a faculty appointment. This faculty member performs adequately in the classroom. Specific characteristics of faculty members at this level include a majority, if not all of the following:

- Systematic upgrading of course content

- Respectful student comments
- Student evaluation scores consistent with guidelines on page 6
- Grading standards consistent with guidelines on page 6

UNSATISFACTORY: Evaluation Range of < 6

A lecturer, senior lecturer, or principal lecturer performing at this level does not conform to the instructional role of a faculty member in the Department of Management. Continual performance at this level may serve as grounds for dismissal.

Levels and Criteria of University, Professional, and Public Service Evaluation

An important aspect of the faculty member's responsibilities is service to the University, College, and Department; to the professional organizations in the faculty's discipline; and to the public. Service to the University, College, and Department is in the form of participation in the activities, which are necessary for any organization to operate, such as committee and task force assignments. Service to the profession includes working as an officer, attendance at meetings, etc. Service to the public includes serving in a pro bono capacity, and consulting. The COB views paid consulting as evidence that faculty are valued by the marketplace, although paid consulting is not required nor is it by itself sufficient for service. (The faculty member is reminded that University rules prohibit the use of state equipment, etc. for non-state activities. In addition, faculty must follow the UNT outside employment Policy 1.2.2.) ***In addition to these considerations, it should be noted that faculty at the lecturer level are for the most part, teachers, and as such, participate in duties based upon the needs of the department. Any service performed by lecturers, however, will be taken into account at the time of merit evaluations.***

EXCEPTIONAL: Evaluation Range of 9 – 10

An “Exceptional” lecturer’s performance would be characterized by an extraordinary level of service to the University, the Department of Management, the member's profession, and the public. This level of service will typically have a significant impact on the department, college and/or university based upon the quality and quantity of the work. Specific characteristics of a faculty member achieving this level include the attributes of a “Satisfactory” faculty member and may include, but not be limited to, some or all of the following:

For Lecturer/Senior Lecturer

- Sponsor of student organization
- Student recruitment
- Student mentoring
- Service to business community
- Formal recognition of service by university, college, department, or professional group
- Involvement of broad impact service to the university, college, or department
- Service on several committees or task forces (the specific role on the committee, such as chair, will be considered)
- Election to and service on Faculty Senate

For Principal Lecturer

- Sponsor of student organization
- Student recruitment
- Student mentoring
- Service to business community

- Formal recognition of service by university, college, department, or professional group
- Involvement of broad impact service to the university, college, or department
- Editor of teaching journal
- Teaching committees
- Teaching advisory board memberships
- Major officer in national organization related to teaching
- Participation in teaching workshops
- Presentations at national meetings
- Service on several committees or task forces (the specific role on the committee, such as chair, will be considered)
- Election to and service on Faculty Senate

EXCELLENT: Evaluation Range of ≥ 8 to < 9

An “Excellent” senior lecturer’s or principal lecturer’s performance would be characterized by a very high level of service to the University, the Department of Management, the member’s profession, and the public. Specific characteristics of a faculty member achieving this level of service include the attributes of a “Satisfactory” faculty member and may include, but not be limited to, some or all of the following:

For Lecturer/Senior Lecturer

- Sponsor of student group
- Student recruitment
- Student mentoring
- Formal recognition of service by university, college, department, or professional group
- Service on several major committees or task forces (the specific role on the committee, such as chair, will be considered)
- Considerable consulting that brings departmental resources and/or recognition
- Election to and service on Faculty Senate

For Principal Lecturer

- Sponsor of student group
- Student recruitment
- Student mentoring
- Formal recognition of service by university, college, department, or professional group
- Service on several major committees or task forces (the specific role on the committee, such as chair, will be considered)
- Considerable consulting that brings departmental resources and/or recognition
- Major officer in regional organization related to teaching
- Presentation at regional meetings
- Election to and service on Faculty Senate

GOOD: Evaluation Range of ≥ 7 to < 8

A “Good” senior lecturer’s or principal lecturer’s level of service potentially would exhibit a moderate amount of work on committees and task forces, a moderate role in professional organizations, and a moderate amount of participation in consulting and service to the public. Specific characteristics of a faculty member achieving this level of service include the attributes of a “Satisfactory” faculty member and may include, but not be limited to, some or all of the following:

For Lecturer/Senior Lecturer

- Sponsor of student group
- Student recruitment
- Student mentoring
- Formal recognition of service by the University, College, Department, or professional group
- Officer or committee chair in an organization (e.g., track chair at a conference)
- Service on several minor committees or task forces (the specific role on the committee, such as chair, will be considered)

For Principal Lecturer

- Sponsor of student group
- Student recruitment
- Student mentoring
- Formal recognition of service by the University, College, Department, or professional group
- Officer or committee chair in an organization (e.g., track chair at a conference)
- Service on several minor committees or task forces (the specific role on the committee, such as chair, will be considered)
- Service on advisory boards related to teaching
- Development/presentation of professional programs or workshops
- Considerable consulting activity

SATISFACTORY: Evaluation Range of ≥ 6 to < 7

The senior lecturer or principal lecturer performing at this level would accomplish those professional duties expected as a minimum of any faculty. These are:

- Membership and service on at least one committee, task force, or other service related assignment
- Regular attendance at departmental faculty meetings
- Membership in a professional organization or engaged in a program of continuous development

UNSATISFACTORY: Evaluation Range of < 6

The senior lecturer or principal lecturer at this level is not meeting the minimum expectations of the service role of a faculty, as expressed in the “Satisfactory” level. Continual performance at this level will require a re-evaluation of workload distribution and merit recommendations.

Guidelines and Recommendations for Promotion and Tenure

Introduction

The following guidelines pertain to the Department of Management and are to be used in the formulation of departmental decisions regarding recommendations for promotion and tenure of tenured and tenure-track faculty. Since the department is an organizational unit of the College of Business Administration and the University, the policies established by those two organizational components will serve as general guides to decisions made within the department. The department reserves the right, however, to be more stringent than the University and the College when identifying the areas of professional performance that will be considered in making decisions on promotion and tenure.

Decisions on promotion and tenure will be made on the faculty member's cumulative professional record. To that end, it is incumbent on the faculty member to maintain files of documentation that are required to demonstrate his/her qualifications. It is suggested that these files be established at the very outset of the probationary or review period to facilitate the processes required by the University to evaluate the faculty member's record of performance. Each member who is a candidate for promotion and/or tenure is expected to be thoroughly familiar with all University, college, and department policies, guidelines and procedures regarding promotion and tenure.

Recommendations for promotion and/or tenure can be made only after the faculty member has been associated with the University for a sufficient amount of time to demonstrate his/her capabilities as a member of the UNT community. For that reason, the policy of the department is that no non-administrative appointment will be made in the department for a probationary period of less than two years, the second of which would be the evaluation year, regardless of the prospective faculty member's prior experience.

Faculty seeking tenure or promotion are expected to publish in Class A basic research journals noted on published College of Business lists, and also may have some publications in Class B basic research journals. Articles published by journals that are related but tangential to the professional disciplines represented by the Department of Management may serve to demonstrate the professional competence of the faculty member in a specific industry, area, or topic, but do not serve as evidence of competence in the areas of academic theory, empiricism, or application.

Faculty are further expected to adhere to the expectations of Academic Responsibility outlined in the Policies of the University of North Texas Section 15.2.20 concerning academic citizenship.

Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

University policy dictates that decisions for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure are generally joint decisions. The guidelines listed below are established in light of university

policy. If for some reason, however, the decision is whether to grant tenure for an Associate Professor or to promote to the rank of Associate a previously tenured professor, the following guidelines would still apply.

Teaching. To qualify for tenure and/or the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate must have consistent evaluations of "Good" or better during the probationary or evaluation period using the departmental merit evaluation document. In some cases, where early years are marked by teaching activity evaluations worse than "Good", trends of recent and significant improvement of teaching performance may be used to justify satisfaction of acceptable teaching.

Scholarly, Creative, and Professional Activities. The only activities considered by the department are those associated directly with research and publication. While setting specific numerical requirements regarding publication is fraught with danger, an expected level of publication would be an average of one basic research article in a refereed academic journal per year during a six-year probationary period. In some instances, the requirement could be as few as five or as many as seven or more depending on the quality of the research. At least two of these articles must be of high quality basic research in a journal that is recognized by the College of Business journals lists. The exact number, however, will depend on the quality of the published research as measured by the quality of the journal and the evaluation of a jury of peers.

Authorship is an important consideration in evaluating research publications. Merit consideration is given to publications as lead or sole author. While joint work is encouraged and is in the best traditions of the community of scholars, evaluation of a candidate's independent contribution with a record wholly consisting of jointly authored articles is difficult. The candidate can demonstrate independent thought by sole-authorship of at least one article of published basic and/or applied scholarship. In the absence of such sole-authored published articles, the Department PAT and Chair must review and comment on the candidate's independent contribution to joint work. The candidate must be a member of the Graduate Faculty.

Service. The member should be actively involved in the Ph. D. program, and should render service to the University, the business community, and professional academic organizations and must render service to the College of Business by serving on College or Department committees, acting as program advisor, etc.

Promotion to Professor

According to University policy, promotion to Professor requires a combination of teaching, research, and service in accordance with a normal workload of about 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. The expectations in the service area for promotion to Full Professor are somewhat more stringent than they are for decisions on tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor.

Teaching, Research, and Service Criteria.

Teaching. Because a faculty member has met the requirements for Associate professor does not relieve the faculty member from demonstrating a satisfactory level of teaching performance. Consequently, a recommendation for promotion to Professor requires evidence that the candidate has had consistent evaluations of "Good" or better during the probationary or review period using the departmental merit evaluation document.

Scholarly, Creative, and Professional Activities. The only activities considered by the department are those associated directly with research and publication. While setting specific numerical requirements regarding publication is fraught with danger, an expected level of publication would be to publish between five and seven additional articles that evidence basic research since promotion to associate professor. At least two of these articles must be of high quality basic research in a journal that is recognized on the College of Business journals lists. Authorship is an important consideration in evaluating research publications. Merit consideration is given to publications as lead or sole author. While joint work is encouraged and is in the best traditions of the community of scholars, evaluation of a candidate's independent contribution with a record wholly consisting of jointly authored articles is difficult. The candidate can demonstrate independent thought by sole-authorship of at least one article of published basic and/or applied scholarship. In the absence of such sole-authored published articles, the Department PAT and Chair must review and comment on the candidate's independent contribution to joint work.

Service. It is expected that each faculty member will be involved in some level of University, professional, and/or public service and that the candidate for promotion to professor will consistently perform at the "Good" level or higher according to the departmental merit evaluation document.

PROBATIONARY FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURE

In accordance with university policy as stated in the Faculty Handbook, probationary faculty will be evaluated each academic year. In addition, the Department of Management will conduct a performance review of probationary faculty during the third year of appointment. This review will consider the probationary faculty during the third year of appointment. This review will consider the probationary faculty member's cumulative record on teaching, research, and service and result in a departmental recommendation regarding continuation of appointment. While the third-year performance review will consider all aspects of the probationary faculty member's cumulative performance, special attention will be given to the annual evaluations as described within the written record (e.g., PAC/PAT/CHAIR review; Probationary Faculty Annual Review Form) and the recommendations contained therein. In general, if the probationary faculty member was considered to be "making progress" toward tenure in each of the first two years and is considered to be "making progress" in the third, a decision to continue appointment would be expected. If the annual evaluations indicate lack of progress in the first two years and progress is unsatisfactory in the third year, a recommendation not to reappoint would be expected. If the record for the first three years is mixed -- making progress some years and lack of progress in others, the recommendation regarding reappointment will be made by the Department Chair with the advice and counsel of the departmental PAT (promotion and tenure) Committee.

A recommendation to reappoint a probationary faculty member based on the three year performance review is a recognition of the department's confidence that the probationary faculty member has the capability to earn a favorable recommendation for tenure at the end of the probationary period. A recommendation to reappoint after the three-year performance review, however, should not be construed as a guarantee that the department will recommend tenure at the end of the probationary period.

PAC/PAT/CHAIR EVALUATION FORM

The criteria for evaluation by the PAC, PAT, and/or Chair are consistent. The form on the last page of this document is given to the faculty member during the annual review with the Chair and a copy is provided to the Dean. In addition to probationary reviews, all faculty who have not been promoted to the rank of full professor, will be evaluated for their progress toward promotion each year in accordance with COB policy. Thus, the PAC Chair, PAT Chair, and Department Chair will sign each form each year. A faculty member's signature on this form means that he or she has met with the Department Chair and received his or her annual evaluation. The faculty member's signature does not signify agreement with the evaluation.

**PAC/PAT/CHAIR EVALUATION FOR TENURED/TENURE-TRACK FACULTY AND
ALL LEVELS OF LECTURERS**

NAME, RANK	WORKLOAD	DATE

TEACHING	<6	≥6 to <7	≥7 to <8	≥8 to <9	9 - 10
Merit Score					
Comments					

INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS	<6	≥6 to <7	≥7 to <8	≥8 to <9	9 - 10
Merit Score					
Comments					

SERVICE	<6	≥6 to <7	≥7 to <8	≥8 to <9	9 - 10
Merit Score					
Comments					

OVERALL EVALUATION:

FACULTY SIGNATURE	DATE
PAC CHAIR SIGNATURE (merit)	
PAT CHAIR SIGNATURE (promotion)	
DEPARTMENT CHAIR SIGNATURE	

Workload Guidelines

Refer to Policies of the University of North Texas, section 15.1.9, for University workload policies.

Workload Options and Weights

Workload options are determined for the following year during the faculty member's merit evaluation.

Workload weights for merit evaluation purposes may be modified within the faculty member's workload option prior to the end of the evaluation period in discussion with the Department Chair.