

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO
Bryan School of Business and Economics
Department of Management

Faculty Meeting

Wednesday, April 20, 2016 11:30-1:00 pm

Faculty/Staff members present:

Moses Acquaah	Hugo Wang	Terry Mullins
Holly Buttner	Vas Taras	
Nir Kshetri	Bill Tullar	Lisa McLaughlin
Eloise Hassell		Glenda Lloyd
Tracy Liu	Willie Wooldridge	

Faculty/Staff absent with notice:

Riikka Sarala

Faculty Excused:

Mike Beitler	Mark Moser	
C. Robin Britt, Jr.	Karen Lynden	Greg Milsom

Announcements:

Moses Acquaah reminded the faculty to complete the following training:

1. Security Training by May 1st.
2. Search Committee Training.

Moses Acquaah asked that you complete the Eliminating Bias training in Canvas.

As we begin to prepare for faculty searches in the upcoming year, this is just a reminder that members of faculty search committees need to complete the Eliminating Bias training in Canvas (<https://uncg.instructure.com/courses/14247>) or click on eliminating bias link at about the middle of the page at <http://provost.uncg.edu/>.

3. Post-tenure Review Training

Approval of Minutes

Eloise Hassell made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 17, 2016 meeting. Holly Buttner seconded the motion. Minutes unanimously approved.

The faculty discussed the Bryan School Faculty Workload Guidelines and the Bryan School Class Size and Course Scheduling Policy.

Moses pointed out the Bryan School “normal” teaching load for tenured faculty will be 3/3 course or 18 credit hour assignment. The Department of Management considers a 2/3 or 15 credit hour load to be “normal”. This item needs to be referred to the Faculty Executive Committee. The Class Size Policy mentions minimums but does not mention maximums. Terry Mullins volunteered to work on a report on class size.

Faculty Search

A new faculty search has been approved in the area of Strategy. The search committee is Nir Kshetri, Chair, Holly Buttner and Bill Tullar.

Research Statement

The Intellectual Contributions document is being revised to a Research, Teaching and Service Statement. Holly Buttner made a motion to approve the Research Statement as a working document, subject to revision at the September 19, 2016 Fall Retreat. Seconded by Bill Tullar. **The faculty unanimously approved the motion.** The Research Statement is located on the **Department Drive (N:) Documents** Folder.

DEPARTMENT RESEARCH STATEMENT

Department of Management

Joseph M. Bryan School of Business and Economics

Revised April 1, 2016

Preface

This document communicates the criteria of the Department of Management for assessing faculty¹ research productivity. Such awareness should provide for better planning of faculty development through annual goal-setting activities. The guidelines presented in this document shall be used to evaluate annual

¹ Full-time faculty not holding administrative appointments.

performance of each faculty member by his/her department peers, the Department Head, the school-wide evaluation committee, and the Dean.

Tenured and other tenure-track faculty are expected to develop and maintain a research agenda of discipline-based scholarship. The Department expects that all tenured and tenure-track faculty and specified non-tenure track faculty members maintain their academic qualifications by engaging in ongoing activities that result in research productivity. The nature, quality, and quantity of research productivity expected will vary depending on the faculty member's teaching, research, and service role/responsibilities.

Meeting the minimum expectations for maintenance of academic qualifications establishes minimal expectations for research productivity (marginally satisfactory, see page two for more comment). Merit salary increases, recommendations for reappointment, permanent tenure, and promotions require research productivity that goes beyond these minimal standards.

Research Productivity Definitions

The Department recognizes that the nature of research productivity can vary widely. Research productivity include documents such as the following:

- Refereed published academic journal articles;
- Referred conference proceedings;
- Practitioner journal articles, books, book chapters, and monographs;
- Abstracts of articles published in proceedings from scholarly meetings;
- Papers presented at academic or professional meetings/conferences;
- Research working papers submitted for review;
- Papers presented at faculty research seminars;
- Publications in trade journals;
- Scholarly book reviews;
- External research grants and contracts awarded;
- External grants for curriculum development;
- Textbooks, mini-cases in textbooks, and instructional development contributions (e.g., cases with written instructions, instructional software, supplemental learning materials, materials describing the design and implementation of new curricula or courses to include distance learning – online – course materials and similar contributions) which aid the practice of, or instruction in, the discipline; and
- Community engaged research and creative activities.

Research productivity may also be classified as intellectual contributions to the academic discipline and cross-disciplines, contributions to practice, and contributions to pedagogy. Because the departmental portfolio of research productivity should support the Department and School mission, the majority of the research productivity of the departmental faculty should be contributions to the academic discipline and cross-disciplines. However, in cases where a faculty member is, by agreement, pursuing a differential role emphasizing teaching, the majority of the research productivity can be in pedagogy.

Research Productivity Assessment Criteria

The criteria for the assessment of research productivity of the faculty will be as follows:

1) *Format*. The research productivity must be in a format allowing review by others and must be subjected to some type of peer evaluation – whether by academic colleagues or practitioners.

2) *Quality*. The judged quality of the research productivity will be assessed critically in terms of content factors such as:

(a). relevance and significance to the field (perceived value-added, citations, etc.), quality of design and methodology, creativeness or innovativeness; and

(b). the quality of the outlet based on reputation or visibility (based on external ratings and rankings) of the journal, review process (peer review/blind, etc.), acceptance rates, and credentials of the editorial board as well as other authors who have published in the journal.

The quality of the contribution is more important than the quantity. The Department will refer to journal quality guides such as the Association of Business School (ABS) Academic Journal Guide; the Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) Journal Quality Lists, and similar lists (e.g., Harzing Journal Quality List) to determine the quality of faculty research productivity.

3) *Proportional Attribution*. Identify the proportional attribution of multiple-authored intellectual contributions.

4) *Previous Year Sedona Entry*. Determine whether or not the publication credit for the intellectual contribution has been attributed in a previous year.

5) *Research Pipeline*. Evaluate the faculty member's research pipeline.

Annual Faculty Research Productivity Performance Reviews and Evaluations

The criteria discussed in this section will be used to evaluate faculty research productivity in the context of the faculty member's teaching, research, and service role/responsibilities. This section will provide comment on the considerations leading to the determination of maintenance of the Faculty Qualification Criteria (Scholarly Academic (SA), Practice Academic (PA), Scholarly Practitioner (SP), and Instructional Practitioner (IP)), and the rating (evaluation) of new research productivity (in the most recent five-year period). The procedures followed will involve two steps: maintenance and evaluation.

Step One: Maintenance of Academic Qualifications.

The Department will determine whether the faculty member's research productivity over the past five years meet the Bryan School's and Department's minimum standards for maintenance of academic qualifications.²

All tenure-track and tenured faculty members are expected to be classified into at least one of the following four categories for the maintenance of academic qualification: (1) Scholarly Academic (SA); (2) Practice Academic (PA); (3) Scholarly Practitioner (SP); and (4) Instructional Practitioner (IP). To maintain academic qualifications:

- (a) An SA faculty member must have produced at least three (3) peer-reviewed articles in scholarly journals OR at least five (5) intellectual contributions, of which at least two (2) are peer-reviewed articles in scholarly journals.
- (b) A PA faculty must have produced at least five (5) professional outcomes, over the most recent five year period.
- (c) An SP faculty must have produced at least five (5) appropriate professional/scholarship/creative outcomes over the most recent five year period.
- (d) An IP faculty must have produced at least five (5) appropriate professional outcomes over the most recent five year period.

Faculty members with a higher research profile are expected to have a greater portion of their research productivity in a higher quality journals. One can satisfy the minimum requirement for the maintenance of academic qualifications but receive less than a good performance rating on an annual research evaluation.

Step Two: Evaluation of "New" Contributions

² The *Bryan School's Faculty Qualifications Criteria* provides the baseline for the Departmental standards for maintenance of academic qualifications.

Step two will be the review and evaluation of new contributions (in-print or accepted for publications and other contributions available for review) during the current year and research work in progress. The annual review of academic research is part of the merit review process in order to evaluate new research productivity in the context of the two prior years. The evaluation process places the highest reward on those published articles that provide the highest visibility for the researcher and enhancement to the Department. The following guidelines will be used to evaluate research productivity:

1. Performance will reflect the degree to which the faculty member's research productivity exceed, meet or do not meet expectations. The five performance categories that will be used for evaluating performance is as follows:
 - (a) Performance is satisfactory and far exceeds expectation
 - (b) Performance is satisfactory and exceeds expectation
 - (c) Performance is satisfactory and meets expectation
 - (d) Performance is satisfactory but below expectation
 - (e) Performance is unsatisfactory due to lack of research required for maintenance of academic qualifications
2. The following requirements for each performance evaluation category is based on the equivalent of a "normal" teaching load and/or teaching predominantly masters courses.³ The determination of faculty member's evaluation would be based on an absolute value calculated from points assigned to the quality of the publication outlet. The ABS Academic Journal Guide and the ABDC Quality List would be used to assign points to journals. Publications in a journal with a rating of 4* or 4 on the ABS Academic Journal Guide or A* on the ABDC List will receive **6 points**; ratings of 3 on the ABS list or A on the ABDC list will receive **3 points**; while ratings of 2 and below on the ABS list and B and below on the ABDC List will receive **1 point**.

All other research productivity items discussed under "Research Productivity Definitions" will also receive points.⁴ The information in Table 1 below are suggested expectations and equivalency points to be used to guide performance evaluation.

Table 1: Research Productivity Outcome Equivalency Table⁵

³ Research productivity expectations for faculty teaching less than the "normal" teaching load (which is usually assumed to be 2/3) will be higher because it is assumed that the teaching load reductions are given for research purposes. Reductions in teaching load for administrative or other purposes do not increase research productivity expectations.

⁴ A referred conference presentation paper that is also published in the proceedings either as an abstract or full paper cannot be double counted.

⁵ Points accumulated from the research productivity outcomes in items 3-11 cannot exceed a total of 3 points for research output expectations; and points accumulated from research productivity outcomes in items 12-17 cannot exceed 1 point for research output expectations.

Items	Research Outcome	Points
1	Article in Journal with rating of "4*" or "4" by the ABS Academic Journal Guide or "A*" by ABDC Journal Quality List	6
2	Article in Journal with rating of "3" by ABS Academic Journal Guide or "A" by ABDC Journal Quality List	3
3	Article in Journal with rating of "2" and below by ABS Academic Journal Guide or "B" and below by ABDC Journal Quality List	1
4	Publication in a practitioner or trade journals not covered in items 1-3	1
5	First Edition of a scholarly book (including editing the book) or textbook within the discipline	1
6	External research and curriculum development grants and contracts awarded	1
7	Peer-Reviewed book chapter	1
8	Mini-cases in textbooks	1
9	Peer-Reviewed Monographs	1
10	Community engaged research and creative activities	1
11	Instructional development contributions	1
12	Papers published in referred proceedings	0.5
13	Papers presented at academic or professional meetings/conferences	0.5
14	Scholarly book reviews	0.5
15	External research grants submitted	0.5
16	Papers presented at faculty research seminars	0.5
17	Research papers submitted for review	0.5
18	Other Quality indicators ⁶	0.25

⁶ These indicators include single author, lead author, lead article in a journal, and award associated with article or research productivity outcome. Note that being the lead author on a single-authored article counts only 0.25 points. The points are cumulative and added to the points received for the research productivity outcome. For example, if a faculty publishes an article in a research productivity outcome category that gives 6 points and the faculty is also the lead author or the article is single-authored, the faculty will receive 6.25 points.

a. Performance evaluation of “satisfactory and far exceeds expectation”

An evaluation of “satisfactory and far exceeds expectation” for the current year requires that the faculty member receives at least one of the following⁷:

- (1) At least 6 points
- (2) At least 4 points, provided that the faculty member had at least 6 points in one of the previous two years
- (3) Other research productivity that the faculty judge as of sufficient national or international recognition as to deserve evaluation as satisfactory and far exceeds expectation”.

b. Performance evaluation of “satisfactory and exceeds expectation”

An evaluation of “satisfactory and exceeds expectation” for the current year requires that the faculty member receives at least one of the following:

- (1) At least 3 points;
- (2) At least 1 point, provided the faculty member had at least 6 points in one of the previous two years, or 3 points in each of the previous two years. An active research pipeline in the current year;
- (3) Other research productivity that the faculty judge as of sufficient national or international recognition as to deserve evaluation as satisfactory and exceeds expectation”.

c. Performance evaluation of “satisfactory and meets expectation”

An evaluation of “satisfactory and meets expectation” for the current year requires that the faculty member receives at least one of the following:

- (1) At least 1 point;
- (2) A “revise-and-resubmit” or a “conditional acceptance” status received from a journal with at least 1 point, assuming that the faculty is academically qualified;
- (3) In cases of faculty who were “ABD” at the beginning of the relevant year, completion of the dissertation and granting of the doctoral degree (though this applies to only the first year of faculty appointment);
- (4) Other research productivity that the faculty judge as of sufficient national or international recognition as to deserve evaluation as “satisfactory and meets expectation”.

d. Performance evaluation of “satisfactory but below expectation”

⁷ A faculty cannot receive more than 3 points from research productivity items 3-11 in Table 1. For example, if a faculty member publishes 5 papers in journals that have ratings of “2” and below on the ABS list or “B” and below on the ABDC list, the maximum points the faculty member will receive is 3. A faculty cannot receive more than 1 point from research productivity items 12-17 in Table 1.

The following research activities will be evaluated as “satisfactory but below expectation”

- (1) At least 0.25 points;
- (2) None from the list of research productivity described in the criteria for “satisfactory and meets expectation”;
- (3) Evidence of substantial progress on a pipeline of working papers and submissions made within the previous twelve months.

e. Performance evaluation of “unsatisfactory”

A performance evaluation of “unsatisfactory” will be given to faculty who do not meet the research expectations to maintain academic qualification for the current year. In all cases, a faculty member who is not academically qualified will be evaluated as **unsatisfactory** irrespective of other accomplishments.

3. The research productivity for a faculty member with a 3/3 teaching load is expected to be correspondingly lower relative to a faculty member on a 2/3 teaching load. Alternatively, the quality and ranking of accepted publication outlets for a faculty member on a 3/3 teaching load may be correspondingly lower because of the increased teaching load. In general, the research productivity expectations for a faculty member with a 3/3 teaching load are expected to be 25% less than a faculty member on a 2/3 teaching load and 50% less than a faculty member on a 2/2 teaching load. Alternatively, the expectations of quality and rankings of accepted publication outlets of a faculty member on a 3/3 teaching load should be sufficiently less relative to a faculty member on a 2/3 or 2/2 teaching load because of the increased teaching load.
4. Faculty members with the equivalent of less than a “normal” teaching load are expected to publish in predominantly in journals that will lead to the award of at least 3 points. They may also submit and receive funding for credible research grants proposals. On the average, the research productivity for a faculty member on a 2/2 teaching load is expected to be significantly higher relative to a faculty member on a 2/3 teaching lead. Similarly, a faculty member on a 2/3 teaching load is expected to be significantly higher relative to a faculty member on a 3/3 teaching lead.⁸

⁸ For faculty members on teaching loads less than 2/2, the policy would apply for each additional reduction in teaching load.

APPENDIX A

Evaluation Criteria for Faculty with reduced teaching load (2/2 teaching load)

a. Performance evaluation of “satisfactory and far exceeds expectation”

An evaluation of “satisfactory and far exceeds expectation” for the current year requires that the faculty member receives at least one of the following⁹:

- (1) At least 6 points
- (2) At least 5 points, provided that the faculty member had at least 6 points in one of the previous two years
- (3) Other research productivity that the faculty judge as of sufficient national or international recognition as to deserve evaluation as satisfactory and far exceeds expectation”.

b. Performance evaluation of “satisfactory and exceeds expectation”

An evaluation of “satisfactory and exceeds expectation” for the current year requires that the faculty member receives at least one of the following:

- (1) At least 4 points;
- (2) At least 2 points, provided the faculty member had at least 6 points in one of the previous two years; or 4 points in each of the previous two years. An active research pipeline in the current year;
- (3) Other research productivity that the faculty judge as of sufficient national or international recognition as to deserve evaluation as satisfactory and exceeds expectation”.

c. Performance evaluation of “satisfactory and meets expectation”

An evaluation of “satisfactory and meets expectation” for the current year requires that the faculty member receives at least one of the following:

- (1) At least 2 points;
- (2) A “revise-and-resubmit” or a “conditional acceptance” status received from a journal with at least 3 points, assuming that the faculty is academically qualified;
- (3) In cases of faculty who were “ABD” at the beginning of the relevant year, completion of the dissertation and granting of the doctoral degree (though this applies to only the first year of faculty appointment);
- (4) Other research productivity that the faculty judge as of sufficient national or international recognition as to deserve evaluation as “satisfactory and meets expectation”.

d. Performance evaluation of “satisfactory below expectation”

⁹ A faculty with a reduced 2/2 teaching load cannot obtain more than 1 point from research productivity items 3-11 in Table 1. The faculty cannot also receive more than 1 point from research productivity items 12-17.

The following research activities will be evaluated as “satisfactory but below expectation”

- (1) At least 1 point;
- (2) None from the list of research productivity described in the criteria for “satisfactory and meets expectation”;
- (3) Evidence of substantial progress on a pipeline of working papers and submissions made within the previous twelve months.

e. Performance evaluation of “unsatisfactory”

A performance evaluation of “unsatisfactory” will be given to faculty who do not receive at least 1 point or meet the research expectations to maintain academic qualification for the current year. In all cases, a faculty member who is not academically qualified will be evaluated as unsatisfactory irrespective of other accomplishments.

DRAFT

APPENDIX B

Evaluation Criteria for Faculty with increased teaching load (3/3 teaching load)

a. Performance evaluation of “satisfactory and far exceeds expectation”

An evaluation of “satisfactory and far exceeds expectation” for the current year requires that the faculty member receives at least one of the following:

- i. At least 5 points
- ii. At least 3 points, provided that the faculty member had at least 5 points in one of the previous two years
- iii. Other research productivity that the faculty judge as of sufficient national or international recognition as to deserve evaluation as satisfactory and far exceeds expectation”.

b. Performance evaluation of “satisfactory and exceeds expectation”

An evaluation of “satisfactory and exceeds expectation” for the current year requires that the faculty member receives at least one of the following:

- i. At least 2 points;
- ii. At least 1 point, provided the faculty member had at least 5 points in one of the previous two years, or 2 points in each of the previous two years. An active research pipeline in the current year;
- iii. Other research productivity that the faculty judge as of sufficient national or international recognition as to deserve evaluation as satisfactory and exceeds expectation”.

c. Performance evaluation of “satisfactory and meets expectation”

An evaluation of “satisfactory and meets expectation” for the current year requires that the faculty member receives at least one of the following:

- i. At least 1 point;
- ii. A “revise-and-resubmit” or a “conditional acceptance” status received from a journal with at least 1 point, assuming that the faculty is academically qualified;
- iii. In cases of faculty who were “ABD” at the beginning of the relevant year, completion of the dissertation and granting of the doctoral degree (though this applies to only the first year of faculty appointment);
- iv. Other research productivity that the faculty judge as of sufficient national or international recognition as to deserve evaluation as “satisfactory and meets expectation”.

d. Performance evaluation of “satisfactory but below expectation”

The following research activities will be evaluated as “satisfactory but below expectation”

- i. At least 0.25 points;
- ii. None from the list of research productivity described in the criteria for “satisfactory and meets expectation”;
- iii. Evidence of substantial progress on a pipeline of working papers and submissions made within the previous twelve months.

e. Performance evaluation of “unsatisfactory”

A performance evaluation of “unsatisfactory” will be given to faculty who do not meet the research expectations to maintain academic qualification for the current year. In all cases, a faculty member who is not academically qualified will be evaluated as unsatisfactory irrespective of other accomplishments.

Assessment

Student Learning objectives will be defined this year (2015-16) and measured in (2016-17).

Holly Buttner made a motion to approve the Student Learning Objectives. Seconded by Terry Mullins. **The faculty unanimously approved the following Student Learning objectives.**

International Business 401SLOs

Proposed SLOs

Student Learning Objective 1 (SLO1): Students will be able to analyze and evaluate key International Business (IB) issues

Student Learning Objective 2 (SLO2): Students will be able to understand the internationalization process of the firm and evaluate the different modes of foreign market entry.

Student Learning Objective 3 (SLO3): Students will be able to evaluate the influence global environments have on management decisions and formulate appropriate strategies to improve performance.

Business Studies (BS) SLOs

Student Learning Objective 1 (SLO1): Students will be able to identify and assess the ethical dimensions of management activities and evaluate their impacts on management decisions.

Dimensions:

SLO1.1: Students will be able to identify ethical dimensions of a management decision or situation.

SLO 1.2: Students will be able to determine possible courses of action in an ethical dimension of a management decision or situation.

Student Learning Objective 2 (SLO2): Students will be able to evaluate the influence global environments have on management decisions and formulate appropriate strategies to improve performance.

Dimensions:

SLO2.1: Students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of competitive challenges in the global market environments.

SLO2.2: Students will be able to match appropriate international strategies and policies to various global environments.

Student Learning Objective 3 (SLO3): Students will be able to understand and apply management principles and theory in decision-making about organizations.

Dimensions:

SLO3.1: Students will be able to understand the role of management principles and theory in decision-making

SLO3.2: Students will be able to apply management principles and theory in decision-making

Human Resources (HR) Student Learning Objectives (SLOs).

Student Learning Objective 1 (SLO1): The student will demonstrate how behavioral or social science theories are applied in the practice of human resource management.

Student Learning Objective 2 (SLO2): The student will be able to analyze a set of metrics used to assess human resources in organizations.

Student Learning Objective 3 (SLO3): The student will integrate the functional areas of human resources and explain how they can work together to implement strategy.

Bill Tullar made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Holly Buttner. The meeting adjourned at 1:05 pm.

Next departmental faculty meeting: DOM Retreat Friday, August 19th at 9:30-1:30pm in the School of Education Building, Room 401.

DRAFT