

Department of Management

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

I. Overview

This document describes expectations for all tenure-track faculty members in the Department of Management to supplement the Auburn University and Harbert College of Business (HCoB) Faculty Handbooks. The document covers the third-year review of untenured faculty, promotion of untenured faculty to associate professor, and promotion to full professor.

Each of the major evaluation categories below (teaching, outreach/service, research) should be reviewed independently of the others. That is, satisfactory progress in any one category, in the absence of demonstrated satisfactory progress in the other two, is not sufficient for continued appointment, tenure, and/or promotion.

Listed below are several overarching principles that apply to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines described in this document:

- These Guidelines go into effect as of June 1, 2016.
- This document should be thought of as a “living, forward-thinking” document. It is subject to change and should be reviewed periodically to determine if changes in content, journal lists, etc. are needed.
- The Department of Management Journal List is a separate document that contains specific classifications of journals. This Promotion and Tenure document is a provost-level document, but the Department of Management Journal List is a college-level document. The department may update the journal list from time to time with the approval of the HCoB Dean without needing to change these Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. Further, a faculty member can attempt to make a case that a specific journal should be considered in a classification if it is not listed or in a classification other than the one in which it is listed herein. The tenured faculty decide whether to make the requested change.

II. Departmental Principles for Evaluating Candidates for Promotion and Tenure

The following principles provide a foundation for the Department of Management's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines:

1. Scholarship is broadly defined in this document to include publication of basic and applied research in outlets of appropriate quality as well as scholarly activities that support the instructional mission. It also includes participation in the procurement of funded contracts and grants, particularly when such contracts and grants result in refereed research articles and generate overhead.
2. Department faculty members expect colleagues (at appropriate academic ranks) to contribute to teaching, scholarship, and university and professional service. Faculty contributions to teaching, scholarship, and service can result from a variety of activities including funded and unfunded research, teaching, professional writing, and business outreach activity.
3. Department faculty members expect colleagues to participate in professional development activities.
4. Faculty members have different interests and strengths, and there is no single model of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service accomplishments. As faculty members move up in rank (from untenured assistant professor to full professor), they will have greater opportunities to pursue and be evaluated on an increasingly diverse set of academic activities. In general, faculty members early in their academic careers (untenured assistant professors) should focus principally on publishing in Elite and other Category 1 academic journals (see the Department of Management Journal List) and classroom teaching.
5. Faculty activities are diverse and any system based strictly on a listing of performance indicators will be incomplete. Consequently, individual faculty members are allowed an opportunity to provide convincing evidence (for example, the ranking of an academic journal at peer and aspirant Departments of Management at least comparable to Auburn University's Department of Management) documenting that a particular accomplishment be categorized differently or at a level higher than that listed in this document.
6. Performance standards for annual evaluations, reappointment, promotion, and tenure may change as the university, college, and departmental missions change. Personnel decisions made in a given year are not necessarily precedents for decisions made in subsequent years.

7. The qualities of a good university professor are many. Factors such as the quality and impact of a faculty member's scholarly activities, collegiality, fit with departmental needs, potential future research productivity, university and professional service, and teaching effectiveness are important and are based on the professional judgments of the Department head and tenured faculty members (at the appropriate academic ranks).

8. Out-of-discipline journal publications of high quality (i.e., Category 1 or Elite journals; see the Department of Management Journal List) are counted as research activity for candidates. Generally, if any HCoB department identifies a journal as a Category 1 or as an Elite journal, then anyone else in the HCoB publishing in those journals will receive appropriate credit when evaluating their research record provided that the tenured management faculty consider such journals to parallel the Elite management journals in terms of quality.

9. Multi-authored research is encouraged. However, for a professor to earn tenure, convincing evidence of the ability to fill a leadership role on research projects is required. The more articles published in Elite or Category 1 journals (or in journals of the same quality as those listed in this document) where the candidate is the sole, first, or second author, the stronger a candidate's case for promotion or tenure. However, these publications alone will not necessarily guarantee tenure or promotion. A candidate's entire body of work will be considered in promotion and tenure decisions.

10. A candidate for promotion and tenure needs to have a sustained level of research productivity with an absence of major gaps (e.g., more than 1 year) in published research (or papers unconditionally accepted for publication) activity in Elite and Category 1 journals.

11. Particularly with regard to Research activities, the Guidelines specify certain "targets" or expectations that 3 year-review candidates as well as promotion-and-tenure candidates need to have achieved to be judged "successful."

12. Although these stated expectations will be heavily weighted, they will not be used as absolute cutoffs in judging a candidate. Candidates have the opportunity to provide evidence that additional research accomplishments build a compelling case that their achievements equal or exceed the stated level of expectations.

III. 3-year Review of Untenured Faculty

Toward the end of their third year of initial appointment, an assistant professor will be considered for continued appointment. This decision concerns an evaluation of a candidate's progress toward tenure and promotion. In making this decision, a candidate's progress is evaluated using not only the 3-year review guidelines outlined below, but also the progress made toward meeting the guidelines for tenure and promotion to associate professor (see Section IV).

A positive reappointment decision means that the tenured faculty believe a candidate is making satisfactory progress and can continue working toward tenure and promotion to associate professor. Conversely, a negative vote can lead to non-continuation of a candidate. A candidate should carefully study and address written feedback from the department head. If a candidate receives a positive vote and support from the tenured faculty, that outcome should not be interpreted as a guarantee that an assistant professor will eventually achieve tenure and promotion. That decision will be made when the assistant professor is considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

A. Evaluation of Teaching

At the time of the third year review, a candidate must have documented evidence of teaching effectiveness. In evaluating teaching effectiveness, tenured departmental faculty will examine information such as student evaluations, course syllabi, number of different class preparations, class sizes, and course level. Examples of teaching documentation may also include evidence of pedagogical innovations, academic rigor of courses and grading load (judged from course syllabi), formally assessed improvements in subject mastery by students, receipt of special teaching awards, and any other forms of teaching recognition.

B. Evaluation of Research

A department's academic reputation is enhanced when professors are actively publishing in well-respected (see the Department of Management Journal List) academic journals. Publication in such high-quality management journals will be the principal basis for evaluating an untenured assistant professor's research during his or her initial 3-year period of employment. Therefore, during the 3-year interim period, an untenured assistant professor needs to focus on submitting and publishing articles that will appear in Elite and Category 1 journals. At a *minimum*, the Department expects that by the end of the 3-year period, an untenured assistant professor needs to have published or have in press the following:

- at least one Elite journal article or two Category 1 journal articles

A candidate should note that while Category 1 articles are viewed at the third year review as an indicator that the candidate possesses the potential to produce a tenurable research record, acceptances at Elite journals are a requirement for tenure, as explained below. Moreover, faculty may evaluate the minimum standards at the three year review more qualitatively than the standards associated with promotion/tenure. For instance, they may lend additional weight to multiple or late-stage revisions at Elite journals or ascribe higher value to publications at the stronger Category 1 journals (i.e., those Category 1 journals indicated by an asterisk on the Department of Management Journal List).

Other considerations in evaluating a candidate's research record include a candidate's articles under review at Elite or Category 1 journals, papers in revise-and-resubmit status for Elite or Category 1 journals, and past success in getting article acceptances. If a candidate cannot provide evidence such as that listed above, it is unlikely that the candidate will pass a third-year review.

If the assistant professor plans to submit to a journal, such as a niche journal that does not appear on the journal list (e.g., pedagogical journals), the faculty member must provide convincing, well-documented evidence that the journal(s) in which he or she plans to publish or has published is equivalent to those on the Department's Category 1 journal list. Journal evidence such as editorial board composition, impact factors, acceptance rates, appropriateness to the field of Management, and rankings of journals by peer and aspirant management departments can be used in making that determination. For journals not on our list, the faculty member should discuss with the department head his or her proposed journal outlet *before* submitting the work for review. Tenured professors in the Department will then examine that evidence for journal acceptability.

Tenured faculty members reserve the right to further evaluate a candidate's research work to determine if there are qualitative aspects of his or her work that also should be considered. Examples of papers/articles that could potentially be considered qualitatively inferior include (but are not limited to) published notes, discussions/replies, papers/articles where the candidate is listed as a third, fourth, etc. author, papers/articles in Category 1 journals outside of the candidate's discipline, pedagogical articles, practitioner articles, and non-research papers/articles. Examples of papers/articles that could potentially be considered qualitatively superior include (but are not limited to) a candidate's listing as a first- or second-listed author on articles in top journals in the candidate's field, papers/articles receiving awards or other forms of formal recognition, and papers/articles that are frequently cited.

Other indicators of research productivity that can supplement one's record include external grants and the creation of intellectual property, copyrights, and patents.

C. Evaluation of Outreach and Service

During the 3-year window for untenured faculty, service responsibilities need to be kept to a minimum and outreach activities are generally low or non-existent. Therefore, tenured Management department faculty members place minimal weight on service activities for assistant professors within this 3-year window. Acceptable service activities within the HCoB might consist of activities such as attending graduation exercises or serving on departmental/college committees having a short-term mission (e.g., a committee that meets no more than two times in a semester).

D. Other

As per university guidelines, any indications of a professor's difficulty in carrying out shared work of the university are pointed out in annual reviews. Thus, it is important that a candidate demonstrate efforts made to correct any problems pointed out to him or her in their annual review given by the Department head.

IV. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

A candidate for tenure and promotion needs to be building an emerging national reputation within his or her discipline. Primary evidence for building that reputation will likely come from the quality of research that a candidate has conducted and published in national venues, such as quality, well-recognized, academic journals. That is, scholars across the United States and in a candidate's discipline should be familiar with a candidate's reputation and academic work record. The narrative below describes some of what the Department expects in a candidate's academic work record as a basis for determining tenure and promotion to associate professor.

A. Evaluation of Teaching

At the time a faculty member is considered for tenure and promotion, the candidate must have documented evidence of teaching effectiveness. In evaluating teaching effectiveness, department faculty members will examine information such as student evaluations, course syllabi, number of different class preparations, class size, and course level. Examples of teaching documentation may also include evidence of pedagogical innovations, academic rigor of courses and grading load (judged from course syllabi), formally assessed improvements in subject mastery by students, receipt of special teaching awards, and any other forms of teaching recognition. Other considerations in evaluating teaching will include any candidate's publications of articles in pedagogical journals, authoring university textbooks published by a widely recognized, academic publisher, or development and receipt of grants or donations of money and/or equipment that support the instructional mission of the Department or the HCoB.

B. Evaluation of Research and Research Impact

At a *minimum*, a candidate for promotion to associate professor and tenure needs to have accomplished the following

- Have at least two published (or in press) articles from the Department of Management's Elite journal list. If a candidate arrives at Auburn with no years of credit toward tenure (e.g., a newly minted PhD), then both of these Elite articles should not have been accepted or conditionally accepted before the candidate signed an offer of employment as tenure-track faculty in Auburn University's HCoB. If a candidate arrives at Auburn with years of credit toward tenure (e.g., the person was an assistant professor elsewhere for three years and has elected to work under a reduced tenure clock at Auburn), then having at least one Elite article accepted after the candidate signed his/her offer of employment is the minimum requirement for promotion to associate professor and tenure.
- A candidate needs to demonstrate the ability to fill leadership roles commensurate with the rank of associate professor in his/her Elite publications. Being the first author or sole author on at least one Elite article is an example of acceptable evidence of leadership.

It is also recommended that the candidate have additional published (or in press) articles from the Department of Management's Elite or Category 1 journal list to round out their body of work, which can be especially helpful when they are being evaluated at the university level.

Note: A candidate may present evidence that publication activity in other outlets serves as a surrogate for an Elite publication; e.g., sole or first-authorship of numerous Category 1 publications, authoring a publication that has been recognized in the field as a "game changing" publication in the field of management (e.g., through a candidate's citation metrics). The tenured faculty will judge the suitability of the information presented by the candidate. Further, when evaluating candidates for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, faculty may consider a publication in a strong Category 1 journal (i.e., those Category 1 journals indicated by an asterisk on the Department of Management Journal List) to be roughly equivalent to an Elite publication if a person has also published work in the Elite category. Stated differently, faculty sometimes view a publication in one of these Category 1 journals as an Elite accomplishment in the presence of other Elites.

In judging a candidate's publication record, the tenured faculty will take into consideration a number of factors. For example, additional strength is added to a candidate's application when the candidate is first- or sole author of an Elite journal article or sole author of a Category 1 article.

A candidate not meeting the above standards will likely not receive a favorable vote for tenure and promotion. However, just because a candidate meets the above standards, there is no guarantee for promotion and tenure. For example, research productivity and collegiality are separate dimensions, both of which are evaluated, and a candidate that failed to meet expectations on either dimension would not likely be recommended for promotion or tenure.

Research impact can also be a factor bearing on a candidate's research evaluation that can bolster his/her record of performance, but expectations for research impact at this relatively early career stage are modest. Factors demonstrating the impact of research for a candidate for Associate Professor can help the candidate, but not having evidence of strong impact does not necessarily reflect poorly on the candidate. The HCoB Guidelines for Understanding and Evaluating Research Impact describe ways in which candidates can potentially demonstrate research impact. These include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The quality of publications in academic and professional outlets other than those on departmental journal lists as reflected by citations.
- The order of a candidate's authorship of Elite and Category 1 research articles (sole-, first-, and second-order authorship).
- Research publications that receive special recognition (e.g., best in a volume).
- Receipt of an award from a regional, national, or international professional association for scholarly contributions in research.
- Refereed papers (includes proceedings' publications, if any) presented at prestigious national and international meetings (e.g., Academy of Management, Society for Industrial-Organizational Psychology, Strategic Management Society).
- Refereed regional association papers may be considered but will carry significantly less positive weight.

- Any grant or contract activity that generates overhead commonly charged by Auburn University for the type of grant or contract awarded where the candidate being considered for tenure and promotion is either the principal investigator or a co-principal investigator.
- A research contract or grant award from a prestigious national funding agency (e.g., NSF, NIH) that has undergone a rigorous review process will be considered similar in stature to a Category 1 journal publication. As indicators of research competency, contract and grant awards from less prestigious funding agencies will be considered commensurately on their own merits. Candidates are cautioned, however, that under no circumstances will grant work completely substitute for published research. In other words, promotion and tenure will not be granted solely on the basis of grants obtained.
- Creation of intellectual property, copyrights, and patents.

The tenured faculty in the Department reserves the right to further evaluate a candidate's research record to determine if there are qualitative aspects of his or her work that also need to be considered. Examples of papers/articles that could potentially be considered qualitatively inferior can include (but are not limited to) published notes, discussions/replies, papers/articles where the candidate is listed as a third, fourth, etc. author, papers/articles in Category 1 journals outside of the candidates' discipline, and non-research papers/articles. Examples of papers/articles that could potentially be considered qualitatively superior include (but are not limited to) a candidate's listing as a first or second author on papers/articles, papers/articles receiving awards or other forms of formal recognition, and papers/articles that are frequently cited.

C. Evaluation of Outreach and Service

Assistant professors who have received a positive vote in the three-year review have somewhat more responsibility for outreach and service activities than an untenured assistant professor within the three-year initial review period.

However, these activities should be kept to a minimum. Acceptable activities within the college might consist of activities such as attending graduation exercises, serving on departmental/college committees having a short-term mission (e.g., a committee that meets no more than two times in a semester), advising an on-campus student organization, working with Management doctoral students. Professional activities might include serving as an ad hoc reviewer for an academic journal or organizing a symposium at a national meeting.

D. Other

As per university guidelines, any indications of a professor's difficulty in performing shared work of the university are pointed out in annual reviews. Thus, it is important that a candidate demonstrate efforts made to correct any problems noted in an annual review.

V. Promotion to Full Professor

A candidate for promotion to full professor should have established both a national as well as an international reputation among academic scholars. Although not the only means for establishing a national and international reputation, it is most likely that a candidate's research program will account for much of a candidate's international reputation. However, in addition to a solid research program, the candidate should have a strong record of teaching, professional and university service, and outreach. Candidates for promotion to full professor will be judged on their performance in teaching, research, and service.

A. Evaluation of Teaching

At the time of application for promotion to full professor, a candidate must have documented evidence of teaching effectiveness. In evaluating teaching effectiveness, department faculty members will examine information such as student evaluations, course syllabi, number of different class preparations, class sizes, and course levels. Examples of teaching documentation may also include evidence of pedagogical innovations, academic rigor of courses and grading load (judged from course syllabi), formally assessed improvements in subject mastery by students, receipt of special teaching awards, and any other forms of teaching recognition. Other considerations in evaluating teaching will include a candidate's publication of articles in pedagogical journals, authoring university textbooks published by a widely recognized academic publisher, or development and receipt of grants or donations of money and/or equipment that support the instructional mission of the Department or the HCoB.

In addition to classroom teaching, a candidate for full professor needs to provide other evidence of teaching effectiveness such as the following:

- Serving as a mentor to junior faculty
- Taking a leadership role in curriculum development
- Serving as a mentor to master's and doctoral students
- Serving on Management Ph.D. students' dissertation committees where the students successfully defended their dissertations

- Chairing Management Ph.D. students' dissertation committees where the students successfully defended their dissertations
- Working with Management Ph.D. students on papers that are submitted for publication

B. Evaluation of Research and Research Impact

Candidates for full professor need to have at least the following:

- Five published (or in press) articles from the Department of Management's Elite journal list. At least two of these articles must have been accepted or conditionally accepted after the candidate's first day as an associate professor.
- A candidate needs to demonstrate the ability to fill leadership roles commensurate with the rank of professor in his/her Elite publications. Being the first author or sole author on at least two Elite journal articles is an example of acceptable evidence of leadership.

It is also recommended that the candidate have additional published or in press articles from the Department of Management's Elite or Category 1 journal list to round out his/her body of work, which can be especially helpful when they are being evaluated at the university level.

Note: A candidate may present compensatory evidence that publication activity in other outlets serve as a surrogate for an Elite publication, e.g., sole or first-authorship of numerous Category 1 publications, authoring a publication that has been recognized in the field as a "game changing" publication in the field of management (e.g., through a candidate's citation metrics). The tenured full professors in the department will judge the suitability of the information presented by the candidate.

Additional strength is added to a candidate's application when a candidate is senior author of an Elite journal article or sole author of a Category 1 article. A candidate who falls short of these minimum standards will not likely be recommended for promotion to full professor. However, even if a candidate meets these minimum research standards, there is no guarantee of promotion.

Candidates should be aware that the elapsed time since promotion to associate is a valid issue for faculty to consider when making promotion decisions, with the normal time as associate professor being approximately five to seven years. Longer periods would engender commensurately higher expectations. A candidate who takes fifteen years, for example, to meet the above minimum standards may be viewed much differently than a candidate who takes five years to meet these standards.

Research impact is a key criterion for candidates being considered for promotion to professor. As mentioned earlier, an individual promoted to full professor should have established himself or herself and built a national and international reputation for research. Means for assessing such a reputation and the impact of research include reviewing a candidate's published research using criteria such as those described in the HCoB Guidelines for Understanding and Evaluating Research Impact. In addition, aspects of a candidate's outreach and service could contribute to or be indicators of their research impact (e.g., major editorial responsibility). There are no minimum guidelines for research impact because evaluating research impact is largely a qualitative exercise. Some of the criteria that could reflect research impact include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Publications/acceptances in Elite and Category 1 journals (see the departmental Category 1 journal list), and the number of citations of these publications.
- Order of authorship of articles published in Elite and Category 1 journals.
- Research publications that receive special recognition (e.g., best in a volume).
- External funding of research is encouraged and will be considered for promotion to full professor when such research contributes to the body of knowledge in a management discipline, to methodologies influencing the effectiveness of organizations, or to student development. Examples that are particularly encouraged include: funding of research by a major external institution/entity such as NSF, NIH, or Fulbright (i.e., selected through a scholarly review panel); or procuring externally funded research that leads to development of new methodologies, or application of existing methodologies in unique situations. However, candidates are cautioned that under no circumstances will grant work completely substitute for published research. In other words, promotion to full professor will not be granted solely on the basis of grants obtained.

- Funded research (grants or contracts) obtained from federal or state governments or industry is also encouraged. In addition, for external funding activities, involving either a grant or a contract to be considered for promotion to full professor, a candidate should have (a) been formally listed as principal or co-principal investigator of the grants or contracts listed on the application for promotion, (b) accumulated a contract(s) or grant(s) valued at over \$100,000 while the candidate has been a faculty member at Auburn University, and (c) the contact(s) or grant(s) must have paid an overhead rate typically charged by Auburn University for contracts or grants similar to the candidate's funded research. A research contract or grant award from a prestigious national funding agency (e.g., NSF, NIH) that has undergone a rigorous review process will be considered similar in stature to a Category 1 journal publication. As indicators of research competency, contract and grant awards from less prestigious funding agencies will be considered commensurately on their own merits.
- Recognition from a national professional association for scholarly contributions in research over time (e.g., Fellow of the Academy of Management).
- Publication of scholarly books (not textbooks) by a major, widely known publisher.
- Receipt of an award from a regional professional association for scholarly contributions in research over time.
- Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book (written specifically for the book).
- Refereed papers (includes proceedings' publications, if any) presented at prestigious national meetings (e.g., Academy of Management).
- Practitioner publications are encouraged and count for promotion to full professor. However, publications in practitioner journals should account for no more than 25% of all journal articles listed on a candidate's application for promotion to full professor.
- Creation of intellectual property, copyrights, and patents.

Tenured faculty members who are full professors in the Department reserve the right to further evaluate a candidate's research and research impact to determine if there are other qualitative aspects of his or her work that also should be considered. Examples of papers/articles that could potentially be considered qualitatively inferior would include (but are not limited to) published notes, discussions/replies, papers/articles where the candidate is listed as a third, fourth, etc. author, papers/articles in Category 1 journals outside of the candidate's discipline, and non-research papers/articles. Such activity is not seen as detracting from a promotion case, but it also does not help a candidate. Examples of papers/articles that could potentially be considered qualitatively superior include (but are not limited to) a candidate's listing as a first or second author on papers/articles appearing in elite journals, papers/articles receiving awards or other forms of formal recognition, and papers/articles that are frequently cited.

C. Evaluation of Outreach and Service

Once tenured and promoted to associate professor, a candidate for full professor has more responsibilities for college, university, and professional service. Outside of Auburn University, outreach and service include activities such as the following:

- Having major editorial responsibility (e.g., Editor, Senior Editor, Departmental Editor, Editor of a special issue, Associate Editor) of a leading refereed journal (see the departmental journal lists).
- Serving as an ad hoc reviewer for leading refereed journals or of proposals for a research institution such as NSF.
- Organizing and conducting a refereed symposium at a prestigious national meeting.
- Quality teaching in the Executive MBA or Physicians' MBA programs.
- Serving as an officer of a national or regional management-related association, for example, President of the Southern Management Association.
- Serving as a resource person for a government agency or professional business society.
- Providing business outreach activity for which no compensation has been received.
- Guest speaker at meetings of professional organizations, schools, or public service groups.

D. Other

As per university guidelines, any indications of a professor's difficulty in carrying out shared work of the university are pointed out in annual reviews. Thus, it is important that a candidate demonstrate efforts made to correct any problems pointed out to him or her in their annual review.