



Introduction

The Department of Management seeks to support the mission and objectives of the G. Brint Ryan College of Business (RCOB) and University of North Texas (UNT) through continuous improvement of faculty and programs. The Department can succeed only to the degree that its faculty are successful in their roles in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Thus, a framework for the evaluation of individual faculty, per their assigned workload, is provided. Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure are conducted according to UNT and RCOB policy, and any standards outlined within this document.

Merit evaluations are conducted early each year for the prior calendar year. Research achievements in the prior two calendar years can factor into meeting a merit threshold in a current evaluation year. In teaching and service, only activities in the current evaluation year are considered. Activities are recorded in the *Faculty Information System* and reported via a faculty activity report and cover sheet.

The evaluation philosophy of the Department of Management consists of three core principles:

1. Policies, guidelines, and procedures relating to annual merit evaluation, reappointment, promotion and tenure, and workloads should be consistent.
2. Faculty should be allowed the greatest degree of latitude possible in developing their academic careers and that the evaluation process should accommodate this latitude.
3. No quantitative metric can consistently and reliably measure the values of the disparate activities in which academics are involved. Consequently, great faith is placed in the professional judgments of the elected members of the Personnel Affairs Committees (PAC), Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee, and the Department Chair to determine levels of performance.

Within each domain of workload, the primary goal is described, necessary definitions and guidelines offered, valued activities explicated, and a scoring rubric offered to structure annual merit evaluation. It is inevitable that circumstances and accomplishments will arise that do not fit cleanly into these established criteria and rubrics, thus, this document will be reviewed and revised periodically.

The Chair of the Department will be evaluated by the Dean. On behalf of faculty, the PACs write letters to the Dean offering an assessment of the Chair's performance. The tenure-system PAC (TS PAC) evaluates tenure-system faculty in all domains. The professional-system PAC (PS PAC) evaluates professional-system faculty in all domains.

Faculty Workload Guidelines

The department assigns academic workloads consistent with university policy ([06.027](#)). Academic workload is a basis for annual evaluations, reappointments, promotions, and, where appropriate, tenure. The Chair will review department needs, norms, rank, equity distribution, as well as the faculty member's strengths, career aspirations, and preferences. Workload assignments will be reviewed at the conclusion of the annual review process (late Spring). When all faculty workloads are established for the next academic year, the Chair will email the list to all faculty (no later than early Fall).

The typical workload for tenure-system faculty in the department is 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. All tenure-system faculty should have a minimum of 10% in each of the three domains. The typical workload for professional-system faculty in the department is 80% teaching, 0% research, and 20% service for lecturers and 60% teaching, 20% research, and 20% service for clinical faculty. Other



alternatives are possible, at the discretion of the Department Chair. Each assigned course is generally considered equivalent to 10% of the yearly work assignment distribution.

Annual Merit Evaluation Criteria

Teaching

This workload domain is common to all faculty and serves as the foundation of our professional obligation. As the core revenue generator, enrollment sustains all other activities within UNT. Thus, it is our **primary goal to offer a valuable student experience in the classroom, help students develop the skills necessary to reach their goals, and demonstrate value added outcomes.**

Guidelines for Student Evaluations: The department recognizes that student perceptions of teaching (SPOTs) are important. Guidelines on SPOT Median scores are provided based on historical data. To support a more complete assessment using SPOTs, items focused on the instructor, course organization and clarity, challenge and engagement (CEI), and student comments are considered. Low response rates or a small total number of responses should be carefully weighed in interpretations.

MERIT	RANGE
Exceptional	about 4.5
Excellent	about 4.0
Good	about 3.5
Satisfactory	about 3.0
Unsatisfactory	below 2.9

Guidelines for Grades: The Department has an interest in upholding consistent and rigorous academic standards across its offerings. Analysis of historical data suggests a significant positive correlation between course GPA and student evaluation scores, thus ranges are offered and considered in annual assessments.

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	3.3 — 3.8

Course Development: The number of courses developed varies for many reasons, but is an important consideration in assessment. Clarifying definitions may be necessary:

- *Course creations* are defined as a course taught for the first time, including a new textbook and materials (exams, quizzes, lectures), on a current or different technology platform.
- *Course preparations* are defined by an absence from teaching a class for one year or more.
- *Course revisions* are made periodically due to new textbook editions, a new teaching format, substantial new material not included in regular course updates, and changes in technology.

Valued Pedagogical Activities:

- Consistent updating or improvement to course content
- Course innovation in instructional techniques and methods
- Engagement with industry and practitioners
- Inclusion of experiential learning activities
- External or internal formal recognitions of teaching excellence
- Supervision of masters or undergraduate theses, independent studies, or honors projects
- Published pedagogical research, instructional research, textbook, or equivalent
- Receipt of an internally or externally funded teaching grant
- Invited presentations or expertise sought by external partners or organizations

Tenure-system faculty are integral in doctoral education beyond the classroom (*e.g.*, dissertation committees, paper committees, independent studies). These efforts should be reflected in merit.

Additional Considerations: The level of courses taught, the total number of students taught, the availability of TAs, whether the course is taken primarily by majors, and whether the course is



newly developed and/or utilizes a new approach are all potential considerations.

Faculty are responsible for maintaining appropriate documentation of all claimed activities.

Tenure-System Faculty PAC Evaluation Rubric

Teaching Merit Evaluation Rubric						
<i>Taken as a whole, what level of performance do the following suggest? Assign a number to one decimal place for each of the below.</i>	Weight	Unsatisfactory (<6)	Satisfactory (6-6.9)	Good (7-7.9)	Excellent (8-8.9)	Exceptional (9-10)
Overall SPOT scores and individual item responses						
Student comments						
Course GPA Compliance (See GPA Compliance Ratio Calculation Explanation)						
Based on the above, the calculated merit score is:						

Additional Valued Pedagogical Activities (<i>Upside Only</i>)	Yes/ No	Discussion
Doctoral dissertation roles, paper committee roles, and/or independent studies		
Consistent updating or improvement to course content		
Course innovation in instructional techniques and methods		
Engagement with industry and practitioners		
Inclusion of experiential learning activities		
External or internal formal recognitions of teaching excellence		
Masters or undergraduate theses, independent studies, or honors projects		
Pedagogical research, instructional research, textbook, or equivalent		
Receipt of an internally or externally funded teaching grant		
Invited presentations or expertise sought by external partners or organizations		
Based on these, how much should the merit evaluation be increased?		

Additional Considerations & Circumstances	Yes/ No	Discussion
Did the faculty member register a qualification statement about the number of course creations, revisions, and/or preps they had to perform?		
Did the faculty member register a qualification statement about specific identifiable concerns with their assigned courses?		
Did the faculty member register a qualification about extenuating circumstances related to a specific section or specific semester?		
Based on additional considerations, should the merit evaluation be increased?		



Professional-System PAC Teaching Evaluation Rubric

Teaching Merit Evaluation Rubric						
Student Evaluations & GPA Compliance <i>Assign a number to one decimal place for each of the below.</i>	Weight	Unsatisfactory (<6)	Satisfactory (6-6.9)	Good (7-7.9)	Excellent (8-8.9)	Exceptional (9-10)
Overall "Median" SPOT score across all sections						
"Instructor" column average SPOT score across all sections						
"CEI" column average SPOT score across all sections						
Taken as a whole, what level of performance do student comments suggest?						
Course GPA Compliance (See GPA Compliance Ratio Calculation Explanation)						
Instructional Design <i>Assign a number to one decimal place for each of the below.</i>	Weight	Unsatisfactory (<6)	Satisfactory (6-6.9)	Good (7-7.9)	Excellent (8-8.9)	Exceptional (9-10)
Did the instructor demonstrate consistent updating or improvement to course content? (See NTSPAC Course Improvement Heuristic below)						
Instructional Organization and Clarity <i>Assign a number to one decimal place for each of the below.</i>	Weight	Unsatisfactory (<6)	Satisfactory (6-6.9)	Good (7-7.9)	Excellent (8-8.9)	Exceptional (9-10)
Average of "Course organization score" and "Clarity of course objectives" scores in SPOT (doubled to be consistent with MPTW scale of 1-10)						
Based on the above, the calculated merit score is:						

Additional Valued Pedagogical Activities (<i>Upside Only: .1 pts per yes</i>)	Yes/ No	Discussion
Course innovation in instructional techniques and methods (New teaching approaches or experiments as opposed to new or improved course content)		
Included classroom engagement with industry and practitioners		
Included experiential ("learn by doing") activities in the classroom		
Received external or internal formal recognitions of teaching excellence		
Supervision of masters or undergraduate thesis, independent studies, or honors projects		
Published pedagogical research, instructional research, textbook, or equivalent material		
Receipt of an internally or externally funded teaching grant		
Invited presentations or expertise sought by external partners or organizations		
Involved significant work regarding course creation, preps, and/or revisions		
Based on these, how much should the merit evaluation be increased?		
Additional Considerations & Circumstances	Yes/ No	Discussion



Did the faculty member register a complaint / qualification statement about the number of course creations, revisions, and/or preps they had to perform?		
Did the faculty member register a complaint / qualification statement about the number of students they had to teach in a section or in total for the semester?		
Did the faculty member register a complaint / qualification statement about specific identifiable concerns with their assigned courses?		
Did the faculty member register a complaint / qualification about extenuating circumstances related to a specific section or specific semester?		
Based on additional considerations, should the merit evaluation be increased?		

GPA Compliance Ratio Calculation Explanation

Each section's GPA was evaluated against the departmental "Guidelines for Grades" metrics (see a few pages earlier). If a section was more than 0.1 points above or below the guidelines, the section was considered to be out of the recommended range. For example, the 4000 level range is 2.50 – 3.00. If a section's average GPA per SPOT was 3.11 or higher or 2.39 or lower, this section would be treated as "out of range." Because some professors have noticeably fewer sections than others, counting the total number of "out of range" sections was deemed to be unfair, so the total number of sections that were out of range was divided by the total number of sections taught by that professor to create a ratio. The following scoring system was then developed. In short, if 25% or less of an instructor's sections were determined to be out of range, that instructor received an "exceptional" performance ranking.

Ratio	Performance Ranking
0 – .25	Exceptional
.26 - .50	Excellent
.51 - .75	Good
.76 – 1.0	Satisfactory

PS PAC Course Improvement Heuristic

The point of this metric is to promote continuous improvement of course materials. Definitions of "improvements" and "updates" are somewhat subjective, but could involve new case examples or new supplemental materials (news reports, videos), etc. New teaching approaches are handled elsewhere. Comments are received from instructors, and another ratio is calculated. If improvements/updates were made for 100% of sections, ranking = Exceptional

Ratio	Performance Ranking
.75 – 1.0	Exceptional
.50 – .74	Excellent
.25 – .49	Good
0 – .24	Satisfactory



Research

This domain is focused on the intellectual contribution of faculty to the creation of new knowledge and/or the application, transfer and interpretation of knowledge to the improvement of management practice. The desired outcome of activities in this domain are impactful research programs that increase the prominence and reputation of our faculty and department within the academy, UNT, and society.

The **primary goal for tenure-system faculty** is research activity that leads to publication in premier and high-quality basic research journals. The **primary goal for professional-system faculty** with a research workload is activity that leads to the maintenance of scholarly academic status (per AACSB). All faculty can take credit for a publication in either the year of acceptance or year of publication, not both.

Journals are classified by RCOB journal lists and department processes as follows:

- “Premier” as defined by the Dean’s Guidelines
- “A*” as defined by classification as a “A*” on the ABDC list
- “A” as defined by classification as a “A” on the ABDC list
- “B” as defined by classification as a “B” on the ABDC list
- “Recognized Journals” as defined as other peer reviewed journal articles (typically listed in Cabell’s or other major directory of peer reviewed journals) that count towards scholarly academic status

There are objective thresholds for each merit level. Placement within a level is based on:

- Publication quality and quantity, as well as authorship order
- Leadership roles in additional valued activities
- Quantity and/or quality of additional valued activities
- Role in external grants and size of award

Additional valued activities:

- The attainment and pursuit of external research grants
- Research presentations and engagement at academic conferences
- Publishing with doctoral students
- In-process research projects targeting appropriate academic journals for rank/track
- Publication of scholarly books, monographs, or book chapters
- Research awards, recognition, and/or intramural research grants
- Research collaborations with industry, practitioners, and/or professional organizations
- Invited research talks at other universities or academic associations
- Presentations at practitioner-oriented events and conferences
- Other funded research projects that have impact on the department

All tenure-system faculty and clinical faculty have a research requirement, though the level of expectation varies based on teaching load (see *Faculty Workload Guidelines*). Recognizing that faculty with course releases for research productivity have additional time for research and faculty with additional courses have less time, the annual merit evaluation uses different thresholds for merit based on these factors.

Per RCOB policy, a faculty member, at the discretion of the Department Chair and Dean, may be given a course release for current and past research performance. However, the faculty member would be expected to continue to publish at a very high level to maintain any workload adjustment. Furthermore, per RCOB policy, faculty can be assigned additional courses for low levels of research productivity for their rank/track.



Research Merit Levels and Criteria			
	Typical Research Faculty (e.g., faculty on a 2/2 teaching load)	Research Emphasis Faculty (e.g., faculty on a 2/1 teaching load)	Teaching Emphasis Faculty (e.g., faculty on a 3/3 teaching load)
Exceptional (9 to 10)	Threshold: (1) an “A” or higher publication in the current evaluation year <u>or</u> (2) an “A” or higher publication in at least one of two previous evaluation years and a revise and resubmit at an “A” or higher journal in the current evaluation year.	Threshold: (1) a “premier” publication in the current evaluation year <u>or</u> (2) a “premier” publication in at least one of two previous evaluation years and a revise and resubmit at a “premier” journal in the current evaluation year.	Threshold: (1) a “B” or higher publication in the current evaluation year <u>or</u> (2) a “B” or higher publication in at least one of the two previous evaluation years and a revise and resubmit at a “B” or higher journal in the current evaluation year.
	Within Level Considerations: Publication quality and quantity, authorship order, leadership roles in and quantity and quality of additional valued activities		
Excellent (8 to 8.9)	Threshold: (1) an “A” or higher publication in at least one of the two previous evaluation years <u>and</u> (2) a “B” publication in the current evaluation year.	Threshold: (1) a “premier” publication in at least one of the two previous evaluation years <u>and</u> (2) an “A*” journal in the current evaluation year.	Threshold: (1) a “recognized journal” publication in the current evaluation year <u>or</u> (2) “B” or higher publication in at least one of the two previous evaluation years and a revise and resubmit at a “recognized journal” or higher in the current evaluation year.
	Within Level Considerations: Publication quality and quantity, authorship order, leadership roles in and quantity and quality of additional valued activities		
Good (7 to 7.9)	Threshold: (1) a “B” publication in the current evaluation year <u>or</u> (2) a revise and resubmit at an “A” or higher journal in the current evaluation year <u>or</u> (3) evidence of a significant ongoing research program targeting “A” or higher publications.	Threshold: (1) an “A” publication or higher in the current evaluation year <u>and</u> (2) evidence of a significant ongoing research program targeting “premier” publications.	Threshold: “Recognized journal” publication in at least one of the two previous evaluation years and activities that lead to the maintenance of Scholarly Academic status.
	Within Level Considerations: Publication quality and quantity, authorship order, leadership roles in and quantity and quality of additional valued activities		
Satisfactory (6 to 6.9)	Threshold: Activities that lead to the maintenance of Scholarly Academic status per AACSB.	Threshold: Evidence of a significant ongoing research program targeting “premier” publications.	Threshold: Activities that lead to the maintenance of Scholarly Academic status per AACSB.
Below 6: Improvements in both quality and quantity of research effort are required. This level will require a re-evaluation of workload distribution and may initiate the University Post Tenure Review Policy.			

Faculty members are responsible for maintaining appropriate documentation of activities.



Service

All faculty have a responsibility to provide service to the department, college, university, profession, and, in some cases, to the public. As such, *all faculty are typically given two course releases for this expectation commensurate with their expected time commitment*. Typical faculty have a 20% service workload assignment and, thus, are expected to spend the equivalent of one working day a week during the academic semester on a mixture of assigned, elected, and voluntary service roles and activities.

The **primary goal of service is to support the operation of the department, college, and university in pursuit of organizational goals**. A secondary, but critical, goal is for research faculty to support the professional groups that organize academic pursuits and disseminate research output. Finally, as a publicly funded entity, it is important to support the community and public.

Within UNT, there are a variety of meaningful ways in which a faculty member may contribute. While engagement in activities within the department is expected, there are impactful activities and roles at the RCOB and UNT level, as well as in the profession that contribute to the goals of the department.

Example service activities:

Within the Department:

- Academic program roles
- Student organization advisement
- Faculty search committee roles
- Standing or ad hoc committee roles
- Student development initiatives
- Corporate partnership and/or employer relations development
- Alumni engagement
- External fundraising
- Receipt of grants (external or internal) that fund departmental initiatives

Within the RCOB and UNT:

- Committee roles at the RCOB or UNT level
- Roles as appointed by a Chair, Dean, Provost, President, or similar
- Election as a faculty senator
- Faculty senate committee roles

Within the Profession:

- Roles within professional organizations
- Roles within academic organizations
- Editor or editorial board roles at academic journals
- Ad hoc reviewing for academic journals
- Conference activity (e.g., executive committee, session chair, PDW organizer, discussant)

Lecturers - Scholarly Academic Status: Lecturers cannot have a research requirement in their workload per UNT policy. However, lecturers that have this status and choose to maintain it, can have this effort counted as half of their service workload (10%). This arrangement must be agreed to by both the lecturer and the Chair during discussion of their workload allocation for the coming academic year.



Service Roles with the Community/Public: Should be discussed with the Department Chair and relevant faculty groups to gauge impact on the department, RCOB, and UNT for merit purposes.

Service Roles with Course Releases: Some service roles within UNT are accompanied by course releases in recognition of their time commitment above and beyond the typical service workload. The additional time allocated for particular roles should be considered in annual evaluations.

Service Merit Levels and Criteria	
Exceptional (9 to 10)	An extraordinary level of service to the department, college, university, the member's profession, and/or the public. Service at this level of merit will have significant impact and leadership in efforts is expected.
Excellent (8 to 8.9)	A high level of service to the department, college, university, and profession. Leadership in efforts is common, but the overall quality, quantity, and impact is the focus.
Good (7 to 7.9)	Exhibits an amount of service commensurate with their workload and has impact.
Satisfactory (6 to 6.9)	Accomplishes those professional duties expected as a minimum of any faculty.
Unsatisfactory (<6)	Not meeting the minimum expectations of the service role of a faculty member.

Professional-System Faculty Guidelines for Reappointment and Promotion

The Department of Management guidelines for reappointment and promotion of professional-system faculty is consistent with and subservient to current UNT policy ([06.005](#)) and RCOB Dean's guidelines. Candidates for promotion should be familiar with expectations in these policies.

The primary criterion for promotion is demonstrated sustained excellence in teaching, service, and intellectual contributions (if applicable). Evidence of sustained excellence could include, but are not limited to the following:

- AACSB participating faculty status (see current RCOB AACSB Guidelines)
- Annual performance reviews that demonstrate sustained excellence over time in each domain
- Syllabi and evidence that demonstrates pedagogical excellence and innovation in teaching
- Letters of support from students, peers, staff, etc.
- Evidence of impactful service within the department, college, UNT, corporate outreach, and/or alumni relations

For Clinical Faculty, maintenance of scholarly academic status per AACSB is a requirement of the role. Evidence of an ongoing research program is expected for reappointment and promotion.

Tenure-System Probationary Faculty Evaluation Procedure

Probationary faculty will be evaluated in accordance with UNT policy ([06.004](#)) and RCOB Dean's guidelines.



Tenure-System Faculty Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

The below outlines the department's expectations regarding recommendations for promotion and tenure of tenure-track faculty. As an organizational unit of the RCOB and UNT, the policies established by both serve as guides to decisions made within the department. The department reserves the right, however, to be more stringent when evaluating performance for promotion and tenure.

Decisions on promotion and tenure will be made on the faculty member's cumulative professional record. It is incumbent on the faculty member to document their qualifications per UNT expectations and to be familiar with all relevant policies, guidelines and procedures regarding promotion and tenure ([06.004](#)) and RCOB Dean's guidelines. Faculty are expected to adhere to UNT's expectations of Academic Responsibility ([06.035](#)).

Faculty seeking tenure or promotion are expected to publish in premier and high-quality journals as classified by RCOB lists and departmental processes, with an emphasis on premier publications. Research published in journals that are related but tangential to the professional disciplines represented by the department are respected, but do not, in of themselves, demonstrate research achievement in the field of Management, an expectation. Faculty that are hired without tenure and have prior years and publications they wish counted should have this detailed in their offer letter.

Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

Per UNT policy, decisions for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure are generally joint decisions. The guidelines listed below are established in light of university and college policy.

Teaching. To qualify for tenure and/or the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate should have consistent merit evaluations of "Good" or better during the probationary or evaluation period. In some cases, where early years are marked by lower teaching evaluations, trends of recent and significant improvement may be used to justify satisfaction of this expectation.

Research. The only activities considered by the department are those associated directly with research and publication. An expected level of publication would be an average of one or more basic research articles in refereed academic journals per year during a six-year probationary period. 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. At least four of these articles should be of high-quality basic research in journals recognized by the G. Brint Ryan College of Business as A*/A level, with at least one premier.

Authorship is an important consideration in evaluating research publications. 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 research record without any lead or sole authorship is difficult. Work with doctoral students is encouraged and support of the doctoral program expected.

Service. Faculty should render service to the department, college, university, and professional academic organizations and the value of those contributions should be reflected in annual evaluations.

Promotion to Professor

Per UNT policy, promotion to Professor requires a combination of teaching, research, and service.

Teaching. To qualify for the rank of Professor, the candidate should have consistent merit evaluations



of “Good” or better during the probationary or evaluation period.

Research. The only activities considered by the department are those associated directly with research and publication. An expected level of publication would be to publish between five and seven additional articles that evidence basic research since promotion to associate professor. 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. At least four of these articles should be of high-quality basic research in journals recognized by the G. Brint Ryan College of Business as A*/A level, with at least one premier.

Authorship is an important consideration in evaluating research publications. 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 research record without any lead or sole authorship is difficult. Work with doctoral students is encouraged and support of the doctoral program expected.

Service. Faculty should render service to the department, college, university, and professional academic organizations and the value of those contributions should be reflected in annual evaluations. The expectations in the service area for promotion to Professor are more stringent than they are for decisions on tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.