

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Kenan-Flagler Business School
The University of North Carolina

Adopted April 24, 1985 and amended March 30, 2009

All procedures and policies relating to decisions affecting faculty in the Kenan-Flagler Business School are intended to conform with statements regarding these matters set forth in university publications. In cases of conflict, the most recent version of university procedures takes precedence. The following criteria and guidelines do not repeat these policies and procedures; they are intended to conform to them. Each faculty member has a responsibility to become familiar with their provisions.

This statement sets forth guidelines for tenure and promotion decisions at the Kenan-Flagler Business School. The philosophy motivating the guidelines is reviewed, as are key criteria and procedures on which decisions are to be based.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

The Kenan-Flagler Business School must be strong in the present and prepared to meet future challenges. This requires that norms for faculty performance be high – and that all faculty continue to grow professionally and contribute to the missions of the School. Individual faculty contribute to the missions of the School by effective performance in research, teaching, and service.

Personnel decisions related to reappointment, tenure or promotion must be guided by evaluation of the performance of the individual faculty member. The overriding issue should be the individual's total contribution to the School's missions.

Process Goals: Both the School and individual faculty are served well by a process of personal and institutional planning and feedback that leads to an allocation of effort and skill to valued activities and areas. Thus, these guidelines should help to establish a decision process and reward system that

1. indicates what faculty activities are valuable to the School,
2. provides regular feedback to individual faculty about the extent of his or her contribution,
3. rewards activities that are a contribution and does not reward those which are not, and
4. explicitly considers individual faculty who agree to perform duties that are important for the School, but that involve assumption of some opportunity cost with respect to individual external reputation.

REAPPOINTMENT

The reappointment evaluation affords an opportunity to assess a candidate's trajectory toward tenure. While the reappointment review occurs relatively early in a candidate's career, a positive outcome is conditional on concrete evidence of progress toward tenure and should not be viewed as automatic. In terms of research, candidates should be reappointed only if it seems reasonably likely that they will ultimately have a tenurable research record, recognizing the relatively short time between the reappointment and tenure decisions and the long lags typical in the publication process. An example of evidence of solid progress toward tenure would be one or more publications in "A" journals, as well as a pipeline of papers under review and working papers.

In addition, candidates for reappointment should have demonstrated effective teaching and a trajectory toward a tenurable teaching record. While effective undergraduate teaching is sufficient for reappointment, candidates who have taught only in the undergraduate program are encouraged to begin developing a plan, in conjunction with their Area, for Masters-level teaching prior to tenure. Service requirements at reappointment are expected to be minimal and will not factor significantly into the reappointment decision.

TENURE

Tenure decisions are – by their very nature – different from any other personnel action. Tenure reviews are the most important personnel decisions made in the School. They represent a commitment of the School to employ a faculty member for the remainder of his or her professional career. Organizationally, tenure decisions limit flexibility because they represent a willingness on the part of the School to forego hiring of alternative faculty in the future.

As such, a positive tenure recommendation should only be made when there is reasonable confidence that a faculty candidate is the best obtainable person now or in the foreseeable future to meet the long-term needs of the School.

Only a person who has already made significant contributions should be considered as a serious candidate for tenure; a tenure recommendation should not be made solely on the presumption that a person will ultimately make contributions in the future. On the other hand, the candidate's potential for long term contributions to the School must be significant, and the likelihood of that potential being realized must be high, if a favorable tenure decision is to be made.

It must be clearly understood by all faculty members that tenure is granted, not merely earned. Accomplishment by itself does not justify tenure. A tenure recommendation should only be made when the trade-off between flexibility of future hiring and the expectation of ongoing significant contributions to the School is in the best long term interest of the School. Acceptance of tenure by a faculty member represents a bilateral agreement. The School makes a commitment to a faculty member, and the faculty

member is committed to making ongoing contribution to the School and the University. Thus, these guidelines are subordinate to, but intended to be consistent with, the broader University policies on tenure.

No one should ever construe performance appraisal feedback to an untenured faculty member as implying a set of preconditions that will insure a positive tenure decision. Performance feedback should be provided as part of a constructive process to help guide development of individual faculty and the School. It is intended to help a tenure candidate identify ways of contributing to the School, thereby increasing the probability of being offered a long term faculty position at the School. In that sense, the ongoing performance appraisal process is designed to serve both the School and the candidate – and to recognize and communicate the concerns and interests of both. Yet, when a tenure recommendation is made, the personal needs and interests of a tenure candidate must be subordinated to the needs and objectives of the School.

PROMOTION

Associate Professor: An initial promotion decision is intertwined with the tenure decision. It is not possible to promote a faculty candidate within the school from assistant to associate professor unless tenure is granted. Promotion at this level must be based on the higher order tenure criteria. This also applies to promotion decisions at a higher rank when the promotion is accompanied by tenure.

Full Professor: Promotion to full professor formally recognizes accomplishments in and contribution to research, teaching and service – in furthering the study and practice of management and the ability of the School as a whole to contribute in these areas. Promotion to a higher rank is a symbol both inside and outside of the School of professional stature. Ongoing professional growth, development, and contribution to the School are expected of all faculty. A positive promotion recommendation should only be made when a faculty member has demonstrated such continuing growth, development and commitment since appointment to the currently held rank. Relative to tenure, promotion to full professor generally entails higher expectations on research, teaching and service dimensions. Candidates for full professor are expected to have made significant contributions in research, teaching and service since tenure, although the relative weights of the three components may vary across cases based, for example, on school needs and the candidate's relative strengths. Lack of citizenship may impede promotion to full professor.

Chaired Professor: Criteria for awarding chairs will be governed by the document “Process for Endowed Chair Consideration at the Kenan-Flagler Business School” (original draft 11/14/01, amended 5/18/07).

KEY PERFORMANCE DIMENSIONS RELEVANT TO PROMOTION AND TENURE

The three performance dimensions are research, teaching and service.

Research and Research Related Activities

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is designated as one of only two research institutions in the state university system, and as such a basic obligation of this institution is development and dissemination of new knowledge. As a major unit within the broader University, the Kenan-Flagler Business School has as a central mission the development of new knowledge relevant to the study and practice of management. This includes (but is not necessarily limited to) the discovery of new principles, tools, theories, and insights that relate to the environment in which managers operate, as well as evaluation of current management practice and mentoring of other scholars.

Effective performance on the research dimension is a necessary precondition to a positive tenure or promotion decision. Such performance is gauged by the following elements:

1. Demonstrated ability to do effective research on topics judged to be significant.
2. Demonstrated individual ability to publish one's research in a high quality forum that will further the potential acceptance, diffusion, and impact of the research.
3. Demonstrated contribution to the research effectiveness of other faculty and doctoral students in the school (i.e., "research leadership").
4. Consistent evidence of ability and motivation to maintain and enhance these factors.

The focus of appraisal on the research dimension is the significance of the contribution to knowledge made by the investigator. This includes consideration of the significance of the questions and topics being studied as well as the thoroughness and extensiveness of the work itself. For tenure or promotion, a candidate must have demonstrated significant contribution to the research literature. One potential indicator of research contribution is that the faculty member is recognized as being among the leading researchers in a topic area so that the candidate is identified with that area, although faculty may also contribute by having an impact on the research literature more generally.

Both the quality of individual contributions and the quantity of those contributions are relevant. Simple "line counts" of the number of research projects and publications are to be avoided. A large quantity of research may not result in significant contribution if the quality is not good. On the other hand, the quantity of high quality contributions affects the likely impact of a faculty member's research.

The potential contribution of an individual research project is sometimes difficult to assess – in part because the impact of a research topic may be long term and cumulative. Moreover, the nature of the contribution to different audiences may vary.

There are, however, indicators of the likely impact of research that will be used. These include:

1. Evaluations of the likely impact of the research by senior faculty members in the School and faculty at other research institutions who have established records for scholarship and expertise in the area of the research.
2. The extent and nature of reference to the work in other published material, when sufficient time has passed for this to have occurred as reflected in, for example, citation counts.
3. The reputation of the publication in which the research appears, including consideration of the procedures used in selecting manuscripts for publication, the competition for space, and the significance of the audience reached.
4. Evidence that the research has had a broad impact on how managers make decisions or how scholars view an area of research inquiry.
5. Cohort analyses of productivity in leading journals relative to peer group.

It is not the intent of these guidelines to suggest that any of these indicators be used in isolation or as a sole surrogate measure of the quality of the research, but rather that the quality and likely impact of the candidate's total research performance be evaluated in as complete a fashion as is possible.

In this vein, the different constituencies of the School warrant specific mention. The traditional publication vehicle for research contributions targeted to the scholarly community is the refereed journal. Publication in high quality refereed journals that reach relevant scholarly audiences is important and necessary. It is also relevant, however, that management professionals are and must continue to be an important constituency of the School. Thus, articles targeted for important professional audiences and based on empirical research or other scholarship are viewed as positive elements of a faculty member's research portfolio, and as positive contributions to the School's missions. However, publications targeted to management professionals are not a substitute for research in high quality refereed journals.

Teaching and Teaching Related Activities

Effective Teaching – the transfer of relevant knowledge and expertise from the faculty to various student groups – is a fundamental responsibility of the School. Teaching is important; a faculty member must be an effective teacher in the School's degree programs to receive further consideration for a favorable promotion or tenure recommendation. In general, faculty members seeking tenure are expected to have demonstrated teaching ability in a Masters-level program.

As with research, appraisal of effective teaching is complicated. However, a number of different elements of contributions to teaching will be evaluated in assessing this dimension of a faculty member's performance. Major elements to be considered are:

1. Course content and design, including development of needed new courses.
2. Development of effective new teaching materials – including those which are used by other faculty at this and other institutions.
3. Personal contributions to the development of effective teaching by other faculty (i.e., building the teaching skills of other faculty members).
4. Skill in classroom presentation and discussion, as based both on student assessments and peer evaluations.
5. Contributions to the development of individual students out of the classroom.
6. Consistent evidence of motivation and ability to maintain and enhance these factors.

Teaching in executive development programs is a voluntary activity and usually involves at least some direct compensation. But, it is also an important part of the School's mission. Faculty members are encouraged to share their research and teaching expertise with non-degree constituencies through the School's ongoing non-degree programs or through a management program designed for a specialized market. Successful contributions in this area can enhance the assessment of a faculty member on the teaching dimension, and can therefore enhance the overall assessment of a faculty member's performance. However, lack of involvement or an assessment of inadequate teaching performance in executive development programs should not be a reason for low assessment of teaching.

It is not necessary for an individual to be an effective teaching contributor to all of the School's degree programs to receive a favorable assessment on the teaching dimension. However, the ability and willingness to make versatile contributions across programs is encouraged and valued. This capability among the tenured portion of the faculty adds to the long term flexibility of the School to meet the challenges and needs of future teaching environments. As such, untenured faculty should be given the opportunity to demonstrate teaching ability across different teaching programs. Such successful diversity can reflect favorably on the potential of the faculty member to meet the longer term teaching needs that may arise in the School. In addition, some courses are more demanding to teach, but responsiveness of the individual faculty member to broader school needs is valued.

Service Contributions to the School, University, and External Constituencies

Accomplishment of the School's missions requires a number of essential and significant activities beyond the areas of teaching and research. Important aspects of this citizenship dimension include:

1. Service within the School on individual assignments, committee assignments, and in administrative positions.
2. Work representing the School in the broader university and to other significant external constituencies.

3. Participation in and leadership of professional associations involving significant external constituencies of the School.
4. Consistent evidence of ability and motivation to maintain and enhance these aspects of service.

Each faculty member should expect to be asked to perform a variety of support activities ranging through committee assignments, special assignments, and administrative posts. Moreover, each faculty member is expected to share meaningfully in the load of day-to-day and special activities that are necessary to the maintenance and development of quality in the school. A failure to contribute equitably to the citizenship dimension should result in an unfavorable overall assessment of performance of a faculty member.

Except in extraordinary situations, untenured faculty will not be asked to take on more than minor service roles.

Consulting with external constituencies on a compensated basis within limits specified by University statutes is certainly acceptable and encouraged. However, such consulting will not be considered as part of the citizenship dimension or as part of the overall performance evaluation of an individual within the School, except of course as it results in other desired benefits which accrue directly to the School – such as through more effective teaching and more significant research output.

Overall Evaluation Process

A reappointment, promotion, or tenure review is required prior to recommendation by the Dean to University officials. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will gather information, including letters from outside referees, and prepare a report for the senior faculty. Appropriate senior faculty will meet and advise the Dean on any such decision by carefully evaluating all of the evidence assembled about a reviewee in each of the three categories of performance overviewed above, and then will provide confidential summary ratings to the Dean.

Specifically, each of the evaluators will rate each reviewee on each dimension (research, teaching, service) with one of four levels of evaluation: Distinguished, Excellent, Effective, Inadequate. Similar ratings will be used to solicit overall evaluations. These inputs are advisory in nature. It remains the responsibility of the Dean to synthesize the inputs and make a recommendation to University officials.

Several points concerning the overall assessment should be emphasized. First, a rating of “Inadequate” on any individual performance dimension should generally result in an unfavorable overall assessment. Moreover, merely achieving the “Effective” level across the board on each of the three dimensions should generally result in an unfavorable overall assessment. For promotion to Full Professor, ratings should generally include at least “Distinguished” in research or two “Excellents” in teaching and research.

Beyond that, the probability of a favorable decision increases with higher evaluations on and across the individual dimensions. As noted above, however, decisions involving a tenure commitment cannot be based on an evaluation of the performance of the faculty member in isolation, but also must ultimately be directed by the likely future contributions of the faculty member relative to the longer term needs and missions of the School.

A similar evaluation will be conducted for an external candidate who is being considered for a new faculty position. In particular, any candidate being considered for an appointment which confers tenure or an advanced rank will be expected to meet the same performance criteria as faculty whose previous service has been at the School.