



College	W. P. Carey School of Business	
Unit	Department of Information Systems	
Document	Faculty Review Procedures	
Approved by the faculty		Date:
Reviewed by the dean		Date:

Provost office approval

Vice Provost for Academic Personnel	Date

Office of the University Provost

300 East University Drive
P.O. Box 877805 Tempe, AZ 85287-7805
(480) 965-4995 Fax: (480) 965-0785
<https://provost.asu.edu/>



DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS

PERSONNEL ADVISORY TEAM
(DISPAT)

FACULTY REVIEW PROCEDURES*

REVISED MARCH 24, 2011

**See also the University Faculty Handbook and W. P. Carey Faculty Evaluation Policies, Guidelines and Procedures.*

FACULTY REVIEW PROCEDURES
DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

Revised March 24, 2011

Table of Contents

I. Annual Review and Assessment of Faculty.....	2
A. Standards of Performance.....	2
1. Teaching.....	2
2. Research and Other Scholarly Activities.....	3
3. Institutional Commitment: Contributions to Academic Discipline.....	4
a. External Institutional Commitment.....	4
b. Professional Institutional Commitment.....	4
c. Community Institutional Commitment.....	5
d. Personal Development.....	5
e. Salary Inequities.....	6
4. Institutional Commitment: Contributions to Department, School and University.....	6
II. DIS PERSONNEL ADVISORY TEAM.....	7
A. Membership.....	7
B. Replacement.....	8
C. Standards of Conduct.....	8
III. FACULTY REVIEW PROCEDURES.....	9
A. Compensation Review Guidelines.....	10
B. Compensation Review Appeal Procedure.....	11
C. Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Guidelines.....	12
D. Promotion and Tenure Processes.....	13
E. Guidelines for the Review of Sabbatical Leave.....	14
F. Post-Tenure Review Guidelines.....	15
1. Post-Tenure Review Process.....	15
2. Teaching.....	16
3. Research and Other Scholarly Activities.....	17
4. Institutional Commitment (Service).....	17
IV. ASSESSMENT OF ADJUST FACULTY MEMBERS.....	18
V. ASSESSMENT OF CHAIR.....	19
APPENDICES.....	20

I. ANNUAL REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF FACULTY (Including Annual Compensation Review)

An evaluation of each faculty member shall be performed at least once every 12 months. The objectives of the annual review are to (1) assist faculty in their professional development, (2) provide a basis for decisions on annual salary increments, and (3) provide a basis for decisions on retention, tenure, and promotion.

A. Standards of Performance

The annual review and other related faculty assessments shall be based on an evaluation of the faculty member's achievement in the areas of (1) teaching, (2) research and other scholarly activities, and (3) institutional commitment. Institutional commitment consists of (a) contributions to the academic discipline, and (b) contributions to the department, school and university. An elaboration of activity areas follows:

1. Teaching

A major emphasis of the review shall be on the quality of an individual's teaching performance. The elements to be considered shall include, but not necessarily be limited to:

- ◆ Student evaluations and other input from students.
- ◆ Evidence of course development and innovative practices including, but not limited to efforts to significantly modernize software systems / computer language course components and/or efforts to introduce new technology-mediated and/or action-learning practices.
- ◆ Course load, including new and repeat courses, graduate and undergraduate courses, class size, nature of the courses taught, and availability of grading assistance.
- ◆ Facilitation of student development, including contributions to advisory and dissertation committees, facilitation of graduate student publications, and participation in curriculum development.

2. Research and Other Scholarly Activities

Basic and applied research contributes to the body of knowledge in an area through (a) theoretical analysis, (b) systematic collection, classification, or analysis of data, including that made for the purpose of generating improvements in business/economic/social practice or decision-making or (c) contributions to design science information systems knowledge. It includes the presentation of new idea(s) and the synthesis of existing ideas. Other applied scholarly activities include communication of existing ideas to a new audience.

The following provide evidence of basic and applied research (basic scholarship per AACSB):

- ◆ Refereed journal articles
- ◆ Reports resulting from sponsored grants
- ◆ Papers presented at academic meetings, including research workshops and symposia
- ◆ Books
- ◆ Patents
- ◆ Monographs
- ◆ Cases
- ◆ Working papers

The following are examples of other applied scholarly activity: (applied scholarship per AACSB)

- ◆ Textbooks
- ◆ Presentations at practitioner meetings
- ◆ Publication of non-refereed journal articles

For purposes of promotion and tenure, publication in leading refereed academic journals is necessary. Also, for promotion and tenure, achievement in the area of basic and applied research requires evidence of contribution in the area of academic research beyond the dissertation stage. Articles in the main or lead section generally receive more credit than those appearing in secondary or correspondence sections of refereed journals. In general, co-authorship is not viewed as a negative attribute. However, if most publications are co-authored with the same individual(s), recognition for research achievement in these instances should be based on knowledge of the individual's input.

For purposes of annual compensation review, consideration also should be given to other scholarly activity but less weight should be assigned to these contributions than those made in the area of basic and applied research. Refereed articles generally receive much more credit than do non-refereed articles, institutional publications, industrial association publications, or newsletters. Generally, invited papers, presentations at academic and practitioner meetings, publication of books/monographs, and cases will not be evaluated as highly as refereed journal articles.

3. Institutional Commitment: Contributions to Academic Discipline (External Market Value and Personal Development)

External market addresses a faculty member's external and internal value within his/her academic discipline. Factors to be considered in assessing external market value (in addition to teaching and research) include: (a) external institutional commitment, (b) professional institutional commitment, (c) community institutional commitment, (d) personal development, and (e) salary inequities.

a. External Institutional Commitment

- ◆ Invitational institutional involvement in a faculty member's area of expertise
- ◆ Speeches to institutional commitment groups in a faculty member's area of expertise
- ◆ Consulting. Consulting is defined as those activities, normally compensated, performed for a public or private organization, institution or association at their request. Not all consulting activities, however, constitute external institutional commitment. Faculty members seeking institutional commitment recognition for consulting activities are encouraged to provide evidence of benefit to the discipline to facilitate appropriate evaluation.

b. Professional Institutional Commitment. Institutional Commitment to local, regional, and national business and professional organizations shall be considered by the decision-making bodies. Examples include:

- ◆ Editorial activities with academic or professional journals
- ◆ Leadership roles in professional organizations
- ◆ Referee for academic journals
- ◆ Reviewer of books
- ◆ Moderator, panel member, discussant, or some similar activity at a meeting of a professional association

- ♦ Committee member of a professional organization

c. Community Institutional Commitment

Community Institutional Commitment is admirable and deserving of recognition. It shall be the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence that such activities were of direct benefit to the academic discipline.

d. Personal Development

One of the lead indicators of external market value is faculty development. AACSB standards specify that a minimum of 90 percent of full time equivalent faculty must be academically or professionally qualified (page 41). This requirement is operationally defined to include not only degree credentials but also to include "...activities that maintain the currency and relevance of their instruction" (page 42). In annual performance reports, it is accordingly important for faculty to show, and for the Department of Information Systems Personnel Advisory Team (DISPAT) to assess, evidence of continuing development as teachers or intellectual contributors to the discipline.

AACSB standards also state, "Individual faculty members are the single most important resource for the teaching program of the school. As such they are personally responsible for bringing current and relevant intellectual resources into the teaching program" (page 52). In addition, AACSB standards require that "...each faculty member is obligated to continuously update, expand, and hone personal knowledge and skills. Without this personal commitment on the part of individual faculty members, the intellectual life of the school will stagnate, and the vitality of degree programs will quickly be lost" (page 53).

Therefore, faculty should have current knowledge of both theory and practice related to phenomena about which they teach and conduct research, and this knowledge should be demonstrably evident in research conducted, course development, effective teaching, instructional innovation, and

involvement with business and professional organizations. Evidence of faculty development in support of teaching and research should be included in the annual performance report and considered by DISPAT.

e. Salary Inequities

Included in this category are salary problems such as salaries below external market value, the lack of past rewards for meritorious performance, and salary compression and inversion (where such compression or inversion has not been due to lower performance).

**4. Institutional Commitment: Contributions to Department, School and University
(Internal Market Value and Institutional Commitment)**

Institutional commitment encompasses those activities of the faculty, other than teaching, research and development, that enhance the prestige and reputation of the department, school and university or increase the effectiveness of institutional programs. Evaluation of institutional commitment activities shall be based on performance and results achieved. Individuals are encouraged to present evidence of achievement (results) and of expenditure of time and effort (commitment). No single institutional commitment activity shall be required of all faculty members.

Institutional commitment activities may be classified into two categories: (1) internal institutional commitment and (2) contributions to Regents' mandated affirmative action. Internal institutional commitment activities shall include but not be limited to:

- ◆ Administration -- serving on a budgeted assignment. Administrative performance shall be evaluated by administrative superiors. Individuals serving as part-time administrators on budgeted assignments shall be evaluated on the basis of the same criteria as those applied to other faculty members. However, the quantity (but not quality) of their institutional commitment requirements shall be proportionate to their assignment to non-administrative duties during the period(s) when engaged in such activities. Therefore, their performance in the budgeted administrative role shall not be a factor in the evaluation of institutional commitment.
- ◆ Department, school or university institutional commitment (team, committee) assignments
- ◆ Student activities (such as advising student organizations)
- ◆ Continuing education activities
- ◆ Contributions to overhead and graduate student support from funded research, sponsored research and non-research fund raising activities
- ◆ Special institutional commitment assignments

Evaluating faculty performance in these activities is a complex process involving both qualitative and quantitative factors. Also, faculty members may serve the department, school and university in many ways, and the specific nature of the contributions from an individual faculty member may change over time. Evaluation procedures must recognize this and must be structured so that both qualitative and quantitative factors are considered. For all personnel actions (compensation, retention, promotion, and tenure) the evaluation shall be based on the guidelines adopted by Department of Information Systems (DIS) faculty as presented in this document and relevant school and university documents.

II. DIS PERSONNEL ADVISORY TEAM

An annual assessment of each faculty member's performance shall be conducted by peer review and by the Chair. The peer review will be performed by the DISPAT following the DISPAT ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REVIEW PROCESS in Appendix C. DISPAT is charged with evaluating faculty and advising the Chair in writing of its evaluation and recommendation. The following apply to DISPAT:

A. Membership

1. The team shall consist of six members.
2. The team shall be composed of four tenured faculty members, one non-tenured but tenure track faculty member, and one non-tenure track faculty member on a multi-year contract. The team must have at least one full professor and at least one associate professor.
3. Voting members of the Department Assembly shall elect DISPAT members. Non-tenure track, full-time faculty members who have been teaching at the Department for three or more years can vote on the election of the non-tenure track member on the Personnel committee.
4. All tenured and non-tenured but tenure track faculty are eligible for election to the team with the exception of:
 - i. Those expected to be on sabbatical leave in the next academic year.
 - ii. Those being considered for promotion, tenure, or both in the next academic year.
 - iii. Those who have not completed their doctoral degree.
 - iv. The Chair and members of any decision making group that acts on matters which would be considered and acted on by the committee, such as a member of the Dean's Personnel Advisory Committee, but excluding the Chair's Advisory Team.
5. The chair of DISPAT must be tenured and shall be elected by the members of DISPAT.

6. Election to the team is for a two-year term for tenured faculty members, and a one year term for the non-tenured but tenure track faculty member and the non-tenured faculty member on a multi-year contract. Terms for tenured faculty members will be staggered with two members elected each academic year.
7. The “Merit Team” shall be composed of the five tenure track faculty members of the team. Additionally, the non-tenure track faculty member on a multi-year contract is eligible to participate in deliberations involving annual and multi-year contract faculty members.
8. The non-tenure track faculty member serving on the team will only be eligible to deliberate and vote on issues related to non-tenure track annual or multi-year contract faculty members.

B. Replacement

A replacement to fill a remainder of the term of a member who resigns from DISPAT will be elected from the same source as the resigning member (i.e., tenured, non-tenured but tenure track and non-tenure track on a multi-year contract). If the resigning member at a rank was the only representative of that rank, then an elected replacement must come from that rank. Elections are to be held according to Section II. A.

C. Standards of Conduct

The deliberations of DISPAT are confidential. This confidentiality is essential to ensure full and open discussion of all positive and negative aspects of each petition considered. Each member should feel obligated to state his (her) views as an integral part of the discussion, evaluation, and recommendations. If the member believes he (she) cannot honestly state his (her) views, that member should resign from the committee. Should a member violate the requirement of confidentiality, the member can be removed from DISPAT by a vote of the majority of the tenure-track faculty in the DIS.

Should a member of DISPAT disagree with the majority decision of the Team, after having expressed his (her) opposing position during a Team session, that member has the option to write a memorandum to the Chair. S/He will also provide a copy of this memo to the DIS representative on the Dean’s Personnel Advisory Committee (DPAC). (A copy of the memo will be forwarded to DPAC as part of the file of the faculty member being evaluated.) The memo should indicate that member’s reasons

for disagreement with the majority decision. Under no circumstances will this memorandum contain information that will compromise the confidential nature of DISPAT deliberations.

III. FACULTY REVIEW PROCEDURES

The Chair and DISPAT will review and evaluate each individual faculty member applying the current criteria for retention, promotion, stability of employment, compensation review, and sabbatical leave adopted by the DIS faculty.

The collection of supporting materials pertinent to all personnel matters will be the responsibility of the individual faculty member, except that the Chair will solicit confidential evaluation letters for promotion and tenure actions. A list of materials to be provided by the faculty member for retention, promotion, and tenure is given in Appendix A. An example of a suggested format for a summary of teaching evaluations for all personnel actions is given in Appendix B.

After a review of the materials submitted by the individual, DISPAT will advise the Chair in writing of its evaluation. All faculty are to be provided with (a) DISPAT's evaluation of performance and (b) the Chair's evaluation. The Chair will review (1) the DISPAT recommendation on the individual, (2) materials submitted by the individual faculty member, (3) confidential evaluation letters (where appropriate), and (4) input from Associate Deans relative to programmatic contributions.

When consistent with the nature of a specific review, DISPAT shall communicate recommended corrective actions to those faculty members deemed not to be making adequate progress toward the tenure decision. This communication shall inform the individual of his/her weakness and identify specific corrective steps to be taken. If an individual's lack of progress toward tenure is deemed serious, DISPAT shall recommend to the Chair that a conditional contract be given to the faculty member for the next fiscal year. If DISPAT believes that an individual has not taken steps to remedy previously identified areas of inadequacy or to rectify areas of inadequacy identified in a conditional contract, and if DISPAT believes that such inadequacies will most likely not be overcome, a terminal contract will be recommended.

A. Compensation Review Guidelines

Assessment of faculty performance and translation of faculty evaluations into salary increase recommendations are among the most sensitive activities and one of the most timely methods of responding to performance in which the DIS engages. Any salary increase system based on accomplishment must be carefully implemented. Events can easily result in a salary structure that does not accurately reflect relative worth to the DIS. Specifically, consideration should be given to teaching, research and other scholarly activities, contributions to the academic discipline, and contributions to the department, school and university as described earlier and consistent with current *School of Business Salary Compensation Guidelines*. A list of specific procedural guidelines follows:

1. By February 1, each faculty member shall (a) submit evidence of performance of responsibilities, normally during the previous three calendar years and (b) file with the Chair a plan of action for the coming academic year (including a tentative Post-Tenure Review Workload Plan). A faculty member must provide required information in a format consistent with Appendix C. A faculty member also has discretion to submit additional data and plans in the form that he/she believes most suitable; however, the Post-Tenure Review Workload Plan must comply with the standard DIS format. All data and plans should be sufficiently specific to allow for clear communications. Revisions to plans of actions and the Post-Tenure Review workload plan may be necessitated by the needs of the Department and/or mandated Post-Tenure Review Faculty Development (discussed in Section III-E-1). If revisions are needed to the Post-Tenure Review workload plan, they will be negotiated by the Chair and faculty member(s) and normally will be concluded by June 1.
2. By February 28, the Merit Team shall review the evidence of performance for the past three-year record, as submitted by each faculty member. DISPAT will only evaluate research, teaching, and internal market/institutional commitment. The Chair will have primary responsibility for evaluating other dimensions discussed earlier. The Merit Team shall recommend to the Chair whether a faculty member should receive (1) very high merit, (2) high merit, (3) merit, (4) satisfactory – no merit, (5) needs improvement – no merit, or (6) unsatisfactory – no merit. In making the recommendation, the Merit Team shall focus on the result of the annual review of faculty performance, but may take into account:
 - a. the contribution of the faculty member for years prior to the most recent three years,
 - b. the requirements specified in a Performance Improvement Plan for the faculty member, if applicable, and
 - c. the contribution of the faculty member during the preceding period (if any) during which merit money was not available.
3. After reviewing DISPAT's evaluation report, the Chair will discuss the report with DISPAT.
4. By March 31, the Chair shall convey in writing to each faculty member (a) the Team's evaluation (ranking) of that faculty member regarding merit pay, and (b) the Chair's preliminary evaluation of that faculty member regarding merit pay.
5. If the faculty member has earned a "needs improvement" evaluation, s/he will work with a joint committee composed of the Chair and DISPAT to develop a Performance Improvement Plan

which will specify actions and outcomes required for achieving satisfactory performance the following year. The joint committee will determine whether the faculty member has met the requirements specified in the Performance Improvement Plan. This plan will influence the faculty member's subsequent years' review as follows:

- a. If the faculty member has met the requirements specified in the Performance Improvement Plan their performance will be assessed as satisfactory (or better).
 - b. If the faculty member has made significant progress towards the requirements specified in the Performance Improvement Plan, but has not fully met the requirements, s/he will receive a second "needs improvement" evaluation.
 - c. If the faculty member has made no significant progress towards requirements specified in the Performance Improvement Plan, s/he will receive an "unsatisfactory" evaluation. This will trigger the faculty member to develop further plans in accordance with the W. P. Carey School's policies and procedures for unsatisfactory performance.
6. A faculty member may receive no more than two "needs improvement" evaluation in two consecutive years; in the third year, the evaluation will be rated as either satisfactory (or better) or unsatisfactory.

B. Compensation Review Appeal Procedure

A faculty member who disagrees with the evaluation of DISPAT, the Chair, or both may appeal. Such appeals shall be based on the failure of DISPAT or the Chair to follow the review or salary adjustment procedures established in this document.

1. A faculty member desiring review (the appellant) shall submit a written request to the Chair within 30 days of (a) meeting with the Chair to discuss DISPAT's and the Chair's evaluation, or (b) receiving the letter of salary adjustment.
2. A review committee shall be assigned within one week of receiving a written request from an appellant. The committee shall consist of three School of Business faculty members selected as follows:
 - a. One member selected by the appellant;
 - b. Two members selected by the School's representative to the Dean's Personnel Advisory Committee (DPAC).
3. The review committee shall provide a written report of the results of its review and its recommendation to the DIS Chair within 14 days of being appointed. The review committee shall have access to the appellant's written request and any supporting documentation provided and deemed necessary by the appellant, and the annual performance review and salary adjustment information on all other faculty members of the department for the year under appeal. As part of its deliberative process, the review committee may request to meet with the Chair, the appellant, or the chair of DISPAT. The deliberations of the review committee are confidential.
4. Upon receiving the report of the review committee, the DIS Chair shall issue a final written recommendation regarding the evaluation or salary adjustment. This recommendation and the review committee's report shall be promptly forwarded to the appellant.

5. If necessary, subsequent appeals by the appellant to the School level shall be filed within 30 days of receipt of the Chair's final recommendation.

C. Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Guidelines

The success of the DIS depends on faculty achievement in the areas of (1) teaching, (2) research and other scholarly activities, (3) institutional commitment: contributions to the academic discipline, and (4) institutional commitment: contributions to the department, school or university. Faculty performance is to be evaluated in each area.

Achievement in these areas is a goal that permits ample opportunity for individual differences to exist. In the assessment of a faculty member's contribution to the DIS, personnel evaluation guidelines shall not be regarded as rules that demand rigid adherence to a particular scheme or mold to which each faculty member must conform.

While there is no single formula by which a faculty member should be evaluated, an effective faculty member should participate in all four activities to some degree. In the aggregate, higher ranking faculty members, because of their experience level, will be expected to assume a disproportionate role in institutional commitment activities. Although not envisioned as an area of time commitment equal to that of teaching and research and other scholarly activities, assistant professors should also begin contributing to the academic discipline and to the department, school or university.

For promotion with tenure to associate professor, the greatest emphasis is on teaching and research and other scholarly activities. Promotion and tenure decisions must take into consideration not only the faculty member's past performance, but also expectations regarding the faculty member's continued progress toward promotion to professor. For promotion with tenure to associate professor, a faculty member's performance must be evaluated as demonstrating excellent contributions in both research and teaching and reasonable contributions in other areas. (Refer to Section I.A.2. for additional guidance in regard to publication.) The granting of tenure prior to a faculty member's normal tenure date shall be made only in exceptional circumstances. To qualify for an early tenure grant, the faculty member must meet the standards expected of a faculty member for the normal tenure period.

For promotion to professor, a faculty member's performance must be evaluated as demonstrating excellence in research and teaching and substantial contributions to the academic discipline and to the department, school and university.

D. Promotion and Tenure Processes

The personnel committee for promotion and tenure to associate professor is all tenured faculty members.

1. All tenured faculty members review the materials for promotion and tenure that are submitted by the candidate.
2. All tenured faculty members meet and vote on whether the candidate should be granted promotion and tenure. Only faculty members that are present for the deliberation are allowed to vote, and the vote takes place at the meeting (not electronically). The department chair is not present at this meeting.
3. The elected personnel committee writes the recommendation letter to the department chair. If the vote is split, and if the number of faculty members voting with the minority is three or more, than the personnel committee letter will provide both positions in one letter that is signed by all. Otherwise, only one position will be reported in the recommendation from the personnel committee to the department chair. The number of persons supporting each position always will be reported in the letter.

The personnel committee for promotion and tenure to full professor is all tenured full professors.

1. All tenured full professors review the materials for promotion and tenure that submitted by the candidate.
2. All tenured full professors meet and vote on whether the candidate should be granted promotion and tenure. Only faculty members that are present for the deliberation are allowed to vote, and the vote takes place at the meeting (not electronically). The department chair is not present at this meeting.
3. The elected personnel committee writes the recommendation letter to the department chair. If the vote is split, and if the number of faculty members voting with the minority is three or more, than the personnel committee letter will provide both positions in one letter that is signed by all. Otherwise, only one position will be reported in the recommendation from the personnel committee to the department chair. The number of persons supporting each position always will be reported in the letter.

E. Guidelines for the Review of Sabbatical Leave

DISPAT will review sabbatical leave proposals and will advise the Chair in writing of its evaluation. The Chair will make a recommendation to the Dean of the School of Business and will include an indication of how the integrity of the teaching, advisement, graduate research direction,

research, and administration of the program within the Department will be maintained during the faculty member's absence.

Criteria to be applied by DISPAT are contained in the University ACD Manual, which states in part (ACD 705):

A sabbatical leave is not deferred compensation to which an administrator, faculty member, or academic professional is entitled after six years of institutional commitment, but is granted or denied on the merits of the individual proposal upon the recommendation of the university

The applicant will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

1. potential value to the teaching program of the department
2. probable enhancement of the applicant's effectiveness
3. potential value to the reputation of the institution
4. contribution to knowledge and
5. provision of outstanding public or professional institutional commitment at a local or national level.

In evaluating sabbatical requests, DISPAT shall consider whether the application convincingly demonstrates incremental benefit to the Department beyond normal faculty workload expectations, based on one or more of the listed criteria. Additionally, DISPAT shall review the applicant's record on previous sabbaticals in arriving at its recommendation. The collection and submission of supporting materials pertinent to the sabbatical decision, including reports filed regarding previous sabbaticals, is the responsibility of the individual faculty member.

F. Post-Tenure Review Guidelines

The purpose of this section is to describe a set of mechanisms and procedures for the Department's implementation of the Post-tenure review (PTR) policy instituted by the Arizona Board of Regents. The overall aim of these mechanisms and procedures is to assure a rational and performance based PTR system that is fair and impartial and is consistent with the implementation guidelines of the School and the University.

1. Post-Tenure Review Process

The post-tenure review process consists of two stages. The first stage coincides with the annual merit review, in which DISPAT evaluates all faculty members in the areas of teaching, research and other scholarly activities, and institutional commitment using the following rating scale: 1) very high merit, 2) high merit, 3) merit, or 4) no merit. An assessment of high merit, medium merit, or merit serves as sufficient evidence of satisfactory performance for purposes of post-tenure review. An assessment of no merit in an area does not necessarily translate into unsatisfactory performance. However, it signals the need for further evaluation of whether the faculty member's performance is satisfactory according to the post-tenure review standards.

The second stage of post-tenure review applies only to tenured faculty members who receive an assessment of no merit in one or more of the areas of teaching, research and other scholarly activities, or institutional commitment. Immediately following the annual merit review, DISPAT will evaluate the faculty member's performance in light of the post-tenure review standards or specific goals of any pre-existing Faculty Development Plan and assign an initial rating of either: 1) satisfactory, or 2) *tentatively* unsatisfactory. Faculty receiving an assessment of tentatively unsatisfactory will then be given the opportunity to provide additional evidence to demonstrate that their performance is satisfactory. After the faculty member has the opportunity to provide additional information (2 weeks following notification of the tentative assessment), DISPAT will make a final evaluation of satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

Consistent with School and University guidelines, an overall assessment of satisfactory or unsatisfactory will be determined from the individual assessments of teaching, research and other scholarly activities, and institutional commitment. A normal workload is essential for satisfactory. Typically, a normal workload will include an annual teaching load of 4 or more course sections or 12 or more credit hours. An overall rating of unsatisfactory will result from unsatisfactory performance in teaching. An overall rating of unsatisfactory may result from unsatisfactory performance in institutional

commitment and/or research and other scholarly activities depending upon the emphasis assigned to the areas in the goal-based agreement between the faculty member and the unit head.

Faculty receiving an overall unsatisfactory rating will enter the School of Business Performance Improvement Process. Faculty who receive an unsatisfactory assessment in institutional commitment or research and other scholarly activities, but not an overall assessment of unsatisfactory, will participate in a Department level Faculty Development Plan. Information about these performance improvement plans is provided in the School of Business Guidelines for Implementation of Post-Tenure Review Policy.

2. Teaching

The primacy of this function is demonstrated by the fact that an assessment of unsatisfactory performance in teaching will lead to an assessment of overall unsatisfactory performance.

The standard teaching load for tenured faculty is four courses per academic year. Reduced or increased teaching loads may be assigned, based on an individual faculty member's research productivity.

- a. Productivity will be measured in terms of quantity and quality of publications
- b. Productivity will be measured over the 3-year window based on acceptance dates used in annual performance evaluations
- c. Teaching load decisions should be based on comparing individual faculty performance to absolute standards, not on the basis of relative performance rankings vis-à-vis colleagues.

Teaching performance is evaluated according to the Faculty Review Procedures of the Department, and the Post-Tenure Review Guidelines of the School and the University. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to present evidence of satisfactory performance.

Unsatisfactory teaching may be evidenced by any combination of factors that result in unacceptable levels of qualitative and/or quantitative performance. It is not possible to enumerate an exhaustive and explicit set of conditions that define unsatisfactory performance. However, the following illustrations may be useful:

- (a) A consistent and repeating pattern of overall incompetence that impedes student learning as evidenced by:

unsatisfactory preparation or delivery,

unsuitable pedagogy,
unsatisfactory student evaluations,
outdated content or subject matter,
failure to stay current in the course subject matter,
capricious or irresponsible grading standards,
uncivil treatment of students,
inappropriate performance expectations.

(b) A consistent and repeating pattern of inability or unwillingness to develop and/or teach course materials required by the curriculum in the general area of the faculty member's expertise.

3. Research and Other Scholarly Activities

Faculty members are expected to be current and familiar with developments in the field. A broad interpretation of this expectation is taken to mean knowledge of the contemporary literature and the consequential patterns and trends.

4. Institutional Commitment (Service)

Institutional commitment includes internal and external contributions to the achievement of Department goals and objectives that are not classified as teaching or research and other scholarly activities. Institutional Commitment contributions may include external institutional commitment, professional institutional commitment, community institutional commitment, and internal institutional commitment to the Department, School, and University. These various forms of contribution are described in Sections I.A.3. and I.A.4. of this document. It shall be the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate the contribution of these activities to the academic discipline and/or to the Department, School, or University. Assessment will be based upon the outcomes of activities rather than the activities themselves.

Institutional commitment shall be deemed unsatisfactory if a faculty member demonstrates repeatedly an unwillingness or inability to make a positive contribution to the governance structure of the

Department, School, or University. Also, failure to contribute externally to the academic discipline may lead to unsatisfactory institutional commitment performance if not compensated for by institutional commitment and commitment.

IV. ASSESSMENT OF ADJUNCT FACULTY MEMBERS

The adjunct faculty and lecturers will elect one representative to participate in DISPAT deliberations of non-tenure track faculty member issues. Concurrent with the annual faculty review, the Chair, DISPAT (including the elected non-tenured representative) shall review and evaluate each adjunct faculty member and lecturer. Performance criteria applied shall be those contained in the individual's employment agreement with the School. These letters shall be provided by the Chair to DISPAT as a basis for performance review.

The collection of supporting materials pertinent to the review is the responsibility of the individual adjunct faculty member and lecturer. Adjunct faculty members should refer to Appendices A and B for a list of appropriate supporting material and the appropriate reporting format for teaching evaluations.

V. ASSESSMENT OF CHAIR

An annual evaluation of the Chair will be conducted by the DIS's senior faculty senator. The evaluation form adopted by the Faculty Senate shall be used, and the procedures established by the Faculty Senate shall be followed in the evaluation process.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:

MATERIALS TO BE PROVIDED BY THE FACULTY MEMBER FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE EVALUATIONS

It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to provide the following materials:

1. An updated vita, detailing the candidate's activities in teaching, research and other scholarly activities contributing to the academic discipline and to the department, school, or university.
2. A summary analysis of teaching evaluations including, but not limited to, summaries of student evaluations.
3. A copy of two to four publications or printed materials reflecting the scholarly endeavors of the faculty member. These copies become part of the file that is forwarded to DPAC and to the Academic Vice President. Access to ALL publications and other evidence of scholarly endeavors should be made readily available.
4. For promotion and tenure evaluations, a candidate must include a statement providing a historical and current assessment of contributions to research and teaching and other scholarly activities contributing to the academic discipline and to the department, school and university. The statement should include an examination of the candidate's progress in contrast to a set of peers selected by the candidate from other high quality information systems programs from the Department's aspirational peer Departments/Programs or Schools. Evidence in support of a candidate's research success should include an analysis of contributions to the literature as based on, for example, how one's published works have been cited and/or advanced in subsequent studies.

APPENDIX A - 1:

UPDATED ANNUAL REVIEW TEMPLATE:



G:\MY WORK FILES\
Information Systems\

APPENDIX B:

A SUGGESTED FORMAT FOR SUMMARY OF TEACHING EVALUATIONS

The following format is preferred for presentation of summary data from student evaluation of

Calendar Year 2007

Time Period	Spring 2007	Summer 2007	Fall 2007				
Course:							
ID	CIS 105	CIS 502	CIS 340				
Line number	12345	23456	34567				
Platform	Undergrad	MBA Evening	On Line				
On load or overload	On load	On load	Overload				
Respondents:							
Total enrolled	50	45	60				
Number responding to evaluation	45	25	40				
% responding	80.00%	55.56%	66.67				
Category/Question:	<u>Trimmed Averages¹</u>						
Course Structure	X	Y	Z				
Learning Climate	X	Y	Z				
Instructor Involvement	X	Y	Z				
Academic Rigor	X	Y	Z				
Evaluation	X	Y	Z				
Overall Average ²	Avg(X)	Avg(Y)	Avg(Z)				

1 – Use the trimmed means as reported in the evaluation summaries generated by the School.

2 – Overall average to be the average of the five trimmed category means

APPENDIX C:

DISPAT ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REVIEW PROCESS

I. Research Evaluation

- Based on the past 3 calendar years
- Based on publication date (not acceptance date)
- Contributors to Research
 - IS Journals: Premier, A, B, and C/Other refereed publications
 - Refereed Conference Proceedings
 - Conference Presentations
 - Textbooks, Case Studies, Book Chapters
 - Technical Reports, White Papers
 - Funded Research Grants
 - Research Awards
- Ratings
 - Annual research evaluation is different from P&T evaluation
 - These are minimum standards for each category. For example, 1A only qualifies for a “Satisfactory” rating, and 1C only qualifies for a “No Merit - Needs Improvement”.

Evaluation Rubric

	Tenured/Tenure Track		Clinical	Lecturer
Very High Merit	1 Premier + 2 (A, B, or C) OR 2 Premier	Academically Qualified / Professionally Qualified	1B OR 1C + Other Research**	Applicability of the research category is based on employment contract. If applicable, then Only Other Research**
High Merit	1A + 2 (B or C) OR 1 Premier + 1 (A, B or C) OR 2A			
Merit	2C+1 Other Research** OR 1B + 1C OR 1A + 1 Other Research** OR 1 Premier			
Satisfactory	In the past three years has one peer reviewed journal article OR a funded research grant through a nationally competitive peer-reviewed process			
No Merit – Needs Improvement	In the past three years does not have either one peer reviewed journal article OR a funded research grant through a nationally competitive peer-reviewed process	No Merit – Needs Improvement	No Evidence of scholarship	If applicable – No Research Activity
No Merit – Unsatisfactory	Two consecutive years in “No Merit – Needs Improvement	No Merit – Unsatisfactory	Two consecutive years in “No Merit – Need Improvement” (No journal article in 4 years)	Two consecutive years in “No Merit – Need Improvement” (No research activity in 4 years)

- **Other Research = other research with significant scholarly impact (e.g., Peer Review Conference Proceedings, Carnegie Scholarship of Teaching recognizes leading textbooks that have an impact on the discipline)

Updated rubric 3/24/2011

- Personnel Committee to focus on factors controlled by faculty
 - Teaching Effectiveness is multi-dimensional
 - The objective criteria for teaching will focus on the course teaching evaluation scores against platform averages
 - The committee will also consider student comments, material enhancements, and grade distributions (Section 1.1 and 1.2 in the annual report)
- Department Chair to consider additional factors
 - Number of sections, preparations, platforms, new course, course impact for the department, coordinator role
- Personnel Committee would like to recommend independent feedback for faculty development
 - Particularly focus on new faculty, PhD students, and faculty with a below “Satisfactory” rating
- Teaching load
 - Non-tenure track (Standard: 8 sections)
 - Minus 1 for research activity
 - Tenured (Standard: 4 sections)
 - Minus 1/Plus 2 based on research activity
 - Tenure track (Standard: 3 sections)
- Off-load teaching evaluations to be included in performance evaluation
 - Excluding off-load
- Student comments and grade distributions will be provided by the department

III. Services Evaluation

- Dimensions to be considered
 - Level of service (Department, School, University, Discipline)
 - Charge of the committee and associated workload
 - Committee chair provides
 - Accomplishments for the year
 - Insights into outlier performance
 - Role on the committee (Chair, member...); Elected/non-elected
 - Section 3.1 in the annual report
 - When evaluating service, the committee will NOT take into account whether the service contributed is a “paid or unpaid” position
- Expectations vary by rank
 - Need to clarify for clinical professors and lecturers

Department of Information Systems
Journal List
Finalized on March 12, 2012

Premier Journals

1. Information Systems Research
2. Journal of the Association for Information Systems
3. Journal of Management Information Systems
4. Management Information Systems Quarterly

A Journals

1. ACM Transactions on Management Information Systems
2. Decision Sciences
3. Decision Support Systems
4. European Journal of Information Systems
5. IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management
6. IEEE Transactions on Knowledge & Data Engineering
7. IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering
8. IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics

A- Journals

1. ACM Transactions on Database Systems
2. ACM Transactions on Human Computer Studies
3. ACM Transactions on Information Systems
4. Communications of the ACM
5. Communications of the AIS
6. Electronic Commerce Research and Applications
7. European Journal of Operational Research
8. IEEE Computer
9. IEEE Transactions on Dependable & Secure Computing
10. Information and Management
11. Information Systems Frontiers
12. Information Systems Journal
13. International Journal of Human Computer Studies
14. INFORMS Journal of Computing
15. Journal of Electronic Commerce Research
16. Journal of Information Systems
17. Journal of Information Technology
18. Journal of the Operational Research Society
19. Journal of Strategic Information Systems
20. MISQ Executive