

**ALBERS SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS**

**FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

Approved by Ballot: December 3, 2003  
(Amended December 5, 2003)  
Amendment Approved by Ballot: June, 2005

Amendment Approved by Voice Vote:  
February, 2007  
Amendment Approved by Voice Vote: May,  
2009  
Amendment Approved by Ballot: June, 2009

Amendments Approved by Voice Vote and  
Ballot: November, 2009 and June, 2010  
respectively

Amendments Approved by Voice Vote and  
Ballot: May, 2012

Amendments Approved by Voice Vote:  
May, 2014

Amendments Approved by Voice Vote:  
June, 2015

Amendments Approved by Voice Vote:  
October, 2015

## PREAMBLE

### General Description

The performance evaluation process is intended to cultivate and reward members of the faculty who ably carry out the missions and strategic priorities of the Albers School of Business and Economics and Seattle University.

The following guidelines describe the bases on which department chairs, personnel committees, and the Albers Dean will formulate decisions regarding salary adjustments, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. They also inform faculty of the expectations for successful performance and provide a basis for developmental consultations between faculty and chairs.

The performance evaluation process employs a simple classification framework. There are five performance categories for each area—teaching, scholarship, and service—in which faculty are evaluated. Each set of category descriptions is preceded by general commentary concerning expectations and evidence of performance. The descriptions themselves then carefully articulate the criteria for each of the performance levels; the criteria are sufficiently detailed to facilitate assessment and classification.

The performance categories are defined as follows:

- Meets Expectations (Level 2)
- Significantly Exceeds Expectations (Level 3)
- Extraordinary (Level 4)
- Partially Meets Expectations (Level 1)
- Does Not Meet Expectations (Level 0)

The Albers School and Seattle University expect a great deal from their faculty. Faculty members are *expected* to be excellent teachers. Faculty members are *expected* to be active scholars. Every member of the faculty is *expected* to do his or her part to ensure the welfare of students, colleagues, and community. It is anticipated that the majority of faculty in each of the three areas will be classified as Meets Expectations.

While most faculty members will meet the lofty expectations of the School and University, some will surpass them. And there may be some who do not live up to them. The evaluation process is designed to recognize truly exceptional performance. And its articulation of criteria for expected performance provides a sound basis on which to judge faculty who are not living up to standards.

### Procedures

In accordance with University policy (see the Seattle University *Faculty Handbook*), all tenured and tenure-track faculty are evaluated annually on a calendar-year basis.

The annual evaluation process begins in early January, when faculty members submit materials to their department chairs. The evaluation packet should include a descriptive summary for each of the three areas in which performance is evaluated. As discussed further below, each summary should describe the faculty member's activities and accomplishments for the past calendar year. Specific criteria for each of the three areas are discussed in the corresponding sections of this document. The faculty member should also submit a completed "Individual Faculty Development Plan."

Descriptive summaries should be accompanied by appropriate supporting materials. As discussed further in the sections below, for teaching, these may include the following:

- course syllabi and related materials
- samples of graded assignments, papers, and/or exams
- peer reviews of teaching and/or course materials

Student course evaluations and grade distributions will be an integral part of submitted teaching materials. For scholarship, copies of acceptance letters or actual publications should be provided as appropriate. Supporting materials may include correspondence with editors, conference organizers, etc.; manuscripts under review; working papers or other significant work in progress; etc. For service, supporting materials may include assorted correspondence, committee reports that indicate depth of participation, etc.

Once all the materials have been received, department chairs will evaluate the faculty in their respective departments according to the guidelines set forth below. The chairs will classify performance in teaching, scholarship, and service for each faculty member.

When the classifications are completed by the department chairs, they will convene to discuss and, as appropriate, revise their evaluations. The primary purpose of the chairs' meeting is to ensure consistency of evaluations and scores across the departments. Once the classifications are settled among the chairs, the scores for each faculty member will be weighted as follows and forwarded to the Albers Dean:

Teaching—45%  
Scholarship—37.5%  
Service—17.5%

In consultation with one another, the Dean and five department chairs may make final adjustments to the weighted-average scores. With the counsel of department chairs, the Dean will then specify the standard by which weighted-average scores will be converted to salary increments. At his or her discretion, the Dean may make further adjustments (e.g., for bonuses or to align with market trends) to the calculated increases.

Once the evaluations are complete, chairs will meet with each of the faculty members in their departments to review the evaluations, identify areas for improvement, and discuss goals for the present year. Depending on the timing of the University's annual budgeting process, salary information may or may not be available when these meetings take place.

## Faculty on Sabbatical and Leave of Absence

Faculty on sabbatical or paid and unpaid leaves of absence will be evaluated as follows, unless specific evaluation guidelines are included in the sabbatical proposal and approved:

1. Faculty who miss one quarter of an evaluated year due to sabbatical or leave will be evaluated according to the guidelines described in this document with expectations for quantity adjusted accordingly. This applies regardless of the length of the sabbatical or leave --for a 1-quarter sabbatical or leave, for each year of a 2-quarter sabbatical or leave that spans calendar years, and for the calendar year of a 3-quarter sabbatical or leave in which one of the quarters fall.
2. Faculty who miss two or more quarters in a calendar year will receive an evaluation score for that year equal to the average of their scores for the three previous evaluation years.

Thus, unless otherwise arranged through an approved sabbatical proposal, evaluations for faculty on sabbatical or leave will be as follows:

Any calendar year with one quarter of sabbatical or leave	evaluated for the remainder of that year, with appropriate adjustments in quantity expectations
Any calendar year with two or more quarters of sabbatical or leave	individual's average score from the previous three evaluation years

## Faculty with Partial Positions

A faculty member with a partial position (e.g., a faculty member who shares a full-time position) will be evaluated according to the guidelines in this document. Expectations will be adjusted as appropriate to match the portion of a position that the faculty member holds.

## Appeals

Faculty members are entitled to appeal their evaluations. The process begins with a formal appeal to the Albers Executive Committee, consisting of the Albers Dean and department chairs. If the matter is not resolved by the Executive Committee, the faculty member may appeal to the Albers Personnel Committee. If the appeal is not resolved at that level, the faculty member may continue to pursue the matter in accordance with the University's faculty grievance procedures (as provided in the *Faculty Handbook*).

### **Three-Year Reviews, Tenure, and Promotion**

As noted above, department chairs, personnel committees, and the Albers School Dean will rely on the annual evaluation process to inform decisions regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Faculty, chairs, personnel committee members, and the Dean are referred to the *Faculty Handbook* and *Guidelines for File Preparation and Presentation* (both available at the Office of the Provost) for procedures related to three-year reviews and consideration for tenure and/or promotion.

### **Composition of Personnel Committees**

All three-year reviews and applications for tenure and/or promotion will be reviewed by the appropriate department personnel committee, the department chair, the Albers Personnel Committee, and the Albers Dean.

Each department personnel committee will be composed of all tenured faculty members of the department. Except as stipulated below, all members of the department personnel committee who hold the rank of associate or full professor will participate and vote in any meeting concerning three-year reviews, tenure, and/or promotion. Members who hold the rank of assistant professor will participate but not vote in such meetings.

Each department personnel committee must elect a chair. The department chair is not eligible to serve as the personnel committee chair. The personnel committee chair will moderate the deliberations of any committee meeting and, as required by University policy, draft a letter which summarizes the committee's votes and recommendations.

A department personnel committee should have at least three voting members. If a voting member is serving on the school personnel committee or university Rank and Tenure Committee, the faculty member should vote only at the department level if there are fewer than three other voting members in the department. If the department still lacks three voting members, the Dean, in consultation with the Executive Committee, will appoint qualified voting members from other departments so that three votes can be cast in the department committee recommendation.

The Albers Personnel Committee will be composed as follows: The Committee will comprise a total of seven tenured faculty members who hold the rank of associate or full professor. Each of the five departments (Accounting, Economics, Finance, Management, and Marketing) will elect one such member. The Albers Dean will appoint two at-large members. Department chairs will not be eligible to serve on the Albers Personnel Committee. The Dean should ensure that the Committee includes at least two faculty members who hold the rank of full professor. If necessary, the Dean should use his or her at-large appointments for this purpose. All members of the Albers Personnel Committee will serve staggered three-year terms. If it is necessary to replace a Committee member, a replacement will be elected or appointed as appropriate (e.g., an elected member will be replaced by an elected member).

If a member of the Albers Personnel Committee is a candidate for promotion, the member will take a leave of absence from the committee for the year in which their application is considered. If the member is serving as the department representative, the department will elect a replacement for the year. If the member has been appointed by the dean, the dean will appoint a replacement for the year.

All seven members of the Albers Personnel Committee will participate and vote in any meeting concerning three-year reviews, tenure, and/or promotion, regardless of rank. Members of the Albers Personnel Committee will participate, but not vote, in the meetings of their respective department personnel committees.

Members of the Albers Personnel Committee must elect a chair. The chair will moderate the deliberations of any Committee meeting and, as required by University policy, draft a letter which summarizes the Committee's votes and recommendations.

## EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The Albers School of Business and Economics is committed foremost to excellence in teaching. As articulated in Seattle University's *Faculty Handbook*,

The excellent teacher possesses a thorough and current knowledge of his or her discipline... He or she conveys key concepts and values in the discipline, enables students to learn the critical thinking and investigative processes of that discipline, and models appropriate strategies of inquiry and scholarship. The excellent teacher engages students actively in their own learning and promotes a spirit of inquiry and openness to knowledge. The excellent teacher organizes the course in a coherent way, describes clearly the expectations for students, uses appropriate evaluative techniques, and provides students with useful and frequent feedback about their learning. The excellent teacher shows a respect for his or her students and creates an environment that enables their growth as persons.

As AACSB International—The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)—advises, “Faculty members must be capable to respond to questions from a deep understanding of theoretical, empirical, and practical knowledge of the subject matter they teach.” Faculty should also provide ample opportunities for students to interact with them “as a part of their educational programs.”

The goal of teaching excellence is to cultivate students who possess a spirit of inquiry and openness to knowledge; who are able to think critically and rigorously; who are able to communicate effectively; and who are compassionate and ethical in their personal and professional lives. Albers students, more particularly, should be able to use information effectively. They should be able to identify key issues or problems related to business or public policy, and they should be able to formulate meaningful opinions or solutions. In addition, they should work well with others, and they should know how to use current business technologies.

Teaching excellence demands much of the faculty. Above all else, faculty must remain current in their respective fields. They should be able to continuously incorporate new knowledge into the content and materials of existing courses, and they should be able to develop and/or teach new courses as needed. A faculty member who is current is also more likely to be able to fulfill other essential aspects of teaching excellence:

- linking content to current business practice and public policy
- introducing, discussing, and applying concepts in a rigorous fashion
- responding effectively to questions regarding concepts or applications
- helping students learn and apply appropriate investigative processes
- developing and using appropriate and rigorous evaluative techniques
- issuing grades that accurately reflect the extent of student learning

Teaching excellence also requires generous opportunities for faculty-student interaction, in a variety of forms:

- openness to questions, comments, or discussion in class
- convenient office hours for questions, discussion, or advising
- timely, fair, and useful feedback on assignments, papers, or exams
- supervision of independent study projects, collaborative research,<sup>1</sup> research, or internships

For every course, teaching excellence requires a clear statement of expectations and an organized and thorough delivery of course content. As appropriate, teaching excellence also encompasses the following:

- emphasis on global dimensions of business
- attention to ethics and social responsibility
- integration of relevant business technologies
- emphasis on teamwork and conflict resolution
- development and/or use of service learning projects
- development of innovative instructional techniques
- development and implementation of new courses
- major revision of existing courses or materials

### **Evidence for Evaluation**

The evaluation of teaching performance will rely on descriptive summaries provided by faculty, student course evaluations and, as appropriate, other sources of information that concern the aspects of teaching excellence articulated above.

Each faculty member is required to submit a descriptive summary of his or her teaching activities for the calendar year. To begin, the summary should indicate (1) each course that the faculty member prepared and, for each course, (2) whether it was required or an elective and (3) the number of students enrolled. If relevant, the summary should also describe independent study projects, collaborative research, research, or internships that the faculty member supervised. The summary should then highlight and discuss the following aspects of teaching performance:

- satisfaction of departmental needs
- currency of course content and related materials
- rigor of teaching methods and assignments
- grading rationale and grade distributions

---

<sup>1</sup> Collaborative research projects occur within the Albers Faculty-Student Research Program.

The evaluation process will use all information provided by student course evaluations. In particular, numerical scores for *all* categories in the course evaluation instrument *and* written comments must be carefully considered. It is expected that student evaluations will be particularly informative for the following aspects of teaching performance:

- accessibility
- responsiveness
- organization
- ability to motivate

As appropriate, the faculty member's descriptive summary should address any notable items in the course evaluations. In addition, the faculty member may choose to submit any of the following supporting materials:

- course syllabi, required texts, and other reading materials
- samples of graded assignments, projects, papers, or exams
- peer reviews of classroom teaching and/or course materials

### **Meets Expectations (Level 2)**

Faculty members who meet expectations are current, rigorous, thorough, and organized. They are able to prepare and effectively deliver courses in accordance with departmental needs, and the content of their courses is consistent with curriculum objectives set forth by the School and its departments. Their courses reflect current thinking and analytical methods, and they reveal relevant links to current business practice.

Faculty members who meet expectations prepare material, assignments, and exams that challenge students and hone their analytical, critical thinking, and communication skills. Their courses exploit opportunities to address ethical and socially responsible behavior and/or global dimensions of business, and whenever appropriate, they incorporate team projects and/or relevant business technologies.

Faculty members who meet expectations are accessible and responsive to their students. They provide timely and meaningful feedback and display a willingness to engage with students in or out of class.

Evidence of performance that meets expectations includes the following:

- student evaluations that reflect successful teaching performance
- grade distributions that are consistent with School standards
- clear, organized, and thorough course syllabi
- texts, readings, and other materials that reflect currency
- appropriate and rigorous assignments, projects, and exams

Student evaluations express the degree of student satisfaction with critical aspects of a faculty member's teaching. A faculty member who meets expectations will have scores that are within a reasonable range of School averages for key categories on the student evaluation instrument. The annual evaluation process will give due consideration to all categories on the numerical evaluation instrument and to the written comments provided by students. Student comments will generally be favorable; they will not systematically suggest any problems.

Grades should provide an accurate assessment of student learning. Grade distributions are expected to fall within ranges deemed acceptable by the School.

Course syllabi should clearly state objectives and expectations that are consistent with those set forth by the School and its departments. Course materials should be obviously current; assignments and exams should emphasize critical thinking and analytical rigor. Graded coursework should show thorough and meaningful feedback. (As noted above, faculty may, but are not required to, submit these materials.)

The number and breadth of course preparations may also be considered in the evaluation process. Most importantly, the faculty member should be willing and able to satisfy the needs of his or her department. Typically, a faculty member will have a combination of two or three undergraduate and graduate course preparations.

Finally, the evaluation process may also give favorable consideration to peer reviews or other efforts to improve the structure, content, and/or delivery of the faculty member's courses.

### **Significantly Exceeds Expectations (Level 3)**

In addition to fulfilling the criteria articulated above, teaching performance that exceeds expectations will exhibit some combination of the following characteristics:

superior performance as measured by student course evaluations  
notable innovation in curriculum or instructional techniques  
unusual breadth of course preparations

A faculty member whose course evaluation scores are consistently at or near the top of the scale and for whom written comments consistently and favorably highlight essential aspects of superior teaching significantly exceeds expectations if, in addition, he or she undertakes significant measures to ensure ongoing excellence in existing courses.

A faculty member whose course evaluation scores are consistently above the School's averages and for whom written comments are generally favorable significantly exceeds expectations if, in addition, he or she prepares an unusual breadth of (three or more) courses or undertakes significant measures to refine and improve existing courses or completes an Independent Research Project.<sup>2</sup>

A faculty member who engages in one or more of the following activities significantly exceeds expectations if his or her course evaluation scores fall within a reasonable range of School averages and written comments do not systematically suggest any problems:

- prepares an unusual breadth of courses
- prepares and delivers an entirely new course
- revamps or thoroughly revises an existing course
- develops and employs new instructional techniques
- integrates a significant business technology into a course
- develops and introduces a service learning or other major project
- supervises multiple independent projects or internships
- completes an Independent Research Project

#### **Extraordinary (Level 4)**

A faculty member whose course evaluation scores are consistently at or near the top of the scale and for whom written comments consistently and favorably highlight essential aspects of superior teaching merits an extraordinary classification if, in addition, he or she prepares an unusual breadth of courses or undertakes significant measures to refine and improve existing courses or completes an Independent Research Project

A faculty member who executes one or more of the activities listed under Significantly Exceeds Expectations may merit an extraordinary rating if his or her course evaluation scores are consistently above the School's averages and written comments are generally favorable. For extraordinary performance, unusual breadth implies at least four distinct courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels. An entirely new course contributes to the depth or breadth of the School's curriculum or raises the visibility of the School or University. Newly introduced technologies and service learning or other major projects are similarly significant. New instructional techniques or substantial upgrades are done for more than one course. The faculty member is actively sought by numerous students to supervise independent projects, collaborative research, research, or internships, or to counsel or serve as a reference. The faculty member may also be sought by his or her peers to review their teaching and/or course materials.

---

<sup>2</sup> Independent Research Projects are completed within the Albers Faculty-Student Research Program.

### **Partially Meets Expectations (Level 1)**

A faculty member who partially meets expectations clearly and consistently attempts to meet expectations but does not fully succeed.

The faculty member may be equipped to teach only a limited number of courses or may not provide courses that are substantially consistent with curriculum objectives set forth by the School and its departments, or he or she may not offer courses that reflect current thinking, analytical methods, or links to business practice.

Materials, assignments, papers, or exams may not be appropriately rigorous; or obvious opportunities to address issues of ethics, social responsibility, or internationalization and culture, or to incorporate team projects or relevant business technologies may have been missed.

Student evaluations may suggest problems with preparedness, organization, accessibility, responsiveness, or some other aspect of teaching performance. Grade distributions may not be consistent with standards set forth by the School.

### **Does Not Meet Expectations (Level 0)**

A faculty member who does not meet expectations shows little or no inclination to meet expectations.

The faculty member makes no attempt to improve his or her knowledge or skills. He or she is unable to prepare courses that are current or consistent with the objectives set forth by the School and its departments. Course materials and assignments are not sufficiently rigorous, and there are no attempts to exploit obvious opportunities to explore important issues or integrate valuable technologies or learning experiences.

Student evaluations systematically and consistently reveal problems with preparedness, knowledge (and ability to respond to questions), organization, accessibility, fairness, or other key dimensions of teaching performance. And the faculty member displays little effort to issue grades that accurately reflect the extent of student learning.

### **Considerations for Rank and Tenure**

Faculty who apply for tenure and/or advancement in rank should have performed at or above expectations on a consistent basis. It should be noted that, in accordance with the University's *Guidelines for File Preparation and Presentation*, any faculty member who applies for tenure or advancement is required to submit all teaching materials, including syllabi and related materials and samples of graded assignments, exams, and/or papers.

All candidates for rank and tenure and three year reviews must use a specified template to prepare a standardized summary of student course evaluations. This summary is not a substitute for a more detailed analysis of the teaching file. Candidates may present additional analyses of their teaching evaluations, including other graphs or numerical comparisons, but these should be separate from the summary page. The template format can be found on the T: drive for all to access.

Faculty who teach as part of the ELP/EMBA would not include these activities as part of the annual evaluation process. However, these activities may be used to support their case for rank and tenure decisions. Since these activities are compensated outside of the normal faculty contracts, they should not be included in annual merit increase decisions. However, given that the teaching and service for ELP/EMBA are supportive of an Albers program, this information is important for rank and tenure decisions. The teaching evaluations for these programs use different teaching forms and should not be included in the teaching summary template, but may be addressed separately, to support the case for excellent teaching in an Albers program.

Tenure-track faculty members are strongly encouraged as early as possible to seek peer reviews of their teaching, course contents and materials, and grade distributions.

In addition to consistently performing at or above expectations, a faculty member who applies for advancement to the rank of full professor should possess a record that reflects a reasonable breadth of course offerings and, as appropriate, a willingness to experiment with innovative courses, materials, or instructional techniques.

## EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP

The Albers School of Business and Economics is committed to supporting scholarship that is consistent with the missions and strategic priorities of the School and University and the guidelines of the AACSB. The School's mission calls upon faculty to excel in their roles as teacher-scholars. AACSB guidelines stipulate that faculty must establish and maintain their academic qualifications "for current teaching responsibilities." In order to maintain their academic qualifications, "faculty members must be involved in continuous development throughout their careers..."

Every faculty member in the Albers School is expected to engage in scholarship as part of his or her continuous development. While there are myriad scholarly activities that are recognized by the evaluation process, those that are subject to rigorous, external review processes are strongly emphasized. In general, scholarly work may be related to any of the three areas identified by the AACSB: Scholarship (basic research), Practice (applied research), and Learning (pedagogical research).

Consistent with the AACSB principle of evaluating faculty scholarship over the previous five years for determining faculty qualifications, annual evaluation of faculty scholarship will review research activity in the previous five calendar years. A five year window recognizes the long gestation period required for high quality work and minimizes faculty incentives to strategize around a limited evaluation window.

### **Evidence for Evaluation**

The evaluation process purposefully encourages publications in high-quality, reputable journals. When the reputation of a journal is not commonly known by members of the department who are in the corresponding discipline, it is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to substantiate quality. Possible indicators of quality include the following:

- reputation of the publisher or publishing university
- reputations of the editors, members of the editorial board, or of the universities with which they are affiliated
- the journal's standing in published rankings of academic journals (on the basis of citation counts, H-index, etc...)
- whether the journal publishes articles by recognized members of the profession
- whether the journal is often cited in other reputable journals
- whether the journal is widely circulated
- rigor of the journal's refereeing process
- whether peer universities consider the journal to be reputable

Journals will be classified into one of four categories in the Albers Scholarship Impact Scale (ASIS), with four being the journals of highest impact and one being the journals with the least influence. The categories can be described as follows:

4. *The top journals in the field:* Publish the most original and best executed research papers. Journals typically have high submission and low acceptance rates. Papers are stringently refereed and have high citation impact factors in their fields.

3. *Highly regarded journals in the field.* Publish original and well-executed research papers. These journals typically have good submission rates and are very selective in what they publish. Papers are stringently refereed and the journals have fair to good citation impact factors.

2. *Well regarded journals in the field.* Publish original research of an acceptable standard. Papers are fully refereed and the journals have modest citation impact factors.

1. *Recognized journals in the field.* Publish research of a modest standard or has yet to establish a reputation. These journals may not have an impact factor.

The Scholarship Review Committee (SRC) will manage the ASIS classification process. It will consist of seven tenured faculty members, one from each of the five departments and two selected by the dean. The dean should select members so as to have the broadest disciplinary representation possible. Members shall serve staggered three-year terms and will select their chair annually. The purpose of the SRC is to consider all changes to the scholarship assessment scales. The SRC should meet regularly to review requests for new scholarship outlets and, to the extent possible, respond quickly to petitions from faculty who are considering submissions. Appendix I provides guidelines for the SRC to use in its deliberations.

Journal rankings are an imperfect indicator of research impact. Many important articles have been published in lower level journals. Therefore, faculty may petition the SRC that individual scholarship be scored at higher levels than indicated by its journal outlet, providing convincing evidence has been presented by the faculty member. Appendix I has details on the evidence to be provided to the SRC.

Besides its emphasis on publications in high-quality, reputable journals, the evaluation process recognizes the following forms of scholarship:

- books, monographs, and chapters in books
- presentations at major academic or practitioner conferences
- papers published in major conference proceedings
- non-refereed cases or other teaching materials
- other articles, notes, comments, or book reviews in non-refereed journals, books, or collections

For purposes of evaluation, all works will be assigned to the year in which they appear-- publication or presentation dates, except in the most recent year, when they may be credited based on acceptance dates.

For any journal publication, the editor's acceptance letter should be submitted for the evaluation process. For any authored book, monograph, or edited book, a copy of the work in its published form should be submitted.

In general, co-authored publications will receive the same recognition afforded sole-authored publications. Exceptions may occur when there is reason to believe that a faculty member who is listed as a co-author did not contribute significantly to the published work.

For other non-publication activities or when supporting evidence is deemed necessary, documentation may include manuscripts, editors' letters, referees' reports, responses to referees' reports, letters regarding conference participation, research grant applications, etc., as appropriate.

Ongoing scholarship must be evidenced every year in order to maintain Academic Qualification. Evidence of ongoing scholarship may have multiple forms. The annual requirement is at least one item from the following list:

- peer reviewed journal article
- peer reviewed, full-length, published conference paper
- peer-reviewed, published conference paper abstracts
- conference presentations
- Scholarly book
- book chapters
- editor role for scholarly book or journal
- journal article reviews (at least two reviews)
- non-refereed scholarly publications
- significant textbook revision
- tangible work in progress (to be submitted with annual evaluation materials)

A point system will be used to evaluate faculty scholarship, with points assigned for scholarship products as follows:

Level 4+ <sup>3</sup> article:	300 points and Big Hit course release
Level 4 article:	300 points
Level 3 article:	200 points
Level 2 article:	150 points
Level 1 article:	100 points
*Other <sup>4</sup>	
• scholarly book or text book, first edition <sup>5 6</sup>	100
• major paper presentation <sup>7</sup>	50
• minor paper presentation	25
• other presentation <sup>8</sup>	20
• invited chapter to scholarly book	50
• editing a scholarly book	50
• text book, revision	50
• book for application or pedagogy	50

---

<sup>3</sup> Level 4+ is reserved for the same small group of "Big Hit" outlets that are currently identified.

<sup>4</sup> All the scores in the "other" category are suggested minimum scores and may be increased upon consideration.

<sup>5</sup> May count as up to one Level 1 item.

<sup>6</sup> Acceptance of a book should include evidence of completed galley sheets and any accompanying publisher's correspondence. A signed contract to produce a book is insufficient.

<sup>7</sup> Major and Minor paper presentations go through a peer review at submission. A paper presentation is considered major if it is done at a conference that the department designates as such or to a group of "Research-1" type scholars. Conferences that are considered "major" should be identified as part of the Scholarship Impact Scale and not so labeled on a post hoc, case-by-case basis. Publication of the presented paper is not necessary; but, publication in a proceedings for the same venue should not be "double-counted". Note that some conference presentations may have sufficient impact to be scored Level 1 or higher.

<sup>8</sup> The category of "Other" paper presentations is distinguished from "Major" and "Minor" chiefly by a lack of peer review of submissions. Included would be any other scholarly presentations to faculty groups, professional groups, or civilians, such as to SU faculty, to a firm's management group, or to local professional or community groups. If essentially the same presentation is made to multiple audiences, all but one of presentations can be regarded as "Other" presentations. That is, only one of the presentations may be scored as "Major" or "Minor."

- working papers that are published in a formal working paper series -- 25
- translations of already published articles that are subsequently published in other journals or books --25
- invited reprints of published articles that are subsequently published in other journals or books -- 25
- non-refereed publication 10-50<sup>9</sup>
- minor refereed publication 10-50<sup>10</sup>

Book reviews published in refereed journals will be awarded points according to the Albers journal ranking:

Albers Big Hit journals	50 points
Level 4 journals	40 points
Level 3 journals	30 points
Level 2 journals	20 points
Level 1 journals	10 points

Editing scholarly journals is a worthy endeavor that contributes to the profession and advances scholarship. Points for editing can be earned as follows:

- Full editorship of a scholarly journal (to be counted as a Level 1+ product, i.e. as a journal article):
  - o Level 4 journal, 300
  - o Level 3 journal, 200
  - o Level 2 journal, 150
  - o Level 1 journal, 100
- Associate editorship of a scholarly journal (to be awarded points as follows, but only Levels 3 and 4 count as an article):
  - o Level 4 journal, 150
  - o Level 3 journal, 100
  - o Level 2 journal, 75
  - o Level 1 journal, 50
- Full editorship of a scholarly journal, special issue (to be awarded points as follows, but only Levels 3 and 4 count as an article):
  - o Level 4 journal, 150
  - o Level 3 journal, 100
  - o Level 2 journal, 75

---

<sup>9</sup> SRC may determine the impact, which may vary from low to high by *outlet* (e.g., *Puget Sound Business Journal* versus *Wall Street Journal*), *length* (short letter to editor versus 2500 word essay), and *other dimensions*.

<sup>10</sup> SRC may determine that some refereed outlets have insufficient impact to warrant Level 1 but not zero impact. As they are identified, these outlets should be added to ASIS.

- o Level 1 journal, 50
- Serving on an editorial board (to be awarded points as follows, but none count as journal articles)
  - o Level 4 journal, 100
  - o Level 3 journal, 75
  - o Level 2 journal, 50
  - o Level 1 journal, 25

In addition to journal level, faculty who claim credit for editing duties should provide, as part of the annual evaluation materials, a description of the specifics of the details, such as number of papers submitted, number of reviewers supervised, number of parallel people at the journal (for associate editors). Points for editorships are a one-time award and do not accumulate with each year of service.

Faculty with administrative duties, such as department chairs and associate and assistant deans, should have lower scholarship productivity expectations. These faculty members will receive 150 points in the form of credit for one Level 2 publication.

Faculty who are program directors (undergraduate and graduate) will receive 50 points of credit.

When faculty members leave their role as administrators, they will continue to receive these compensating points in their annual evaluation for each year of service up to a maximum of three years.

Evaluation is based on points earned in the previous five years and evidence of ongoing scholarship. The evaluation standards for scholarship are as follows:

**Meets Expectations (Level 2)**

A faculty member who earns at least 350 points in the last five years, with a minimum of 300 points from Level 1-4 items and at least two Level 1-4 items, meets expectations for scholarship. Evidence of on-going scholarship is also expected.

**Significantly Exceeds Expectations (Level 3)**

A faculty member who earns at least 600 points in the last five years, with a minimum of 500 points from Level 1-4 items, significantly exceeds expectations. Evidence of on-going scholarship is also expected.

#### **Extraordinary (Level 4)**

A faculty member who earns at least 900 points in the last five years, with a minimum of 800 points from Level 1-4 items, is considered to be performing at an extraordinary level. Evidence of on-going scholarship is also expected.

#### **Partially Meets Expectations (Level 1)**

A faculty member who earns at least 120 points in the last five years partially meets expectations. Evidence of on-going scholarship is also expected.

#### **Does Not Meet Expectations (Level 0)**

A faculty member who earns less than 120 points in the last five years does not meet expectations.

The five levels of evaluation can be summarized in the table below.

<b>Extraordinary (Level 4)</b>	900 points in 5 years, with <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a minimum of 800 points from Level 1-4</li></ul>
<b>Significantly Exceeds Expectations (Level 3)</b>	600 points in 5 years, with <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a minimum of 500 points from Level 1-4</li></ul>
<b>Meets Expectations (Level 2)</b>	350 points in 5 years, with <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a minimum of 300 points from Level 1-4, and</li><li>• a minimum of 2 Level 1-4 items</li></ul>
<b>Partially Meets Expectations (Level 1)</b>	120 points in 5 years
<b>Does Not Meet Expectations (Level 0)</b>	fewer than 120 points in 5 years

## **Considerations for New Faculty Members**

For new tenure track faculty members for which Albers is their first multi-year appointment, in the **first evaluation year** scoring for scholarship normally will be an automatic Level 2 (as well as for teaching and service). Exceptions will be made for those who meet the usual criteria for higher scores or for those who merit lower scores (due to significant failures to meet expectations).

In the **second evaluation year**, criteria for Levels 3 and 4 are unchanged. The criteria for Levels 1 and 2 are:

### **Meets expectations (2)**

A minimum of 100 points in the previous 5 years, and:  
at least one paper accepted as a level 1-4 item or  
at least one revise-and-resubmit status at a level 1-4 outlet and one paper under review at a level 1-4 outlet;  
and on-going work in progress.

### **Partially meets expectations (1)**

A minimum of 50 points in the previous 5 years, and at least one paper under review at a level 1-4 outlet, and on-going work in progress.

In the **third evaluation year**, the criteria for Levels 3 and 4 are unchanged. The criteria for Levels 1 and 2 are:

### **Meets expectations (2)**

A minimum of 200 points in the previous 5 years, and:  
at least one paper accepted as a level 1-4 item and one paper under review at a level 1-4 outlet or;  
at least two revise-and-resubmit status at a level 1-4 outlet and one paper under review at a level 1-4 outlet;  
and on-going work in progress.

### **Partially meets expectations (1)**

A minimum of 100 points in the previous 5 years and at least one paper, either accepted as a level 1-4 item or under review AND with a revise-and-resubmit status at a level 1-4 outlet, and on-going work in progress.

## Considerations for Rank and Tenure

The expectations for tenure and advancement in rank are generally more stringent than those for annual evaluation purposes.

A faculty member who entered Seattle University in the first of six probationary years will be expected to have earned at least 550 points in the last five years, with a minimum of 300 points from Level 2-4 items and a minimum of three Level 1-4 items, prior to filing his or her application for tenure.

The number of required points for a faculty member who entered Seattle University in the second or later year of the probationary period will be scaled down proportionately. For example, a faculty member entering in the third of six probationary years will be expected to have produced at least 330 points, with a minimum of 180 points from level 2-4 journals and minimum of 2 Level 1-4 items, from the time he or she entered Seattle University. The number of required items is always rounded up.

In all circumstances, the entire body of the faculty member's work must demonstrate an ability to advance knowledge. That is, the faculty member must demonstrate an ability to engage effectively in basic and/or applied research. Thus an assistant professor who will become a candidate for tenure and advancement to the associate level is encouraged to concentrate his or her scholarly efforts in the AACSB-designated areas of Scholarship (basic research) and Practice (applied research).

Faculty members at the associate level are expected to develop records of scholarship that establish them as respected members of their disciplines. Thus while associate professors may pursue wider varieties of scholarly activities, they should continue to emphasize the advancement of knowledge by engaging in basic and/or applied research. An associate professor applying for advancement to the rank of full professor will be expected to have satisfied the following criteria prior to filing his or her application for promotion: (1) either at least 1500 points with a minimum of ten Level 1-4 items over the course of one's career **or** at least 1000 points with a minimum of eight Level 1-4 items over the past ten years, (2) at least four Level 2-4 items over the course of one's career, and (3) at least 600 points in the past five years, with at least 400 points from Level 1-4 items.

Full professors are expected to engage in scholarly activities that advance the reputation of the School and that help cultivate those who rank below. Full professors will tend to pursue much wider varieties of activities, which include authoring text books and other pedagogical materials, extensive editorial or reviewing duties, substantial collaborative efforts, etc.

For tenure and/or promotion to associate or full professor, at least three evaluations from peers outside the university who can speak to the quality and significance of the candidate's scholarly work are required. All evaluators should be recognized contributors to their field. The role of external evaluators should be to assess the significance of the candidate's scholarship within the standards of the discipline. External evaluators should not be asked to attempt to assess candidates against the standards and expectations of Seattle University or their institution. At least two of the external evaluators should be outside the candidate's circle of professional and personal acquaintances. For example, this criterion would exclude, among others, the candidate's former professors or dissertation advisors, former colleagues of the candidate at Seattle University or any other school, and individuals who have co-authored scholarly or pedagogical works with the candidate.

The candidate should submit a list of possible evaluators to his or her department chair along with a description of his or her relationship with each evaluator. At least four external evaluators will be chosen by the department personnel committee from this list and from other qualified individuals. The candidate will be allowed to review the list and strike up to two evaluators from the combined list if she or he feels the evaluator will be biased or is not qualified to review their work. The candidate will provide the personnel committee with a written explanation of their objection, and the committee will then select two other evaluators, taking into account the objections raised for any of the potential evaluators.

The Albers uniform solicitation letter should be sent and signed by the department chair. The solicitation letter should request that the evaluation be returned to the department chair before September 15th. It should ask that the evaluator send a copy of his or her vitae. This should be included as part of the candidate's file. The solicitation letter should state that the department is considering the candidate for the possible tenure and/or promotion and request the following information: (1) how and for how long the external evaluator has known the candidate; and (2) the significance, influence, and promise of the candidate's scholarship. Each evaluator should be provided with the candidate's vitae, a representative set of the candidate's scholarly materials, and the candidate's research statement. The department chair is responsible for reviewing all letters of evaluation promptly upon receipt.

The solicitation letter should be signed by the department chair and should request that the evaluation be returned to the department chair. It should state that the department is considering the candidate for the possible tenure and/or promotion and request the following information: (1) how and for how long the referee has known the candidate; and (2) the significance, influence, and promise of the candidate's scholarship. Each evaluator should be provided with the same representative set of the candidate's scholarly materials.

## EVALUATION OF SERVICE

In keeping with its mission to educate leaders for service, the Albers School of Business and Economics expects its faculty to exemplify a commitment to service and concern for the welfare of students, colleagues, and community. Community comprises the various units of the institution—department, School, and University—the respective professions of the faculty, and the broader public.

The evaluation process considers two key facets of service: breadth and depth. Breadth describes the faculty member's responsiveness to the needs and requests of the various units of the University and the broader community. Breadth also encompasses general collegiality and participation in ongoing activities of the faculty member's department, the School, and the University.

Depth refers to the extent of the faculty member's involvement and the impact of his or her contributions. A faculty member who is deeply involved and who makes significant contributions embraces a leadership role and assumes responsibility for the successful completion of defined tasks. His or her contributions significantly and positively affect the welfare of others.

### **Evidence for Evaluation**

Service activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

- participating in department, School, and University meetings and functions
- participating on department, School, and University committees or task forces
- participating in University governance
- serving as advisor for student organizations
- serving as career advisor for undergraduate students
- serving as mentor or peer reviewer for colleagues
- participating in faculty or student recruiting efforts
- providing expert commentary to the news media
- developing or participating in non-credit programs or workshops
- reviewing textbooks, study guides, and other teaching materials
- editing newsletters, organizing conferences, chairing sessions, holding office, etc., for professional organizations
- advising or serving on commissions or boards for business, government or public service and other non-profit organizations

For purposes of the annual evaluations, activities for which the faculty member receives compensation in excess of a customary honorarium will normally be excluded from his or her service contributions.

For purposes of the annual evaluation, the faculty member should submit a summary of all service activities for the year under review. While it is not necessary to elaborate on routine participation in department, School, and University meetings or other events, the summary should indicate the nature of each significant activity, the faculty member's role, an estimate of time committed, and any other information regarding the depth of participation.

### **Meets Expectations (Level 2)**

A faculty member who meets expectations is generally cooperative and is a dependable colleague. The faculty member clearly does his or her part to fulfill departmental needs. His or her career advisees are responsibly served. He or she is generally available and regularly takes part in meetings and events of the department, School, and University. Others can rely on the faculty member to follow through on service obligations.

In addition, the faculty member will typically be an active member of at least one major committee or task force in the School or University, or he or she may formally serve as the advisor for an active student organization. The faculty member may also be widely recognized as a resource for colleagues on matters of teaching or scholarship or fulfill key roles in activities that serve his or her profession or the broader public.

### **Significantly Exceeds Expectations (Level 3)**

A faculty member who significantly exceeds expectations will be involved in activities that exhibit substantially greater breadth and/or depth than is normally expected. He or she may actively advise an unusually large number of students or serve as a mentor for several colleagues. He or she may volunteer for, or willingly accept, a leadership role and assume responsibility for the successful completion of defined tasks. Service will extend beyond the department and typically, but not necessarily, beyond the School.

Significant service activities may include, but are not limited to, any of the following:

- chairing a major committee or task force
- organizing a major conference or similar event
- directing a major program, center, or institute
- active involvement in University governance
- holding an elected office in a professional organization
- participating on an advisory board for a government or service entity

### **Extraordinary (Level 4)**

Extraordinary service is that which exhibits substantially greater breadth *and* depth than is normally expected. The faculty member frequently assumes responsibility. He or she also takes the initiative to seek and organize activities that significantly contribute to the welfare of students, colleagues, and community.

The faculty member whose service is extraordinary is deeply involved at multiple levels of the institution. And he or she serves the broader community by holding a major office in a professional organization, actively advising on the boards of governmental agencies and/or other civic organizations, etc.

The faculty member will be recognized within the University and broader community as one whose contributions significantly and positively affect the welfare of others.

### **Partially Meets Expectations (Level 1)**

A faculty member who only partially meets expectations provides service that is lacking in breadth or depth. The faculty member may not be consistently available for students or colleagues; and he or she may not regularly attend department, School, and University meetings and events.

Although basically cooperative, the faculty member is generally reluctant to respond to requests from the department, School, or University. When the faculty member agrees to serve, attendance at committee or task force meetings may be inconsistent; and/or he or she is a passive participant, contributing little effort or creative energy to the successful completion of defined tasks.

### **Does Not Meet Expectations (Level 0)**

The service of a faculty member who does not meet expectations is seriously lacking in breadth and depth. The faculty member often misses department, School, and University meetings and events; is generally not available to students or colleagues; does not serve on any significant committee or task force; and often refuses requests from his or her department, the School, or the University.

A faculty member at this level is generally not a dependable colleague. He or she tends to increase the burden on others to fulfill the needs of the University community.

### **Considerations for Rank and Tenure**

Any faculty member who applies for tenure or advancement in rank will be expected to have performed at or above expectations on a consistent basis. His or her service record should reflect consistent reliability, increasing involvement, and increasingly significant contributions over time. Although compensated consulting activity is excluded from annual evaluations, when the business community repeatedly seeks a faculty member's professional advice and counsel, whether compensated or not, it provides a valuable service to the community as well as an external validation of the reputation of the faculty of the school. Candidates for rank and tenure may include evidence that compensated or uncompensated consulting service has contributed to the reputation of the University. That evidence is enhanced if the activity relates to a candidate's teaching or scholarship or building relationships with the business community.

Faculty who provide service as part of the ELP/EMBA would not include these activities as part of the annual evaluation process. However, these activities may be used to support their case for rank and tenure decisions. Since these activities are compensated outside of the normal faculty contracts, they should not be included in annual merit increase decisions. However, given that the teaching and service for ELP/EMBA are supportive of an Albers program, this information is important for rank and tenure decisions.

A faculty member applying for advancement to the rank of full professor should possess a record that clearly demonstrates a positive impact on the welfare of the University.

## Appendix I

### Guidelines for Proposing Changes to the Albers Scholarship Impact Scale (ASIS)

Proposals for changes to ASIS, either positioning additional journals or repositioning journals already on the scale, will be evaluated by the Scholarship Review Committee (SRC).

#### Level 1 Journals (acceptable journals)

The scale identifies outlets only at advanced levels (2, 3, and 4). The presumption remains that all other acceptable journals are Level 1. Unless otherwise empowered, at a future time, the Scholarship Review Committee will *not* make determinations of which journals are acceptable at Level 1. The determination of acceptability is made by the Albers Executive Committee. To propose a journal's acceptability, at any point, either before submission or after publication, the author provides, via his chair, appropriate evidence of acceptability as described in our evaluation guidelines--namely, blind/peer review, quality of publisher, editors, authors, rankings in scales, etc... Prior to annual evaluations, all the accepted articles in journals not already accepted and listed as such in Sedona are reviewed by the Executive Committee. At this point the Sedona list is updated. Entering a journal article into Sedona does not automatically initiate a decision about its acceptability. The Executive Committee does that, usually at the end of the calendar year.

#### Level 2-4 Journals

These guidelines should be used when proposing to include a new scholarship outlet to ASIS at Level 2 or higher (or to reposition one that is on the list). Note that the criteria differ in persuasiveness. The strongest argument for placing a journal, for example, is evidence that its citation variables match those of other journals already accepted at the proposed level. Other compelling evidence would be ratings in other established ranking scales, evidence of the quality of editors and authors, and ratings from other schools. Also, note that several criteria that have been sufficient in the past--blind peer review and circulation may be included in a proposal, but they are not persuasive. Such factors may have relevance for acceptability, but they say little with certainty about higher ratings of journals. Proposals should address a variety of criteria, not just one. For example, noting that a journal has a high h-index, alone, will not be as persuasive as evidence that the journal scores well on most or all the criteria.

Within levels, the journals in ASIS may vary on several dimensions. Stronger arguments result from favorable comparisons with the higher rather than the lower values within a level. For example, evidence that Journal X has authors or is approved by schools similar to Journals A, B, and C from Level 2, will be a stronger argument if

Journals A, B, and C are at or above the mid-point of the Level 2 category than if they are among the weakest Level 2 journals.

- *Citations.* A strong argument would be to demonstrate that a proposed journal has citation rates appropriate to the proposed ASIS level. Other citation data may be presented, such as ISI impact factor scores, provided comparisons can be made with journals on ASIS. The key measures of citations, taken over the past five years, are average citations per paper and the h-index. Both are readily available from Publish or Perish. These measures are provided for comparison for all journals on ASIS.
- *Rating of the outlet in established scales.* ASIS initial rankings are limited to the ABS and M-H scales. Other rankings are out there, and evidence that other scales identify a journal at a specific level will be considered. Rankings that consider a broad spectrum of business disciplines have the value of attempting to hold impact constant across disciplines. Being rated highly among a small set of journals in a specific field does not, alone, imply a similarly high level of general impact. On the other hand, relative positions within specific field ratings may be useful. For example, if Journal X is rated above Journal Y in a rating of journals in a specific field, and Journal Y is already in ASIS, that would be a good argument for positioning Journal X on ASIS at least at the same level.
- *Reputation of editors and authors.* To argue on the basis of quality of editors or authors that a journal be considered at Level 2-4, one must definitely demonstrate that the proportion of "high quality" scholars affiliated with the journal is consistent with journals at the same level in ASIS. Absent other measures of quality, the strongest argument for quality on this criterion would be a survey of the past year of the journal, identifying the proportion of authors affiliated with Ph.D.-granting schools, relative to the same proportion for other journals that are already acceptable.
- *Other school ratings.* Evidence that other schools, particularly Ph.D.-granting schools, which we presume put more emphasis on the impact of scholarship, identify a journal at a specific higher level might be persuasive. Such evidence must be considered as qualitative support, however, unless one is willing to request evidence from a representative sample of all such schools.
- *Reputation of the publisher.* As an argument for consideration of a higher level, this criterion does not carry much weight and would have to be clear to all. Being published by Stanford, Harvard, University of Chicago, and such is not definitive of higher impact, but it may help the argument.
- *Peer review, review process, and circulation* information have no effect on placement at higher levels unless they are conspicuously limited, in which case supplemental explanation may be required.

### **Changes in Journal Ratings over Time**

For a variety of reasons, journal reputations and citation rates may change over time. The following are implications of changing rankings:

- SRC will monitor ASIS bi-annually to assure currency.
- Scores for articles will remain at the level of the journal when the article was accepted. Thus, if a Level 3 journal drops to a Level 2, any article accepted when the journal was Level 3 will continue to be scored as a Level 3. The reverse will also be true.
- Once a journal is repositioned, however, articles accepted in that journal will get the new score. Thus, two articles in the same journal may be scored differently due to a change in the journal's rating on ASIS. Authors are responsible for being aware of current ASIS ratings.

### **Changes to Individual Articles**

When scholarship is initially produced, we are largely limited to evaluating its quality and impact from past data on the perception and citation of the publication outlet. Over time, however, the impact of an article may be shown to exceed the impact of the journal in which it was published. An article published in a Level 1 journal, for example, may be discovered to be of superior quality and widely cited. In such a case, the specific scholarship should be re-evaluated, once compelling supporting evidence is provided. Such evidence might include the following:

- *Citations.* An individual article's citation numbers may compare with the average citations per paper in higher-ranked journals
- *Awards.* Articles selected for awards may be proposed as meriting more consideration than generally awarded the journal in which they were published.
- *Expert testimony.* Expert testimony, based on an article, before government or other policy-making bodies, is an indication greater impact of the article.
- *Changes in business or teaching practice.* Such evidence should be considered as an indication of impact.
- *Requests for reprints or presentations.* Evidence that the market demands repeated presentations in print or in person is evidence of impact.
- *Sales.* For books, sales are an indicator of impact. Sales evidence should be presented with relevant comparisons.

Other than citations and sales, these criteria are limited to one or a few isolated cases. When making a case for reconsideration of an article, the proposer should consider the limits of arguments based on a single or few cases. That one other faculty member reports using a technique proposed in an article is not strong evidence for impact. On the other hand, we recognize that doing a census of all the readers of an article to determine how much influence it had is not feasible. These proposals will necessarily be judged on a case-by-case basis, with the expectation that upgrades in assessment of past research will be done only under unusual circumstances.