

**DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT  
ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY  
APPOINTMENT, SALARY, PROMOTION & TENURE POLICIES  
Effective January 1, 2025**

The Department of Management (MGT) Faculty Status Committee (DFSC) will conform to the Illinois State University Appointment, Salary, Promotion, and Tenure (ASPT) Policies in effect beginning January 1, 2025. Where any DFSC policies and procedures regarding appointments, dismissals, salaries, promotions and tenure are not specifically set forth in this document, the DFSC shall adopt the general policies and procedures as set forth by the University's ASPT policies and consistent with College of Business standards.

**I. DEPARTMENT FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE:**

The DFSC shall consist of four elected faculty members and the Chair of the Department, who will be a voting member and chairperson of the Committee. The tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Department will elect DFSC members annually via secret ballot. Elections must be completed by May 1 and terms will begin on August 16 of the following Fall semester. DFSC members shall be elected for two-year staggered terms with no elected member serving more than two consecutive terms. A majority of the Committee must be tenured. If a DFSC member resigns from the Committee during his/her term, an election will be held to determine the faculty member to serve the remainder of the term. This service will not count against the two consecutive term limit mentioned above if the remaining term length is one year or less. Finally, DFSC members will be evaluated on their performance, tenure and promotion by the Chair of the DFSC and the remaining Committee members. An untenured faculty member shall not be elected to a term that coincides with the year in which the DFSC is considering that individual for tenure.

**II. APPOINTMENT & REAPPOINTMENT:**

**Search Committee Composition and Process** (approved on September 20, 2011 by a vote of 19 to 3).

For tenure-track positions, the Chairperson of the Department is responsible for establishing a search committee and overseeing the selection process. Members of the committee will select a search committee chair; the department chair is not a member of the committee.

The majority of the search committee members, should, broadly defined, be in area for which the position was authorized. For instance, when hiring for an OB/HR position, the majority of the search committee members should be from the OB/HR areas. Likewise, when hiring for a Strategy position, the majority of the search committee members should be from the Strategy area. Faculty can elect one or two members from outside of the area to serve on the search committee. Any member of the DFSC sitting on a search committee will recuse him/herself from the DFSC vote to recommend candidate rankings to the department chair.

Only the search committee and the department chair will have access to all of the materials provided by applicants for the position. The search committee is bound by confidentiality – the applicant materials reviewed by the search committee and all search committee deliberations are confidential. An applicant attains the status of a candidate when s/he is invited for a campus visit. All tenure-line faculty members will be allowed access to candidates' credentials, per the University's policies.

All tenure-line faculty members will have the opportunity to meet with candidates and provide their evaluation and comments in writing. It is expected that such comments will be based on one's own individual judgment and not be unduly influenced by the opinions of others. Faculty should recognize that we have a professional obligation to provide a fair and objective evaluation of each candidate.

The search committee will consider the evaluations and comments and determine candidates who are acceptable and those who are not acceptable. Such a decision will be the result of a consensus among the committee members.

The chair of the search committee will keep the department chair informed about the preliminary activities of the search. The department chair, as a representative of the DFSC, will be expected to read all applicants' files and be present for interviews. Based on the department's feedback, the search committee will recommend its decision about the ranking of job candidates to the DFSC; the DFSC will then make its recommendation in deliberations that include the department chair. The department chair will be responsible for making the hiring decision and for managing the entire process in an effective and efficient manner.

### **Reappointments**

The MGT department will follow the University calendar for reappointments, following the Calendar in Appendix 1 of the University's ASPT Policies.

### **III. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION & SALARY INCREMENTATION:**

Faculty performance is by its very nature complex and multi-faceted. However, faculty performance should emphasize the student-oriented nature of our College of Business Mission and the requirements necessary to maintain our status as an AACSB accredited institution.

*By majority vote, MGT department affirms the continued usage of the current teaching evaluation instrument and process (approved on November 17, 2009 by a vote of 18 to 1).*

**a. Faculty Assignments:** Faculty assignments should remain flexible and are tied to the mission of the Department, College and University. In addition, assignments reflect the fact that all tenured/tenure-track faculty should maintain consistent, high-quality performance in the mutually supportive areas of teaching, intellectual contributions, and service.

Typical faculty assignments are made based on a twelve-hour teaching load that assumes a three- hour reassignment for research. To qualify for a nine-hour teaching assignment, faculty must continue to make continuous intellectual contributions as defined by the AACSB. If a faculty member has not made an intellectual contribution within the last two years (that is, DFSC review periods), that faculty member will have a twelve-hour load until such time as an intellectual contribution is made.

**b. Evaluation:** To be considered for a “Standard Raise,” and thus become raise eligible under the current ASPT system, a faculty member must receive an overall rating of “satisfactory.” To receive an overall rating of satisfactory, a faculty member must meet the following criteria:

### **(1) ANNUAL EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

The DFSC will use at least two teaching artifacts to assess teaching, including annual faculty self-reflection and student feedback. Faculty may also provide other teaching artifacts, such as syllabi, Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), professional development, and/or classroom observations.

#### Standard raise:

All faculty in MGT are expected to deliver quality instruction as defined in the University’s **General Policy 3.3.12A, Faculty Responsibilities to Students**. Quality instruction is further evaluated on 1) preparation; 2) instructional delivery; 3) professionalism, 4) curricular improvement, and 5) annual pedagogical self-reflections.

Faculty who do not meet the basic criteria listed above for quality teaching will receive a teaching rating of “unsatisfactory” and be ineligible to receive annual raise dollars for that year.

#### Raise beyond standard:

Faculty deserving of the raise beyond standard in teaching will have demonstrated all of the above criteria for quality teaching, as well as demonstrating additional commitment to the following: professional development, and/or teaching innovation, and/or teaching outside of the classroom, and/or curriculum development, and/or classroom performance that exceeds departmental standards, including consistently positive written student comments, and/or publishing peer reviewed Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in a nationally recognized outlet. The DFSC may consider additional teaching activities in which faculty engage at the request of any individual faculty member.

#### Exceeds raise beyond standard:

The DFSC shall determine, based on performance and evidence, those faculty members who have surpassed the level of “raise beyond standard” and are thus deserving of the rating “exceeds raise beyond standard.”

*Faculty approved these standards for teaching by a vote of 18 (in favor) to 5 (opposed) in a ballot that ended 19 October 2018.*

## (2) ANNUAL EVALUATIONS OF SCHOLARSHIP

### Standard raise:

All faculty in MGT are expected to perform quality scholarship by making at least one peer-reviewed intellectual contribution to the discipline per calendar year.

MGT follows ISU's ASPT policies, which define acceptable scholarly contributions in Appendix 2, "Criteria for the Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Productivity." Quality scholarship is further evaluated on 1) the quality of the outcome; 2) the quality of the scholarly outlet in which the information is disseminated; 3) building a consistent record of intellectual productivity in fields relevant to the discipline; 4) remaining either Scholarly Academic or Scholarly Practitioner, per the College of Business's guidelines. Productivity in quality outlets is ordinarily defined to include the following:

- verifiably peer-reviewed conference papers and proceedings at non-predatory conferences whose editorial integrity and basic legitimacy is apparent in the conference's marketing materials (e.g., website, submission deadline vs notification deadline, editorial committee, keynote speakers, etc.)  
*Faculty approved the addition of this criteria by a vote of 11 (in favor) to 1 (opposed), 1 (abstained), and 1 (other) in a ballot held the second week of May, 2023.*
- verifiably double-blind peer-reviewed, research articles in non-predatory journals that are listed in the most recent annual journal directory of the Australian Business Dean's Council (ABDC), or the Chartered Association of Business Schools (ABS), or Cabell's *Journalytics*, or a citation index of similar scholarly standing;
- editorially- or peer-reviewed books or book chapters;
- editorially-reviewed case studies;
- competitive external grants carrying indirect costs.

Faculty should ascertain the viability of a journal not listed in the ABDC, the ABS, *Journalytics*, or the College's journal list from the DFSC *prior* to submitting manuscripts for consideration at an unlisted journal, following the procedures outlined by the COB. Publication in journals not approved by the DFSC will not be counted toward any faculty member's annual productivity.

Faculty who do not meet at least one of the basic criteria listed above for quality scholarship will receive a rating of "unsatisfactory" in their scholarship evaluation.

### Raise beyond standard:

Faculty deserving of the raise beyond standard in scholarship will have fulfilled the above criteria for quality scholarship, as well as the following: publishing a peer reviewed journal article, as listed above; or a book chapter; or receiving and/or maintaining a major external grant that includes indirect costs; or similar intellectual contributions that demonstrate significant impact on the discipline.

Exceeds raise beyond standard:

Faculty deserving of the raise beyond standard in scholarship will have fulfilled the above criteria for quality scholarship, as well as the following: publishing more than one peer-reviewed journal articles and/or publishing one article in a journal with a high rating (defined as 3, 4, or 4\* in ABS or the ABDC equivalent) and/or receiving a major external grant that includes indirect costs; and/or similar intellectual contributions that demonstrate significant impact on the discipline.

MGT adheres to the College of Business's standards defining what it means to be a Scholarly Academic or Scholarly Practitioner for the purposes of AACSB.

*Faculty approved these standards for scholarship by a vote of 11 (in favor) to 1 (opposed) and 1 (abstained) in a ballot held the second week of May, 2023.*

**(3) ANNUAL EVALUATION OF SERVICE & CITIZENSHIP**

The DFSC in MGT evaluates the University's category of "Service" in annual reviews using three factors: citizenship, service internal to the University, and service external to the University.

Citizenship is prosocial participation in the life of the department, the College, and the University. It ordinarily includes regularly attending routine department and College meetings; meeting job candidates and attending their job presentations; attending scholarly presentations given by colleagues, and attending functions for students, such as the annual graduation lunches.

- While no member of the faculty is expected to attend all events, citizenship includes participating regularly in the activities listed above. Faculty are also encouraged to attend such events as Business Week activities, Commencement, and evening and weekend events sponsored by the department and the College.
- Pre-tenure faculty who have defended their Ph.D. within two years are encouraged to participate more in citizenship activities than in service activities.

Service

*Internal Service* includes serving on committees at the department, College, or University level. Other forms of internal service can be identified in the University's *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 2.

- Faculty who have defended their Ph.D. more than two years ago are ordinarily expected to serve on at least one committee per year.
- Faculty who are tenured are expected to have a continuous level of service that includes a combination of department, College, and University service over the years.

*External Service* is outlined in the University's *ASPT Policies*, Appendix 2.

- External service in MGT typically takes the form of journal-editing, reviewing for peer-reviewed venues, such as journals or conferences; or serving as an officer in a large regional or national organization.
- Ordinarily, post-tenure faculty are expected to engage in some form of external service.

Standard raise:

With the exception of pre-tenure faculty, faculty performing no service and who meet only the above-defined citizenship criteria will receive a standard raise.

Raise beyond standard:

Faculty participating substantially in internal or external service will be eligible for the raise beyond standard.

Exceeds raise beyond standard:

The DFSC shall determine, based on performance and evidence, those faculty members who have surpassed the level of "raise beyond standard" and are thus deserving of the rating "exceeds raise beyond standard."

Unsatisfactory:

Faculty performing neither citizenship nor service shall receive a rating of "unsatisfactory" in service, unless they have already applied for retirement.

*Faculty approved standards for service by a ballot of 14 (in favor) to 7 (opposed) in the second week of April, 2019.*

Faculty rated as satisfactory on all of the three criteria of teaching, intellectual contribution, and service will be evaluated as "overall satisfactory" and will be considered raise eligible and shall be entitled to the "standard" raise. Faculty not rated as satisfactory on one or more of the three criteria of teaching, intellectual contribution and service will be evaluated as "overall unsatisfactory" and will not be considered raise eligible.

**c. Salary incrementation:** Raises will be distributed using the following guidelines:

- (1) 20% of the "available raise pool" (available raise pool = raise pool minus the 10% held by the Provost's office) will be distributed to raise eligible faculty as the university standard increment as per Section 7. 2a and 2b of the University's ASPT guidelines. This amount will be distributed as an equal percentage of the base to all raise eligible faculty.
- (2) The remainder of the "available raise pool" will be distributed as a DFSC standard increment to "raise eligible" faculty who maintain a level of intellectual contribution sufficient to be viewed as either "scholarly academic"

(SA) or “professional academic” (PA) under AACSB standards as indicated below. This amount will be distributed as an equal percentage of the base salary. The distribution will occur as follows:

If the remainder of the available raise pool (see above) is less than 3%, then 75% of this pool will be distributed as an equal percentage of base salary to all raise eligible faculty who maintain either SA or PA status under AACSB standards.

The distribution of the rest of the funds will be based on performance.

If the remainder of the available raise pool (see above) is 3% or more, then 50% of this pool will be distributed as an equal percentage of base salary to all raise eligible faculty who maintain either SA or PA status under AACSB standards. The distribution of the rest of the funds will be based on performance and equity considerations. The allocation between performance and equity will be determined by a departmental vote at that time.

- (3) faculty members with unsatisfactory performance as defined above shall receive no raise increment.

**d. Information requirements:**

Because of the long-term nature of the review and salary incrementation, a curriculum vita will need to be submitted by the University deadline (January 5). Research outcomes and grants to be evaluated during the current review period can simply be highlighted in some manner. Information on teaching performance can be provided in narrative form on a course-by-course basis with appropriate documentation (such as example student projects). Service contributions should be provided in narrative form addressing the outcomes of the group involved and the role of the faculty member in those outcomes. Faculty must indicate in their January 5 self-evaluation which of the following weightings they wish the DFSC to use in evaluating their annual productivity:

- i. 40% teaching/40% research/20% service; or
- ii. 40% teaching/20% research/40% service [recommended only for faculty who are assigned to administrative positions]; or
- iii. 40% teaching/30% research/30% service.

**IV. PROMOTION:**

The attainment of successively higher academic ranks marks professional growth and the achievement of status within a discipline. Such status is expected to be demonstrated by a sustained record of professional accomplishment. Thus, promotions are neither automatic nor the product of any set formula. The following sections describe expectations concerning promotions to various ranks.

a. **Promotion of Instructor to Assistant Professor:** The candidate will have the appropriate terminal degree (earned doctorate) or its equivalent in the academic discipline and the candidate's overall performance in teaching, intellectual contribution and service should be of sufficient quality to warrant promotion. In addition, the candidate must demonstrate proficiency in oral and written communication skills as evidenced by peer and/or student evaluation.

b. **Promotion of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:** The candidate will have the appropriate terminal degree in the discipline. A candidate may bring in up to three years of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor at the college/university level in consideration for promotion to Associate Professor. The expectation is that tenure and promotion are linked for most candidates. That is, promotion prior to tenure will be a rare event.

To be considered for promotion to the Associate Professor rank, the candidate must have made a solid, quality contribution in both teaching and service. Effective for all candidates hired after January 1, 2018, the candidate must have a minimum of five publications, three of which must appear (or be unconditionally accepted for publication) in quality, peer-reviewed academic outlets, such as journals or edited book volumes. The remaining publications can include other peer- or editorial-reviewed intellectual contributions or all other intellectual contributions as defined by the AACSB Business Accreditation Standards (2020 standards used as reference here). All five publications must occur during the six- year probationary period. Candidates who bring years toward tenure from another institution must demonstrate an ongoing trajectory of continued publication following their appointment at ISU. These are the absolute minimum requirements and the DFSC will make an evaluation of both the quantity and the quality of the scholarly contribution.

c. **Promotion of Associate Professor to Full Professor:** The candidate will have the appropriate terminal degree in the discipline. In addition, an Associate Professor is eligible for review for promotion in the tenth year of teaching at the College/University level with the promotion taking effect in the eleventh year. Ordinarily an Associate Professor must have served at least four years at Illinois State prior to the promotion.

To be considered for promotion to Full Professor, the candidate must have made a significant contribution in both teaching and service. In addition, the candidate must have a minimum of six publications, three of which must appear (or be unconditionally accepted for publication) in quality refereed journals. Faculty who publish an article in the *Financial Times* 50, an ABDC A\*, or an ABS 4\* journal will have achieved the equivalent of two peer-reviewed quality articles and will thus need only one additional peer-reviewed, quality, journal articles for promotion to full, as well as three additional publications. The remaining publications can include other peer- or editorial-reviewed intellectual contributions or all other intellectual contributions as defined by the AACSB Business Accreditation Standards (2020 standards used as reference here). All



publications must occur after the application deadline of the candidate's successful bid for the rank of Associate Professor and/or tenure at ISU. No faculty member will be allowed to count any publications in more than one application for a higher academic rank and/or tenure. These are the absolute minimum requirements and the DFSC will make an evaluation of both the quantity and the quality of the scholarly contribution. Finally, while the candidate is an associate professor, the candidate must either have had at least one independently authored, peer-reviewed journal article or demonstrate lead/primary authorship on an article published post-tenure with one of the following four rankings: ABDC (A\* or A), ABS (4\* or 4).

Note that time spent on unpaid leaves of absence shall not be counted as progress toward promotion. In addition, time spent on sabbatical leaves shall be counted as progress toward promotion unless the faculty member and the Provost agree in advance that it shall not be counted.

## **V. TENURE:**

### **A. Nature of Tenure**

The 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure states: "*After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their services should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies.*" The 1940 Statement also provides the rationale for tenure:

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: 1) Freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and 2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligation to its students and to society.

Recognition of the tenure concept and its rationale are provided in the governing policies of the University and are strongly supported by the department. Briefly summarized, academic tenure is an arrangement under which faculty appointments, after successful completion of a probationary period, are continued, subject to dismissal for adequate cause or unavoidable termination because of bona fide financial exigency or termination or reduction of an institutional program, until retirement or physical disability. The probationary appointment is that period of professional service during which a faculty member does not hold tenure and is carefully and systematically observed by colleagues for the purpose of evaluation of his or her professional qualifications. By the end of this period, the faculty member either receives tenure or is not reappointed.

## **B. General Tenure Policies**

Tenure is not automatically attained. In order to be recommended for tenure, faculty members must serve a probationary period, as stated in their contracts. A tenure decision will be initiated at such a time so that a determination has been made at least one year before the end of the probationary period by the DFSC. Time spent on a leave of absence shall not be counted toward the probationary period of service unless the Provost and the faculty member agree at the time the leave is granted that the purpose of the leave is such that it could count in the probationary period. Time spent on sabbatical leaves shall be counted as progress towards tenure unless the faculty member and the Provost agree in advance that it will not be counted.

The probationary period ordinarily may not exceed seven years. Review for tenure shall occur no earlier than the third year of service and no later than the sixth year of service at Illinois State University. A new faculty member with prior full-time service at another college/university may be credited with up to three years' service.

Consideration for tenure is predicated upon receipt of the appropriate terminal degree (earned doctorate) or its equivalent in the discipline, as determined by the department and College, together with other professional qualifications and accomplishments, including competence in teaching, research and service in the candidate's field of academic endeavor. There must be evidence of continuing high-quality professional performance during the probationary period with emphasis upon teaching (including student input about the quality of teaching), research and service as mutually supportive activities. It is also understood that when a judgment for tenure is made there is an expectation for continuation of the high-quality performance and professional growth.

To be eligible for tenure, a faculty member must hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor or be recommended for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor when tenure is recommended. An individual who cannot qualify for promotion to Associate Professor (as outlined in 4b of this document) at the time of tenure will not be considered for tenure.

## **VI. POST-TENURE REVIEW:**

Every five years, a post-tenure evaluation of all tenured faculty members shall be made in compliance with Board of Trustees Policy. The five-year, post-tenure review will be viewed both as developmental and evaluative. Post-tenure reviews will be conducted as a portion of the annual evaluation process.

The DFSC will review the five-year performance and provide written feedback to the faculty member as a component of the annual evaluation letter. The faculty member shall be provided the opportunity to review and confer with the DFSC prior to submission of the Post-tenure review assessment to the Dean.

If the DFSC recognizes after having the post-tenure review that serious unresolved

deficiencies exist, the faculty member in consultation with the DFSC shall develop a plan for remediation of these deficiencies. Future annual summative reviews of performance shall assess the extent to which the plan has been acted upon until the deficiencies are eliminated.

## **VII. APPEALS PROCEDURE:**

The MGT department will follow the University appeals process as outlined in the University's current ASPT policies.

## **VIII. CFSC RECUSAL**

*MGT Department Faculty approved the option noted below by 18 votes (option 1 received 3 votes & option 3 received 2 votes) on Tuesday, October 11, 2011)*

CFSC members shall neither participate in nor vote at ASPT deliberations (including appeals) involving individuals from their own department/school

Note: MGT will conform with the college policy regarding CFSC recusal.

---

---

Note: CFSC recommended (memo dated March 18, 2010) that a copy of the student evaluation form be included as part of the DFSC document. MGT Department approved this recommendation (17 yes votes, 1 no vote; votes cast April 14-15, 2010) and the evaluations form appears as Appendix 1.

## **IX. REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT ASPT AND EVALUATION POLICIES**

On March 1, annually, the department chair will gather informal feedback about this document from the faculty in the MGT department. Feedback will be generated electronically, for faculty members to provide each other feedback.

Faculty who wish to preserve confidentiality may submit informal feedback to the chair in writing; the chair will then post such comments to the email discussion. By March 31, the DFSC will review all feedback and determine which policies need updating.

All revisions to this document will be reviewed by the department, discussed in department meetings, and voted into place by a secret ballot, majority vote of 50% of the faculty plus one.

A formal review of this document will be staged every five years, beginning in 2017.

## **X. Termination of Employment Policies and Disciplinary Actions**

The Department follows the policies specified in the University's ASPT policies.

## Appendix 1 – Teaching Evaluation Instrument

### DIRECTIONS

Please use this (side of the) form for your personal comments on teacher effectiveness and other aspects of the course. Your instructor will not see your completed evaluation until final grades are in for your course.

NOTE: Someone other than your instructor should collect and deliver these forms to the person designated by your department.

### PLEASE WRITE COMMENTS BELOW

- A. What are the major strengths and weaknesses of the instructor?
- B. What aspects of the course were most beneficial to you?
- C. What do you suggest to improve this course?
- D. E. and F. – Instructor Option Questions

Questions:

1. Rate the course in general	Rating Scale: Excellent to Very Poor
2. Rate the Instructor	Rating Scale: Excellent to Very Poor
3. The Instructor achieved established course objectives	Rating Scale: Strongly Agree to
4. The Instructor was organized in presenting class materials.	Strongly Disagree
5. The Instructor generally treats the students in the class with respect.	“
6. The Instructor was available to discuss course content outside the classroom	“
7. The Instructor made an effort to fulfill classroom responsibilities.	“
8. The Instructor explained difficult or abstract ideas.	“
9. The Instructor provided valuable insight into the material.	“
10. The Instructor appeared to be knowledgeable about the subject matter of the course.	“
11. The Instructor provided the opportunity to ask questions and participate in class discussion.	“
12. The Instructor used meaningful examples and illustrations in class presentations.	“
13. The Instructor expressed ideas clearly and effectively.	“
14. The assignments made by the Instructor helped in learning the course material.	“
15. The Instructor used appropriate and fair methods for determining student grades.	“
16. The examinations administered by the instructor seemed appropriate for the course.	“
17. The Instructor could field questions effectively.	“

18. With relation to other instructors I have had, I would rate this instructor in the...	Rating Scale: Upper Fifth to Lower Fifth
19. Compared to other courses, I learned...	Rating Scale: Very Much to Not Very Much
20. Compared to other courses on the same level, how much effort did you put into the class?	Rating Scale: Much More Than Normal to Never Had to Study