

**Statement on Intellectual Contributions**  
**Department of Business Administration**  
**The Joseph M. Bryan School of Business and Economics**  
**March 19, 2007**  
**Final Version**

**Preface**

This document communicates the criteria of the Department of Business Administration for assessing faculty<sup>1</sup> intellectual contributions. Such awareness should provide for better planning of faculty development through annual goal-setting activities. The guidelines presented in this document shall be used to evaluate annual performance of each faculty member by his/her department peers, the Department Head, the school-wide evaluation committee, and the Dean.

Tenured and other tenure-track faculty are expected to develop and maintain a research agenda of discipline-based scholarship. The Department expects that all tenured and tenure-track faculty and specified nontenure-track faculty members maintain their academic qualifications by ongoing activities that result in intellectual contributions. The nature, quality, and quantity of intellectual contributions expected will vary depending on the faculty member's teaching, research, and service role/responsibilities.

Meeting the minimum expectations for maintenance of academic qualifications establishes minimal expectations for intellectual contributions (marginally satisfactory, see page two for more comment). Merit salary increases, reappointment, permanent tenure, and promotions go beyond these minimal standards.

**Intellectual Contributions Definitions**

The Department recognizes that the nature of intellectual contributions can vary widely. Intellectual contributions include documents such as the following:

- refereed published academic journal articles and proceedings,
- practitioner journal articles, books, book chapters, and monographs,
- abstracts of articles published in proceedings from scholarly meetings,
- papers presented at academic or professional meetings,
- research working papers submitted for review,
- papers presented at faculty research seminars,
- publications in trade journals,
- scholarly book reviews,
- external research grants and contracts awarded,
- external grants for curriculum development, and
- textbooks, mini-cases in textbooks, and instructional development contributions (e.g., cases with written instructions, instructional software, supplemental learning materials, materials describing the design and implementation of new curricula or courses to include distance learning – online – course materials and similar contributions) which aid the practice of, or instruction in, the discipline.

---

<sup>1</sup> Full-time faculty not holding administrative appointments.

Intellectual contributions are classified as contributions to the academic discipline, contributions to practice, and contributions to pedagogy. Because the departmental portfolio of intellectual contributions should support the Department and School mission, the majority of intellectual contributions produced by departmental faculty should be contributions to the academic discipline. However, in cases where a faculty member is, by agreement, pursuing a differential role emphasizing teaching, the IC majority can be in pedagogy.

### **Intellectual Contributions Assessment Criteria**

Criteria for assessment of intellectual contributions include:

- 1) *Format*. The intellectual contribution must be in a format allowing review by others and must be subjected to some type of peer evaluation – whether by academic colleagues or practitioners.
- 2) *Quality*. The judged quality of the intellectual contribution will be assessed critically in terms of content factors such as relevance and significance to the field (perceived value-added, citations, etc.), quality of design and methodology, creativeness or innovativeness, and the quality of the outlet based on reputation or visibility (ratings) of the journal, review process (peer review/blind, etc.), acceptance rates, and credentials of the editorial board as well as other authors who have published in the journal. For information on an extensive list of journals, the Department refers to Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Management, Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Marketing as well as other appropriate Cabell directories. There is a departmental journal list which is reviewed on a regular basis (this list is available as a separate document).
- 3) *Proportional Attribution*. Identify the proportional attribution of multiple-authored intellectual contributions.
- 4) *Previous Year Sedona Entry*. Determine whether or not the publication credit for the intellectual contribution has been attributed in a previous year.
- 5) *Research Pipeline*. Evaluate the faculty member's research pipeline.

### **Annual Faculty Intellectual Contributions Performance Reviews and Evaluations**

The criteria discussed in this section will be used to evaluate faculty intellectual contributions in the context of the faculty member's teaching, research, and service role/responsibilities. This section will provide comment on the considerations leading to the determination of AQ status (maintenance) and the rating (evaluation) of new intellectual contributions (in the most recent five-year period). The procedures followed will involve two steps: maintenance and evaluation.

*Step One: Maintenance of Academic Qualifications*. The Department will determine whether the faculty member's intellectual contributions over the past five years meet the Bryan School's and Department's minimum standards for maintenance of academic qualifications.<sup>2</sup>

All tenure-track and tenured faculty members are expected to maintain academic qualification defined as a minimum of two peer-reviewed articles (or equivalent) plus three other intellectual contributions over the most recent five-year period. Nontenured-track, Ph.D. faculty members (i.e., lecturers) may be academically qualified through publications in peer-reviewed outlets. Faculty members with a higher research profile are expected to have a greater portion of their

---

<sup>2</sup> The *Bryan School Standards for Maintenance of Academic Qualifications* provide the baseline for departmental standards for maintenance of academic qualifications.

intellectual contributions in published research at higher quality journals. One can be academically qualified (meeting minimal expectations), but receive less than a good performance rating on an annual research evaluation.

*Step Two: Evaluation of “New” Contributions.* Step two will be the review and evaluation of new contributions (in-print or accepted for publications and other contributions available for review) during the current year and research work in progress. The annual review of academic research is part of the merit review process in order to evaluate new intellectual contributions in the context of two prior years’ intellectual contributions. The evaluation process places the highest reward on those published articles that provide the highest visibility for the researcher and enhancement to the Department.

Research is assessed as “Outstanding” (far above expectations), “Very Good” (above expectations), “Good” (meeting expectations), “Marginally Satisfactory” (below expectations, but sufficient to meet academic qualifications) or “Unsatisfactory” (not meeting academic qualifications). “Good” to “Outstanding” research ratings are dependent on the quality and placement of the published research and the continual development of a research pipeline subject to the teaching profile of the faculty member. Faculty members who do not have a publication or other kind of academic research may be rated below “Good” on research unless there is substantial new development in their research pipeline or research activities, e.g., the new submission of a grant and professional presentations of papers in the research pipeline.

The following guidelines will be used to evaluate intellectual contributions and the level of productivity. The judgment of research will be calibrated as a function of the teaching load (e.g., a lower teaching load – not administratively based – is expected to yield higher research productivity); this is especially true over a five-year period. The faculty members of the Department of Business Administration are asked to perform a variety of roles, and one result of this situation is that teaching is a multivariate area when one considers the contributions of the Department to business education. The multiple teaching assignments, and their attendant responsibilities, work in this Department because the contributions of such arrangements are recognized.

New IC contributions and the research pipeline in the immediate past year as well as research productivity in the previous four years (a five-year period) are considered in the assignment of a research performance category for the current year. So, as one considers the rating explanation below, the performances (immediate and recent years) and an active research pipeline will impact the rating.

The illustrative rating for faculty members will be based on those persons with the equivalent of a normal teaching load. (There are many teaching profiles that are considered normal in the Department, and they defy a one-size, fits-all definition. In a given AY, we have tenured faculty with a range of course offerings as high as 24 s. h., some have to prepare for five to seven different undergraduate and MBA courses, some teach classes with 140 enrollment in one class, some teach online courses, some team-teach, and some are on a 1/1 teaching load as part of their “job description.”)

Faculty with the equivalent of a normal teaching load will receive a “Good” (meets expectations) research rating in an annual review if they achieve any of the following:

Achieve at least one of the following:

- a peer-reviewed (or a similar process appropriate for the publication) journal acceptance for scholars or practitioners;
- a peer-reviewed (or a similar process appropriate for these publication mediums) publication of a chapter in a book, book, monograph, case, or other materials that meet scholarly standards;
- a presentation at a national or regional conference;
- evidence of a pipeline of working papers and submissions that lead to publications;
- an external grant or contract submission;
- other intellectual contributions which the faculty judge as of sufficient quality to meet expectations.

For faculty with the equivalent of a normal teaching load, higher ratings than “Good” will be based on considerations as deemed appropriate (examples are multiple contributions, quality of publications, sole versus multiple authorships as well as other criteria listed earlier – see “Intellectual Contributions Assessment Criteria”).

For faculty who do not have a normal teaching load, the peer-reviewed journal requirements are higher (quantity and/or quality) for faculty with a lower than normal teaching load (less than a traditional 3/3 load) and lower (quantity and/or quality) for faculty with a higher than normal teaching load (more than a traditional 3/3 load). This summary statement regarding requirements is based on the wide range of profiles in the Department.