Date: April 20, 2015

To: David Rosowsky, Provost and Sr. Vice President

From: Sanjay Sharma, Dean, School of Business Administration

Metrics for Scholarly Productivity and Impact

Objectives
The objectives of the exercises undertaken between 2012 and 2014 to develop metrics for intellectual contribution and impact were:
1. To build a global reputation for the business school for high quality academic research,
2. To determine the various elements that would constitute high quality scholarly productivity and impact, and
3. Implement workload equity by recognizing high quality/high impact research.

Process
Phase 1
An ad hoc committee of faculty members from different business disciplines was struck by me in the Spring of 2012 with a charge to develop metrics for scholarly productivity and impact and link them to workload equity. The committee benchmarked scholarly productivity against our peer and competitors schools. The benchmarking revealed that most schools had abandoned this exercise after years of conflict. The ad hoc committee brought a set of recommendations to the entire faculty in September 2012 for discussion and the final recommendations were presented to the faculty on October 28th 2012. The recommendations listed specific journals by each discipline in three categories ranging from journals of distinction to acceptable scholarship. The faculty voted positively for the recommendations but the vote was split and there was some dissatisfaction amongst a minority of faculty members. Consequently, we decided to continue to refine the metrics.

Phase 2
 In August 2013, the school convened a full day faculty retreat to address various strategic goals including a revisiting of the recommendations of scholarly productivity. At the retreat, the faculty members were able to grapple more effectively with the issue and agree on metrics for scholarly productivity in journals. These were refined by another task force appointed by me at the retreat. The task force brought recommendations based on dynamic externally validated rankings of top tier journals that were updated every year with input from top research focused business schools. These rankings were based on the *Financial Times 45* and the *ABS* rankings. The faculty members voted unanimously in the faculty meeting on 11th October 2013. The approved rankings for scholarly productivity are attached as **Appendix 1**.

Phase 3
To foster an environment aimed at achieving the school's scholarship goals and as agreed by the faculty at the August 2013 faculty retreat, another ad hoc committee of faculty members brought a proposal for teaching equity tied to scholarly productivity to the faculty meeting. The BSAD faculty voted unanimously on December 11th 2013 that "research active" tenured faculty be granted a reduced course load and that "research inactive" tenured faculty teach an increased course load. The structure of course reductions would be determined by the updated journal ranking criteria approved by the faculty. The teaching load guidelines are attached as **Appendix 2.**

Phase 4
On January 17th 2014, another ad hoc committee appointed by the business school's Faculty Standards Committee brought a proposal for a challenge process to add or delete journals from the scholarly productivity metrics approved in October 2013. The challenge process was unanimously approved by the faculty at the meeting. The challenge process is attached as **Appendix 3**.

Phase 5
In August 2014, the school convened a half day retreat to develop metrics for intellectual contributions and impact beyond publications in academic journals. This was a very productive meeting and several faculty members volunteered to be a part of another ad hoc task force to finalize the metrics. The ad hoc committee held discussions extensively with faculty members within the school and in other business schools with a strong reputation and brought its recommendations for metrics for a comprehensive grid of intellectual contributions spanning scholarship, pedagogy, academic field, and practice impacts to the faculty meeting on December 4th 2014. This proposal was unanimously voted by the faculty. The impact grid is attached as **Appendix 4.**

The metrics, the challenge process and the teaching load guidelines are on the BSAD website and are used by the FSC for the RPT process and by the Dean for performance review. Search committees for faculty hiring also take these guidelines into account in evaluating candidates.

Appendix 1

Revision to current journal list for the School of Business (BSAD Journal List)

The current BSAD journal list, approved October 28, 2012, consists of nine different categories with two ranking tiers for each category.[1] The revisions replace the current list as follows:

1. Eliminate the nine categories and replace this with a single list for the entire School of Business.
2. Place each academic journal in four ranking tiers: Top Tier (Grade 4); Second Tier (Grade 3); Third Tier (Grade 2) and Fourth Tier (Grade 1).
3. Utilize the following criteria for placing a journal in a given ranking tier:
    a. Top Tier (Grade 4) – A journal will be ranked in this tier if:
        i. the journal is on the most recent version of the Financial Times (FT) 45 journal ranking list[2], OR
        ii. the journal is ranked Grade 4 on the most recent version of the ABS Academic Journal Quality Guide[3], OR
        iii. the journal is ranked in the highest tier by 3 different FT 100 ranked universities located in North America[4].
    b. Second Tier (Grade 3) – A journal will be ranked in this tier if:
        i. the journal is ranked Grade 3 on the most recent version of the ABS Academic Journal Quality Guide, OR
        ii. the journal is ranked in the second highest tier by 3 different FT 100 ranked universities located in North America.
    c. Third Tier (Grade 2) – A journal will be ranked in this tier if:
        i. the journal is ranked Grade 2 on the most recent version of the ABS Academic Journal Quality Guide, OR
        ii. the ranking is justified by reference to three or more different independent sources.
    d. Fourth Tier (Grade 1)
        i. the journal is ranked Grade 1 on the most recent version of the ABS Academic Journal Quality Guide, OR
        ii. the journal is listed as a peer-reviewed journal in Cabells.
4. Include a process through which faculty can challenge a journal's existing ranking or initiate the ranking of an unranked journal, and the mechanism through which proposed changes and additions are vetted and determined.

---

[1] The nine categories are Accounting, Finance, Information Systems, Organizational
[2] The current FT 45 journal ranking list can be found at the following url
http://www.ft.com/cms/s/2/3405a512-5cbb-11e1-8f1f-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2gbKIuODM. (accessed October 4, 2013)
[3] While version 5 is supposed to be available this year, version 4 (2010) can be found at the following url
http://www.bizschooljournals.com/node/4. (accessed October 4, 2013)
[4] The most recent version of the FT 100 Global MBA ranking can be found at the following url
http://rankings.ft.com/businessschoolrankings/global-mba-ranking-2013. (accessed October 4, 2013)

Point System for Course Load Adjustment for Tenured Faculty

The BSAD Journal List includes "Top tier," "2nd tier," "3rd tier," and "4th tier" journals. Consistent with the transparency and equity objectives underlying teaching load adjustment policies at other schools, we propose a clearly defined system that awards points to faculty who have published in journals as follows:

- Top tier journal............ 8 points
- 2nd tier journal............ 4 points
- 3rd tier journal............ 2 points
- 4th tier journal............ 1 point

A normal course load for a tenured faculty member is 5 course sections per academic year. We propose course load reductions would be determined by the number of points earned within a rolling 5-year time frame as follows :

LOAD	CRITERIA
Six+ course load	Less than 6 points.
Five course load	At least 6 points.
Four course load	10 points based on the point system indicated above. At least 4 points must come from 2nd tier journals or higher.
Three course load	24 points based on the point system indicated above. At least 12 points must come from 2nd tier journals or higher, and of these at least 8 points must come from Top tier journals.

Appendix 2: Journal Ranking Challenge and Evaluation Process

The purpose of the proposed Journal Ranking Challenge and Evaluation Process is to provide a mechanism through which individual faculty can present evidence to challenge a journal's existing ranking tier or initiate the ranking of an unranked journal.

Rationale for the proposed process:

- Not all applicable journals are included in the ABS list, and none of the lists obtained thus far from FT 100 universities include journals ranked in tiers 3 and 4 (several FT 100 lists include only a single tier, sometimes comprising only the FT 45 journals). Thus, especially for journals in ranking tiers 3 and 4, a process is needed to challenge existing rankings and add new journals that do not rely solely on ABS, FT 45, and journal ranking lists from FT 100 universities.

- Some sub-disciplines and "niche" research areas where there are relatively few faculty working (nationally and/or internationally) are not adequately covered / represented by ABS, nor by the lists obtained thus far from FT 100 universities. For example, journals that publish real estate or tax research are not well represented in these lists. In such cases, a process is needed for faculty to present a case for ranking and adding new journals to our list.

- All journal rankings are imperfect and affected by some level of subjectivity inherent in any ranking exercise. This includes ABS and the lists from FT 100 universities. Other legitimate ranking sources may exist and faculty should be able to draw upon such sources when appropriate to refine our list.

Faculty wishing to challenge a journal's existing ranking tier or wishing to add a new journal to our list should compile as much compelling and recent evidence as reasonably possible to support their position. Such evidence might include, but is not necessarily limited to:

- Comparative tiered journal rankings from multiple aspirants and/or widely recognized high-quality research universities outside of the FT 100 that have a graduate-level focus in the associated discipline or sub-discipline area.

- Comparative tiered journal rankings by multiple highly ranked universities in an AACSB discipline.[5]

---

[5] For a list of AACSB disciplines see page 32 of the following pdf file:
http://www.aacsb.edu/publications/data-trends/2013.pdf (*accessed November 18, 2013*).

- Multiple published journal articles that evaluate or rank journals based on various quality or prestige metrics.

- Other documented evidence relating directly to how a specific sub-discipline or niche area evaluates journal quality or prestige, other than journal lists.

It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member making a challenge or journal addition to collect, organize, document, and present a preponderance of evidence that supports their case. All challenges and additions must be formally documented and submitted in writing, including the rationale and all associated evidence and corresponding sources. We understand that some sources may be more dated than others and encourage the use of recent / timely sources to the extent possible. Faculty should be able to clearly explain why they are challenging the existing ranking. While it is not the purview of this subcommittee to rule on exactly what may constitute an unacceptable rationale for challenge, we strongly advise against challenges based on comparisons made to FT 45 journals – for example, arguing that a particular ABS 2nd tier journal should actually be counted as top-tier because there is a comparable ABS 2nd tier journal that is currently in the FT 45.

We propose that the members of the FSC will review all challenges and requested journal additions, while having discretion to involve all or some subset of the FSC members in conducting these reviews. All members of the FSC will have opportunity to review all documented challenges and additions, discuss each case, and then vote to either: 1) accept the challenge or journal addition as submitted, 2) request clarification and/or additional support information from the submitter, 3) offer a counter ranking recommendation for the submitter to either accept or reject while having opportunity to provide their rationale, or 4) reject a submitted challenge to an existing ranking tier.

Appendix 4
Intellectual Contributions Impact Grid

	Research: Basic	Research: Applied	Research: Pedagogical	Outreach & Practice	Instruction
Input					
	Working Papers	Working Papers	Working Papers	Relationship Building	Mentoring Colleagues
	Submissions	Submissions	Submissions	Client Development	Curriculum Development
	R&Rs	R&Rs	R&Rs		Course Development
	Conference Papers	Conference Papers	Conference Papers		Honor's Thesis Advisor
	Grant Proposals	Grant Proposals	Grant Proposals		Independent Study Advisor
			Case Development		Master's Committee
					Doctoral Committee
					Executive Education
					Student Advising
Output					
	Academic Journal Articles	Practioner Journal Articles	Education Journal Articles	Repeat Engagements	Classes Taught
	Proceedings	Proceedings	Education Journal Cases	Company Projects	Student Credit Hours Taught
	Funded Work	Funded Work	Education Panel	Data Access	Guest Lectures
	Book Chapters	Book Chapters	Book Chapters	Consulting/Professional Reports	Experiential Learning Supervision
	Books	Books	Books	Professional Certifications	Curricular Materials
	Conference Presentations	Conference Presentations	Conference Presentations	Consulting	Completed Independent Studies
	Grant Funded Monographs	Grant Funded Monographs	Textbooks	Onsite Seminars/Presentations	Completed Honor's Theses
	Patents	Patents		Professional Memberships	Completed Master's Theses
				Executive Education	Completed Doctoral Theses
				Faculty in Residence	Student Evaluations
				Videos/Podcasts/Webinars	Faculty Evaluations
				Blogs	Curriculum Materials
Impact					
	Editorial Boards	Editorial Boards	Editorial Boards	Invited Boards	Case Competition Awards
	Citations	Citations	Citations	Keynotes	Job Placement
	Editor	Editor	Editor	Recruiters	Internships
	Journal Reviewer	Journal Reviewer	Journal Reviewer	Career Fairs	Alumni Engagement
	Book Reviewer	Book Reviewer	Book Reviewer	Donations	Donations
	Invited Talks	Invited Talks	Invited Talks	Exec. Ed. Enrollments	Teaching Awards
	Journal Quality	Journal Quality	Journal Quality	Major Events	Student Exit Surveys
	Host Conferences	Host Conferences	Host Conferences	Media Coverage	Media Rankings
	Visiting Scholar/Fellow	Visiting Scholar/Fellow	Visiting Scholar/Fellow	Media Features	Recruiters
	Scholarly Awards	Scholarly Awards	Scholarly Awards	Media Mention	Applications
	Prof. Assoc. Leadership	Sales	Sales	Editorials	Yield
	Media Rankings	Adoption	Adoption	Society Presentations	Placement
	Downloads/Hits	Downloads/Hits	Downloads/Hits	Downloads/Hits	Commissioned Course Development
			Media Cites	Community Awards	Writing National Exam Questions
				Service Learning	Service Learning