

## PTR Research Criteria: Warrington College of Business

April 29, 2024

The Warrington College of Business aspires to excellence in education, research, and service. We seek a reputation for conducting rigorous, systematic, and impactful research that not only advances knowledge but also addresses significant questions, enhances education, and tackles societal challenges. Numerous metrics, including citations, patents, publications in leading journals, peer evaluations, formal recognitions, presentations, and more help track immediate progress towards these objectives. Of course, metrics are not goals in themselves. This document utilizes these metrics to gauge individual researchers' immediate progress toward our goals of creating, applying, and disseminating knowledge for education and societal benefit.

The PTR research criteria is based on a point system that provides a holistic evaluation of the faculty member's research portfolio over the prior five years. The table below defines how a faculty member can accrue points to meet the guidelines of various categories. The following should be noted.

- These guidelines represent only one input in a comprehensive and objective PTR evaluation process that incorporates teaching, research and service, and other factors described in the university criteria.
- We expect that the criteria will be revised regularly to reflect changes in the environment.
- The point targets are guidelines and are not meant to replace judgment. The Dean, Chair and faculty committees should use their judgment to perform a holistic evaluation.
- The point targets are for those with a research assignment typical of tenured faculty in the department. The point targets should be adjusted based on the research assignment of the faculty being evaluated.
- This document is designed to be used in the PTR process and not in other college processes (e.g., promotion and tenure, merit raises, annual evaluations, etc.)

Category	Description	Points
A	Publications in peer-reviewed general-purpose journals that are deemed top-tier in any business academic discipline (e.g., <i>Financial Times 50</i> and journals of equivalent quality in disciplines not covered by FT50)	3
B	Publications in peer-reviewed specialty journals that are deemed as top-tier within a narrow sub-specialty (e.g., real estate, tax, audit, sales management etc.).	2
C	Publications in peer-reviewed journals <b>and conferences</b> not covered by A and B. This will also include published book chapters related to research.	1
D	Working papers submitted to journals in Category A and B (revision stage)	1
E	Invited presentations in major conferences, peer universities and other prestigious venues	1
F	Editorship of journals in category A or B (EIC, Senior Editor, Associate Editor, Departmental editor etc.) Membership in prestigious academic and industry boards	1 per year of editorship or membership

## **PTR Research Criteria: Fisher School of Accounting**

A faculty member who **exceeds expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following over the prior 5 years:

- 9 or more points overall with at least 6 points in category A or Category B
- Evidence of a high level of professional impact, for example including regular participation in invited presentations at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within the field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; professional awards; significant number of citations; and median mentions.
- Leading and serving on national advisory committees for major conferences, research foundations, federal funding agencies or other similar professional bodies
- Receipt of awards or recognition for excellence related to research, scholarship, or related activities.

A faculty member who **meets expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following over the prior 5 years:

- 3 or more points overall **in categories A through D** (but fewer than points needed for “exceeds expectations”).
- Evidence of some professional impact, for example including regular participation in presentations at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within the field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; professional awards; reasonable number of citations; or median mentions.

A faculty member who **does not meet expectations** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the prior 5 years:

- Between 1 and 2 points overall **in categories A through D**.
- Inconsistent evidence of professional impact, for example including irregular participation in presentations at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within the field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; professional awards; insignificant number of citations or median mentions.

A faculty member who is **unsatisfactory** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the prior 5 years:

- Substantial and chronic deficiencies or failure to meet expectations in research, scholarship, or creative works as expected in the faculty member’s discipline, with minimal to no efforts to follow previous advice or other efforts to make corrections.
- No peer reviewed research articles or scholarly works of similar quality. Zero points from the table above in categories A through D.

## **PTR Proposed Research Criteria: Department of Finance, Insurance and Real Estate**

A faculty member who **exceeds expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following over the prior 5 years:

- 9 or more points overall with at least 6 points in category A or Category B
- Evidence of a high level of professional impact, for example including regular participation in invited presentations at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within the field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; professional awards; significant number of citations; and median mentions.
- Leading and serving on national advisory committees for major conferences, research foundations, federal funding agencies or other similar professional bodies
- Receipt of awards or recognition for excellence related to research, scholarship, or related activities.

A faculty member who **meets expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following over the prior 5 years:

- 3 or more points overall **in categories A through D** (but fewer than points needed for “exceeds expectations”).
- Evidence of some professional impact, for example including regular participation in presentations at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within the field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; professional awards; reasonable number of citations; or median mentions.

A faculty member who **does not meet expectations** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the prior 5 years:

- Between 1 and 2 points overall **in categories A through D**.
- Inconsistent evidence of professional impact, for example including irregular participation in presentations at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within the field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; professional awards; insignificant number of citations or median mentions.

A faculty member who is **unsatisfactory** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the prior 5 years:

- Substantial and chronic deficiencies or failure to meet expectations in research, scholarship, or creative works as expected in the faculty member’s discipline, with minimal to no efforts to follow previous advice or other efforts to make corrections.
- No peer reviewed research articles or scholarly works of similar quality. Zero points from the table above in categories A through D.

## **PTR Proposed Research Criteria: Department of Information Systems and Operations Management**

A faculty member who **exceeds expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following over the prior 5 years:

- 11 or more points overall with at least 8 points in category A or Category B
- Evidence of a high level of professional impact, for example including regular participation in invited presentations at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within the field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; professional awards; significant number of citations; and median mentions.
- Leading and serving on national advisory committees for major conferences, research foundations, federal funding agencies or other similar professional bodies
- Receipt of awards or recognition for excellence related to research, scholarship, or related activities.

A faculty member who **meets expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following over the prior 5 years:

- 3 or more points overall **in categories A through D** (but fewer than points needed for “exceeds expectations”).
- Evidence of some professional impact, for example including regular participation in presentations at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within the field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; professional awards; reasonable number of citations; or median mentions.

A faculty member who **does not meet expectations** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the prior 5 years:

- Between 1 and 2 points overall **in categories A through D**.
- Inconsistent evidence of professional impact, for example including irregular participation in presentations at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within the field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; professional awards; insignificant number of citations or median mentions.

A faculty member who is **unsatisfactory** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the prior 5 years:

- Substantial and chronic deficiencies or failure to meet expectations in research, scholarship, or creative works as expected in the faculty member’s discipline, with minimal to no efforts to follow previous advice or other efforts to make corrections.
- No peer reviewed research articles or scholarly works of similar quality. Zero points from the table above in categories A through D.

## **PTR Proposed Research Criteria: Department of Marketing**

A faculty member who **exceeds expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following over the prior 5 years:

- 11 or more points overall with at least 8 points in category A or Category B
- Evidence of a high level of professional impact, for example including regular participation in invited presentations at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within the field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; professional awards; significant number of citations; and median mentions.
- Leading and serving on national advisory committees for major conferences, research foundations, federal funding agencies or other similar professional bodies
- Receipt of awards or recognition for excellence related to research, scholarship, or related activities.

A faculty member who **meets expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following over the prior 5 years:

- 3 or more points overall **in categories A through D** (but fewer than points needed for “exceeds expectations”).
- Evidence of some professional impact, for example including regular participation in presentations at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within the field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; professional awards; reasonable number of citations; or median mentions.

A faculty member who **does not meet expectations** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the prior 5 years:

- Between 1 and 2 points overall **in categories A through D**.
- Inconsistent evidence of professional impact, for example including irregular participation in presentations at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within the field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; professional awards; insignificant number of citations or median mentions.

A faculty member who is **unsatisfactory** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the prior 5 years:

- Substantial and chronic deficiencies or failure to meet expectations in research, scholarship, or creative works as expected in the faculty member’s discipline, with minimal to no efforts to follow previous advice or other efforts to make corrections.
- No peer reviewed research articles or scholarly works of similar quality. Zero points from the table above in categories A through D.

## **PTR Proposed Research Criteria: Department of Management**

A faculty member who **exceeds expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following over the prior 5 years:

- 11 or more points overall with at least 8 points in category A or Category B
- Evidence of a high level of professional impact, for example including regular participation in invited presentations at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within the field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; professional awards; significant number of citations; and median mentions.
- Leading and serving on national advisory committees for major conferences, research foundations, federal funding agencies or other similar professional bodies
- Receipt of awards or recognition for excellence related to research, scholarship, or related activities.

A faculty member who **meets expectations** is generally expected to have produced evidence of the following over the prior 5 years:

- 4 or more points overall **in categories A through D** (but fewer than points needed for “exceeds expectations”).
- Evidence of some professional impact, for example including regular participation in presentations at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within the field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; professional awards; reasonable number of citations; or median mentions.

A faculty member who **does not meet expectations** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the prior 5 years:

- Between 1 and 3 points overall **in categories A through D**.
- Inconsistent evidence of professional impact, for example including irregular participation in presentations at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within the field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; professional awards; insignificant number of citations or median mentions.

A faculty member who is **unsatisfactory** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the prior 5 years:

- Substantial and chronic deficiencies or failure to meet expectations in research, scholarship, or creative works as expected in the faculty member’s discipline, with minimal to no efforts to follow previous advice or other efforts to make corrections.
- No peer reviewed research articles or scholarly works of similar quality. Zero points from the table above in categories A through D.