

**The University of Tennessee
Haslam College of Business
Department of Supply Chain Management**

Department By-Laws

Approved: 11-22-24

The purpose of these By-laws is to establish the overall organization of the Department of Supply Chain Management and to provide a vehicle supporting the cooperation, advice and consent of Department faculty in the conduct of its affairs, all within the general framework of the organization and regulations of the Haslam College of Business and the University of Tennessee-Knoxville.

I. Faculty Membership and Voting Privileges in the Department

- A. Membership of the faculty of the Department of Supply Chain Management (SCM) shall consist of all persons holding regular or temporary department appointments to an academic rank as lecturers, senior lecturers, distinguished lecturers, instructors, clinical professors, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors.
- B. The voting membership of the Department consists of faculty members where at least 75% of their workload (e.g., 6 out of 8 workload units) is allocated to the Department of SCM. This includes faculty in tenure-track (TT), including those TT members who have not yet earned tenure, and non-tenure-track (NTT) positions. Faculty on joint appointments with other research, administrative or teaching departments, bureaus, or offices within the university are voting members as long as their workload to the Department of SCM meets or exceeds the 75% workload threshold. All such persons shall enjoy full voting membership in the Department. Of the persons meeting (or exceeding) the 75% workload threshold, TT faculty members have full voting privileges in the department, whereas NTT faculty are eligible to vote on all matters other than TT faculty hiring, tenure, promotion, and retention.
- C. Faculty members who meet the 75% workload threshold and are on full or part-time leaves of absence (or reduced time) shall enjoy the voting status that would be available to them were they not on leave.
- D. Departmental Emeritus Professors are nonvoting faculty members.
- E. The *Faculty Handbook* states that “visiting faculty do not participate in the governance of the department,” and as such, are considered nonvoting faculty members.
- F. The Department Head (DH) and faculty share in the governance of the Department.

II. Departmental Meetings

- A. Department meetings shall generally be held twice per semester during the academic year. However, additional meetings may be called by the DH or at the written request of a simple majority of the voting faculty. A quorum exists if at least one half of the voting membership is present, either physically or via live electronic communication. Proxy votes for particular agenda items may be given by a faculty member to any other voting member. In all matters, the Department Head’s presence, vote, and proxy shall be counted on par with any other voting member.
- B. In the case of departmental meetings in which questions of hiring tenure-track faculty are decided, two-thirds of the voting departmental membership must be in attendance, either physically or through electronic connection, in order to constitute a quorum.

- C. For decisions other than TT faculty hiring, tenure, promotion, and retention, a simple majority of those present and those sending proxy votes and/or absentee ballots shall decide an issue. For these special types of decisions, a 2/3 majority is the minimum threshold to decide an issue in the affirmative, and/or render a positive recommendation. For these special decisions, the Department Head shall ensure that every voting member of the faculty who is present will have the opportunity, although not an obligation, to express an opinion on those issues that come to a vote.
- D. When any departmental issue requires a vote, any member of the faculty may call for and thereby require voting by secret ballot. All voting for faculty hiring (if a vote is required), retention, tenure and promotion are to be conducted via secret ballot.
- E. The Department Head, or his/her designate, shall serve as chair of SCM Department meetings. Minutes of all faculty meetings, as well as any reports or materials submitted to the faculty during the meetings, shall be kept and made available to the faculty.
- F. An initial agenda for regular Department meetings shall be prepared by the DH and distributed in writing to the faculty at least three calendar days prior to the meeting. Additional items may then be suggested by individual faculty and, at the discretion of the DH, may then be added to the agenda. Alternatively, items may also be placed on the agenda by a written petition of twenty-five percent or more of the voting-eligible faculty. All additions to the DH's initial agenda must occur at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. Announcements, which are informational items that do not require faculty action, can be added to the agenda at any time, and/or raised during the "new business" portion of the meeting docket.
- G. If, during the meeting, a matter not on the agenda evolves into a formal motion, any voting member may request and thereby require that the motion be tabled until the next meeting.
- H. Except for votes taken on TT faculty hiring, tenure, promotion, and retention decisions, at the discretion of the DH, a vote of the faculty may be taken electronically. When electronically voting, faculty will have a minimum of three (3) business days to submit their vote after it is requested. When voting in this manner, one option available on the ballot must be to defer the vote until discussion is held at the next scheduled faculty meeting. Deferral will occur if 20% or more of the faculty members who cast a vote so request. Voting on TT faculty hiring must take place following face-to-face discussion of any and all candidates under consideration. If faculty are unable to attend a TT faculty hiring discussion in person or via electronically-mediated communications, their proxy vote(s) can be submitted to the department head via e-mail, and these proxy votes will be counted toward both the quorum count and final vote tally for the hiring decision.

III. Department Committees, Course Champions and Undergraduate Program Director

There are four types of department committees:

- Promotion and tenure committees
- Standing committees
- Faculty search committees
- Ad hoc committees

A. Promotion and Tenure Committees: Criteria for promotion and tenure are as set forth in the *Faculty Handbook and UT Manual for Faculty Evaluation*.

1. *Committee on Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor*

This committee shall consist of all Professors and Associate Professors who hold tenure in the Department of Supply Chain Management. Its purpose shall be to report to the DH with regard to candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Two thirds of the committee membership being in attendance, either physically or through electronic connection, shall constitute a quorum for conducting business. A vote shall be taken on the candidate's dossier and the results made part of the submitted report. One member of the Committee shall be designated by the DH to summarize discussion and submit a formal recommendation. The DH cannot participate in this vote.

- a. The DH shall preside at meetings of the full committee and shall be responsible for calling a meeting of the committee. The time and place of meetings shall be made known to committee members at least seven calendar days in advance.
- b. Absentee votes shall be allowed and care should be taken to keep the votes anonymous.
- c. In unusual circumstances, operational procedures may be altered by two-thirds vote of the committee membership.

2. *Committee on promotion to Rank of Professor*

This committee shall consist of all Professors who hold tenure in the Department of Supply Chain Management. Its purpose shall be to make recommendations to the DH with regard to candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor. Operational rules for this committee shall be equivalent to those of the Committee on Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor.

3. *Committee on Awarding of Tenure*

This committee shall consist of all tenured members of the departmental faculty. Its purpose shall be to make tenure recommendations to the DH in situations in which tenure decisions must be made separate and apart from promotion recommendations and decisions. Operational rules for this committee shall be equivalent to those of the Committee on Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor.

4. *Committee on promotion for non-tenure track faculty*

If it is determined by the DH that a full-time non-tenure track faculty member is eligible to be considered for promotion, the DH will form a committee to consider the candidate's dossier and make recommendation to the DH. This committee should consist of a minimum of three faculty members, two of whom should be tenured faculty. If a NTT faculty member is included on the committee, that individual should be at a higher rank than the current rank of the candidate under review.

B. Standing Committees

There are five standing Department committees:

- Undergraduate Studies and Scholarships Committee
 - Graduate Studies and Scholarships Committee
 - Peer Teaching Review Committee
 - Strategy Advisory Committee
 - Supply Chain Forum Advisory Committee
1. *The Undergraduate Studies and Scholarships Committee* will focus on curricular, strategy, and other undergraduate studies issues in Supply Chain Management, and will also administrate the selection and distribution of undergraduate scholarships to recipients. Appointment to this committee will be made by the Department Head. The committee will consist of five to six people: the Assistant Department Head (ADH) who will chair the committee, at least one NTT faculty member, and at least one TT faculty member. Appointments to the “Undergraduate Committee” will be made by the DH. It should meet at least once per semester to consider issues such as SACS Assurance of Learning processes, the content of major field tests, proposed curriculum changes, and any other issues assigned by the DH. The committee may be divided into two subcommittees – one that focuses on curriculum and related issues and the other that focuses on scholarships. The subcommittees will meet on an as needed basis. One member of this committee (selected or approved by the DH) will serve on the Haslam College of Business Undergraduate Policy Committee.
 2. *The Graduate Studies and Scholarships Committee* will focus on curricular, strategy, and other graduate studies issues in Supply Chain Management, and will also administrate the selection and distribution of graduate scholarships to recipients. Appointment to this committee will be made by the Department Head. The committee will consist of three people: the ADH, who will chair the committee; one faculty member; and the SCM Ph.D. Program Director. The appointment of the faculty member to this committee will be made by the Department Head. The committee should meet at least once per academic year to consider issues involving graduate curriculum, Ph.D. program concerns or strategies, and any other relevant topics/issues assigned by the DH. One member of this committee (selected or approved by the DH) will serve on the Haslam College of Business Graduate Policy Committee.
 3. *The Peer Teaching Review Committee* shall consist of two SCM department faculty members. This team will conduct all peer teaching reviews required by the department during the year. The team members are appointed by the department head, and will serve staggered two-year terms for the purposes of providing continuity, i.e., each year one person is “new,” and the other is in their second and final year of service. The chair of this committee is selected by the department head. At least one member of the committee must hold a TT position. Guidelines for the responsibilities of The Peer Teaching Review Committee can be found in the *Haslam College of Business, Peer Teaching Review Procedure* document.
 4. *The Strategy Advisory Committee* will consist of the Department Head as chair, the ADH, the GSCI Executive Director and two other “at large” faculty, one of whom should be a tenured full professor holding an endowed chair or professorship. The at large members shall be elected by the voting members of the department and shall serve a three-year term.
 5. *The Supply Chain Forum (SCF) Advisory Committee* will consist of the GSCI Faculty Director(s); Forum Operations Director; Forum Operations Manager, and 2 faculty selected by the Dept Head to serve on the committee. The committee will manage the SCF to provide value to the

Forum members and SCM Department.

Additional standing committees may be formed at the discretion of the DH or by consensus action of the faculty. Within ninety days of its creation any new standing committee is required to submit to the entire voting faculty a written statement describing its scope of responsibilities. Approval of this statement shall require a 2/3 majority vote of the voting-eligible faculty and the statement will then be attached to the minutes of the meeting. If a committee's scope of responsibility changes at some later date, a new statement must be submitted and approved in the same manner.

Standing committees have the right and the responsibility to make motions to the faculty. Such motions do not require a second.

C. Faculty Search Committees

During periods when faculty searches are active, a search committee shall be appointed, in accordance with Haslam College and University policies.

Search committees for TT positions shall be comprised of a subset of departmental TT faculty selected by the DH (including a committee chair), as well as one faculty member from outside the department (nominated by the search committee and approved by the DH), and a representative from the Haslam College Office of Access and Community Connections.

Search committees for NTT positions shall be comprised of a subset of departmental faculty (TT and/or NTT) selected by the DH (including a committee chair), which will continuously coordinate with the Haslam College Office of Access and Community Connections and engage with that office's personnel as requested.

In the SCM Department, search committees are not standing committees; they are appointed for the purposes of fulfilling the duties related to a single, identified search, and are then disbanded at the conclusion of a successful search or at such a time when the search is deemed "failed" or is terminated for any other reason. If a failed search occurs, any subsequent searches would require that a committee be reconvened as specified above.

D. Ad Hoc Committees

Various ad hoc committees may be constituted, under the appointment and direction of the Department Head or by consensus of the faculty to deal with particular matters as they occur.

E. Course Champions

In addition to departmental committees, faculty will be expected to serve, at the discretion of the department head, as course champions for the various courses we offer at all levels of education. Ideally, no faculty member will serve as champion of more than two courses, and junior faculty will serve as champion of one course or none at all. However, in safeguarding the high quality of our programs, and given the large demand from students to take a variety of supply chain management courses, it may be necessary to deviate from these principles in select cases. Specific policies related to course champions are as follows:

- Each course in the undergraduate and graduate programs will have a course champion that is responsible for overseeing the course development process, course content and guidelines for the course.
- The course champion will work with the other course champions, undergraduate/graduate programs committee, and supply chain faculty to ensure that the course content meets the learning objectives for the course and that the course content fits with the overall curriculum in the supply chain program. The undergraduate program course champions will also work with the Undergraduate Program Director to ensure the quality of the courses and program. When possible, first-time instructors should consult with the course champion the semester prior to the teaching assignment, to fully grasp the content presentation and link to course objectives.
- The Ph.D. Program Director should also work with course champions and the Department Head when Ph.D. students are assigned as instructors to provide them additional direction about the course and ensure they are prepared to properly execute the course.
- Course champions should be notified by the DH or ADH when a new instructor is appointed to teach a course, for the purpose of engaging in consultation.
- All instructors who teach a supply chain course will work in good faith with the course champion to ensure that their syllabus conforms to meeting the course learning objectives. All instructors will have their syllabi and/or other evidence of course content reviewed by the course champion to ensure consistency and agree not to significantly change the content of a course without first seeking the counsel of the course champion. Where possible, instructors should be allowed the latitude to teach and assess the content of a course how they see fit, as long as what they teach does not seriously deviate from the course content and objectives.
- Disagreements on course content will be brought first to the undergraduate/graduate program committee for resolution and then to the Department Head (if necessary) for a final decision.

F. Undergraduate Program Director

Given the size and complexity of the undergraduate program, a faculty member (TT or NTT) will serve, at the discretion of the department head, as the Undergraduate Program Director. The director will oversee the undergraduate program to ensure that it is delivering a consistent and quality offering to the students and the companies/organizations that hire them. The Director's duties include, but are not limited to: (1) Managing the undergraduate course champion process; (2) Overseeing undergraduate scholarships; and (3) Managing undergraduate curriculum changes. These and other responsibilities (if any) can be determined in consultation with the department head.

IV. Department Head

A. Selection and Length of Term

1. Selection of the DH will follow procedures as articulated in the Faculty Handbook. As part of that selection process, the voting members of the department will have the opportunity to vote on preference for department head, and that vote is reported to the Dean of the Haslam College of Business as advisory. The DH is appointed by the Dean of the Haslam College of Business. Normal term of office should be five (5) years. Renewal for another term is at the discretion of the Dean, in consultation with the faculty, as described in the Faculty Handbook.
 2. In accordance with the Faculty Handbook, the DH will be reviewed annually by the Dean.
- B. Assistant Department Head (ADH)
1. Pending the availability of resources, and in coordination with HCB Deans and administrators, the Department Head will select, hire, and retain an ADH. The primary role of the ADH will be to assist the DH in conducting normal daily operations such as course scheduling, financial management, internal and external communications, etc., as well as the other duties described in previous sections. The ADH will also assist the DH in departmental administration and decision-making.
 2. The ADH should possess expertise and/or formal pedigree that would support their eligibility to teach in SCM Undergraduate and/or Graduate Programs; this teaching commitment will be an expectation within their annual workload requirements.
- C. Hiring and Retention of Non-Tenure Track Faculty
1. NTT appointments are carried out at the discretion of the Department Head in a manner consistent with established department governance procedures, Haslam College of Business by-laws and the University of Tennessee policies.
 2. Evaluation of NTT Faculty is carried out at the discretion of the Department Head. S/he will conduct such evaluations in a manner consistent with the Haslam College of Business by-laws and the University of Tennessee policies.
- D. Administration of Faculty Reviews
1. Faculty Responsibilities
 - a. Unless otherwise stipulated in a written agreement with Haslam College and/or University central administration, each faculty member will contribute fully to the department. Such contributions will be divided into teaching, research and service categories. The proportions that a faculty member will contribute from each category will be established at the discretion of the DH, in consultation with the Associate Dean for Faculty and Research, in a manner consistent with the Haslam College of Business by-laws and the University of Tennessee policies. The proportions will be communicated to the faculty member during or subsequent to the administration of the annual faculty review process.
 2. Annual Retention Review
 - a. The DH will follow the guidelines of Haslam College of Business as set forth in the Faculty Handbook, UT Manual for Faculty Evaluation and Haslam College of Business Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Guidelines.
 3. Annual Faculty Evaluation

- a. The DH will follow the guidelines of Haslam College of Business as set forth in the UT Manual for Faculty Evaluation and Haslam College of Business Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Guidelines.

V. Ratification and Amendment of These By-Laws

Ratification of these by-laws may be accomplished by the process defined in Section II above. Subsequent to ratification, it may be also amended by the process defined in Section II above.

APPENDIX A

SCM Department Faculty Performance Review

Per University of Tennessee policy, all full-time faculty are evaluated on an annual basis. This includes tenured/ tenure track (TT) faculty, who are evaluated subsequent to each academic year, and non-tenure track (NTT) faculty, who are evaluated subsequent to each calendar year. Following the timeline determined by the Provost's Office, faculty submit a Faculty Accomplishment Form (FAF) and/or any other requested documents for review by the Department Head. Once the Department Head (DH) has completed his/her review, the faculty member has opportunity to review the scores given and any narrative comments, then to respond if he or she chooses. The DH review and recommendation are then forwarded to the Dean, who performs a similar review and recommendation process, with both the faculty member and department head retaining the right to respond. The Dean's office forwards all recommendations and responses to the Chief Academic Officer, who makes the final decision on the review. More details on the evaluation process can be found in the Faculty Handbook and Manual for Faculty Evaluation from the Provost's web site.

The purpose of this departmental bylaws addendum is to provide greater clarity about how the DH of the Department of Supply Chain Management will determine assessments across the various categories of the university's annual review system. Specifically, the DH will abide by the following general philosophies, definitions, principles, and guidelines when performing an annual faculty performance review:

Teaching

1. Teaching is at the core of the duties for most faculty members. Excellence in the classroom is a basic expectation across all ranks for both TT and NTT faculty, when teaching is assigned within their annual workload. The criteria for evaluating teaching should be standard across all faculty. However, the extent to which different criteria should be used to evaluate a given faculty member should consider both experience in a course and number/sophistication of course preparations assigned in the total workload.
2. In evaluating teaching, the DH should consider not just student-generated SAIS scores, but should also consider other factors that contribute to the overall teaching mission of the department, college, and university, as appropriate for rank. There is much more to the evaluation of teaching than simply SAIS scores that reflect a faculty member's "deep and sustained commitment" to teaching. Therefore, in addition to SAIS scores, department heads should also consider broader types of mission-directed contributions when evaluating teaching. Contributions which may lead to an assessment of "exceeds expectations" or "far exceeds expectations" will typically include exceptional efforts or circumstances, including, but not limited to:
 - a. Willingness and demonstrated ability to teach multiple course preparations, or step in and take new preps when the department is in need, as appropriate to rank.
 - b. Willingness and demonstrated ability to teach in multiple programs (undergraduate, masters and PhD programs) as per departmental and college needs.
 - c. Willingness and demonstrated ability to generate innovative offerings (particularly those that have the ability to impact significant numbers of students).
 - d. Any department, college, or university awards (or finalists for awards) given for excellence in the classroom.
 - e. The rigor of the course being taught, when considered in light of intended learning goals and/or pedagogy.
 - f. The grade distributions assigned by the instructor when submitting final grades.

- g. Any peer reviews (or other formal reviews) of teaching performed during the reporting period.
 - h. The strategic importance of the course as it relates to the overall curriculum.
 - i. Any other inputs deemed relevant by the DH due to their containing valuable information for assessing faculty teaching effectiveness, or their representation of outstanding efforts on the part of the faculty member toward pedagogical improvement or teaching excellence.
3. The “normal standard” for all teaching performance review scores is the rating of “meets expectations.” The department head shall review teaching performance based on the criteria noted above, such that a faculty member meeting expectations is considered:
- a. a highly competent instructor who is teaching the core learning objectives in the course(s) assigned,
 - b. as applying appropriate rigor,
 - c. to be experiencing no major organizational or pedagogical problems within the courses taught,
 - d. to be achieving strong student evaluation scores when controlling for the nature of the course and the professor’s experience teaching the course, and
 - e. to be within normal departmental expectations with respect to grade distributions, topical coverage, rigor, etc.
- Performance evaluation scores other than “meets expectations” should be thought of as meaningful deviations from the normal standard.
4. The inherent challenge and subjectivity of these assessments is acknowledged. However, the DH should make every effort to provide rigorous and equitable evaluations across courses, faculty members, and faculty subgroups.

Research/Scholarship

1. Research is generally only expected from TT faculty, as determined by workload assignments made by the DH in collaboration with the Associate Dean for Faculty and Research. Research/scholarship quality is considered from a multifaceted perspective. While academic journal articles published during the three-year review period are the central consideration in assessing a research portfolio for more junior/early career stage faculty, other types of contributions during the review period are also recognized as adding value, particularly as faculty increase in seniority/are later in career stage. Indicators of quality research/ scholarship valued by Department of Supply Chain Management include:
- a. Research published in highly-regarded academic journals;
 - b. Tangible evidence of an active and strong research pipeline;
 - c. Tangible evidence supporting that scholarly activities are having an impact on the external visibility of the faculty member, the Department and the College;
 - d. Research published in other highly regarded and widely disseminated practitioner outlets, and/or alternative knowledge products that impact the practice of supply chain management, such as proceedings, books, monographs, white papers, case studies, grants and related contract research reports and proposals. If this research direction is the exclusive pursuit of the faculty member, the direction should be vetted with the DH prior to receiving research credit for knowledge creation.
 - e. Any other inputs deemed relevant by the department head due to their containing valuable information for assessing the faculty member’s research/scholarship accomplishments.

2. The weighting and ideal mix of the different types of research/scholarship is determined by a faculty member's career stage and scholarly focus, based upon agreement between the faculty member and the DH. In the earlier career stages, a central focus on academic journal articles is highly recommended. In this portion of the career, the greatest weight will be given to articles accepted for publication (during the review period) in journals on the department's HCB-approved journal list, with the weight decreasing with journal qualification classification, (i.e., Premier being the highest quality classification). As the career progresses, faculty may choose to diversify the types of audiences and correlated impacts sought in research. Appendix B lists our policy on Multidisciplinary Collaboration. The following are general guidelines to be used in the determination of evaluation scores for research for various faculty levels.
 - a. *Assistant Professors* are expected to show promise in developing a program in disciplinary research and scholarship that is gaining external recognition. The probationary (pre-tenure) period is intended to allow time for an Assistant Professor to develop a research portfolio targeted at Premier journals that will show clear achievement of this goal. Thus, the annual reviews should shift focus from "promise" to "accomplishments" over the course of the probationary period. For assistant professors, "meets expectations" in research represents steady progress towards the establishment of a portfolio that establishes a scholarly reputation in their field, including research published by Premier journals, that would be well regarded by our peer institutions. Consideration of progress relative to peers at other institutions is a valid input for the evaluation of an assistant professor.
 - b. *Associate Professors* are expected to continue to target Premier journals and produce scholarly output that enhances their professional reputation and makes them a widely-recognized contributor in their discipline. A rating of "meets expectations" for research should reflect an appropriate combination of quality journal contributions (per the department-approved journal lists) and other scholarly contributions. Positive deviation from "meets expectations" for research are most heavily influenced by academic journal articles, most significantly by articles published in Premier journals, and progress towards being a recognized scholar within their field. Consideration of progress relative to peers at other institutions is a valid input for the evaluation of an associate professor. Consideration of the workload units assigned to research is highly relevant in all of these assessments since, with more units comes greater output expectations.
 - c. *Professors* are expected to continue to produce scholarly output that enhances their professional reputation and makes them a widely-recognized contributor in their discipline. It is acknowledged that the mix of scholarly output may change somewhat for some full professors with longevity. A rating of "meets expectations" for research should reflect an appropriate combination of quality journal contributions (per the department-approved journal lists) and other scholarly activities. Consideration of the workload units assigned to research is highly relevant in all of these assessments since, with more units comes greater output expectations.
 - d. The Department has agreed to comply with the HCB Mentorship Policy for faculty.

Service

1. Service to the department, college, university, and discipline is a necessary and important element of the academic career and faculty workload. Service can take many forms, including

both internal and external roles. The performance evaluation score for service reflects the relationship between service workload units and service activities. Generally speaking, service expectations for tenure track faculty are lower during the pre-tenure (probationary) period than for tenured faculty; it follows that service expectations are highest for the most senior faculty.

2. An evaluation score of “meets expectations” for service generally reflects competent participation in service roles in such a way that is respected by peers and adds value to the department, college, university, or discipline. Negative deviations from the “meets expectations” standard occur when service opportunities fail to be fulfilled or are fulfilled with an unsatisfactory degree of quality; positive deviations occur when a faculty member performs service at a greater than expected workload per their rank, and/or do so with a greater degree of quality than would be normally expected.
3. It is important to note that service in the Department of Supply Chain Management is evaluated along both quality and quantity dimensions. It is tempting to equivocate the undertaking of large numbers of service items with high performance on the service evaluation. However, the DH should recognize that not all service assignments are of equal difficulty or impact, and therefore s/he should weigh more heavily those items that are most difficult to successfully complete, and/or that yield the greatest overall positive impact on the focal constituency.

Professionalism

1. The professionalism evaluation criterion reflects a combination of interpersonal attributes which we associate with a strong and valued faculty member of the Department of Supply Chain Management, regardless of rank or tenure track / non-tenure track status. These include descriptors such as courtesy, respect, tolerance, tact, honesty, integrity, reliability, responsiveness, diligence, and collegiality. A rating of “meets expectations” reflects someone with a high level of these attributes.
2. In the department of Supply Chain Management, demonstration of these descriptors is a basic expectation, even if at times maintaining these attributes means setting aside personal agendas, goals and desires.
3. Dissenting opinions are welcomed. By maintaining a professional, team-oriented overall demeanor, even when communicating dissenting opinions, our faculty reflect that we hold ourselves to the highest standards of professionalism found in academia.
4. The standard expectation is that all of our faculty will “meet expectations” in terms of professionalism by consistently adhering to the descriptions listed above, and because this is the only one of the four faculty performance dimensions that is entirely within the faculty member’s individual control, any negative deviation from the descriptors is taken seriously. Alternatively, faculty members who go substantially beyond the call of duty in terms of professionalism should be recognized. Thus, though professionalism scores are not tracked at the University level, the SCM Department Head can and should use them as the basis of differentiation when distinguishing between otherwise similarly performing members of the faculty.

Appendix B

Multidisciplinary Collaboration

Collaboration within teams that include faculty from multiple academic disciplines can advance research, teaching, and service, thereby advancing the mission of the university. Such efforts are commonly referred to using a variety of terminologies, but they generally include situations where faculty members from multiple fields of inquiry work together on a project or stream of work that draws from each individual's area of expertise, advancing theory and practice in the constituent disciplines.

Meaningful faculty participation in collaborative research, teaching, and service across disciplines is encouraged and valued by the Department of Supply Chain Management (SCM). Yet, the relative amount of value attributed to research efforts is contingent on the type of effort and the journal in which it is published. Specifically, the Department of Supply Chain Management recognizes three types of multidisciplinary research:

Type 1: Multidisciplinary research with significant supply chain content published in supply chain journals¹ – this type has tremendous upside potential for the supply chain field as it injects new insight into it. Multidisciplinary research published in supply chain journals that advances knowledge of the field's scholarship such as methodological/conceptual/discipline notes, theory assessments/guidance and other forms of introspective reflection are also included in Type 1 – these papers are often highly impactful.;

Type 2: Multidisciplinary research with significant supply chain content published in business journals outside of the supply chain domain – this type broadens the stature of the supply chain field by contributing to other business disciplines.; and

Type 3: Multidisciplinary research with significant supply chain content published in journals outside of the business domain – this type further broadens the reach and impact of the supply chain field.

All things (e.g., journal ranking) being equal, faculty wishing to engage in multidisciplinary research should primarily focus on Type 1. This is especially important for faculty at the rank of assistant and associate professor as they work towards promotion. Type 2 is encouraged as a complement (not a supplement) to Type 1. Type 3 should be sought even more sparingly, especially before the rank of full professor. Multidisciplinary work that does not contain significant supply chain content should be sought only in rare circumstances.

Evaluators of multidisciplinary research efforts, especially those focused on the attraction, retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty, should recognize and assign appropriate credit (considering the types noted above) when faculty engage in collaborative activity across disciplines.

The above dialogue relative to the types serve as broad guidelines. In assigning or gaining credit, it is ultimately the responsibility of the faculty member to accurately represent and demonstrate how their role in such collaborations enhances the reputation and expertise of themselves, the department, college, and/or university. Likewise, Department Heads should work with faculty to ensure that the college and department's valuations of collaborative activities are clearly communicated to others who may be conducting internal and external faculty review.

¹ Supply chain journals include those listed on the SCM Department's list as well as closely aligned journals such as selected ones on the Business Analytics and Statistics Department journal list (e.g., Manufacturing and Service Operations Management).