

# **Great Lakes Institute of Management, Chennai**

## **FACULTY PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL GUIDELINES**

**w.e.f. April 1, 2020**

## **Purpose of this Document**

This document provides guidelines for annual reviews, promotion, and other pertinent elements of faculty employment at Great Lakes Institute of Management, Chennai. These guidelines are derived from and support the vision, missions, and core values of Great Lakes Institute of Management, Chennai.

It is true that the mission of the institution is not cast in stone or static, and hence the criteria for evaluation of performance must evolve with the mission. However, it is important to define a set of guiding principles in order to outline and facilitate a common understanding of standards of performance that are consistent with the mission, goals, and core values of the institution.

This document is also meant to be the basis for discussion between faculty members and area heads/program directors and the Personnel Committee regarding setting of individual annual and long-term goals. Each member of the faculty will be entitled to a one-on-one discussion of progress with the area head/program director and/or members of the Personnel Committee including the Dean. A formal communication of feedback will be the direct responsibility of each area head/program director and/or members of the Personnel Committee and will include written communication to be placed on record in the faculty's personnel file.

## GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Faculty will be evaluated on three major dimensions:

1. Scholarly output and knowledge creation via research activities
2. instruction/teaching, and
3. institution-building, service to the profession, and external constituencies such as the Government, corporate sector, or non-profits.

In contrast to the point system that guides the incentive process, it is not merely enough to accumulate activities. Rather, it is the **quality of your accomplishments** that will form the basis of evaluation.

Great Lakes Institute of Management, Chennai defines and recognizes performance at four different levels in each of the three areas.

*Excellent performance:* This is a high level of performance that meets and exceeds norms and expectations. Such norms are defined by indicators of excellence that are described more fully in the next section.

*Good performance:* This is an acceptable or above acceptable level of performance that meets or slightly exceeds norms and expectations, as defined by indicators of a good performance, described more fully in the next section.

*Satisfactory Performance:* acceptable and satisfactory performance that meets norms and expectations, defined by indicators of satisfactory performance as described in the next section.

*Unsatisfactory Performance:* unacceptable performance that fails to meet norms and expectations, reflected by an absence of indicators of performance at excellent, good, or satisfactory levels.

At Great Lakes Institute of Management, Chennai, we recognize that faculty may have a variety of indicators of various levels of performance, and that individual members of the faculty may be able to show performance with a different set of indicators over time, and also that such indicators may vary across faculty at different stages of their career.

## RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION

**Indicators of excellence in research and publication include the following examples:**

- Publication in FT50, A\*, or A journals.
- Publication of acclaimed scholarly book(s) (international)
- Publication of acclaimed practitioner book(s) (international/national)

- Frequent citation of publications (> 10 citations/year).
- Editorship of journals
- Editorship of scholarly book.
- Associate editorship or section editorship of journal(s).
- Receipt of major fellowship, research, or publication award(s).
- Membership on editorial board of a major journal(s).
- Receipt of significant external peer-reviewed funding for research.
- Membership on review panel(s) for national or international research organization(s).
- Presentation of papers at important area-listed international conferences.
- Invitation to present research at top-tier schools in India or abroad.
- For research associates and research-active lecturers:
  - Publication in any legitimate peer-reviewed journal

**Indicators of good performance in research and publication include the following examples:**

- Publication in respected refereed journals (B level) in appropriate disciplines.
- Publication of a respected professional book.
- Publication by research sponsor of technical reports or monographs.
- Presentation of papers at IIM/ISB or at international conferences and professional meetings of appropriate disciplines.
- Publication of chapter(s) in scholarly international book(s).
- Invitation to revise and resubmit paper in FT50 or A\* journal
- Ad hoc reviewer for FT50/A\*/A journal and/or national or international organizations.
- For research associates and research-active lecturers:
  - Revise and resubmit decision at any legitimate peer-reviewed journal

**Indicators of satisfactory performance in research and publication include the following examples:**

- Publication in respected refereed journal (C level or SCOPUS non-indexed) in appropriate disciplines
- Presentation of papers at other Indian institutions (within top 20) or conferences and professional meetings of appropriate disciplines
- Publication of chapter(s) in scholarly national book(s)
- Invitation to revise and resubmit paper in A or B journal
- Ad hoc reviewer for B, C, or Scopus non-indexed journal
- Significant self-development activity, including attending faculty development workshops and training sessions for research-related activities
- For research associates and research-active lecturers:
  - Presentation at internal or external workshop/conference

In addition, Great Lakes Institute of Management, Chennai recognizes the importance of collaboration in research and the contribution to building a network of scholars in a particular research area. We encourage faculty to demonstrate research leadership by occasional single-authored works and/or a balance of authorship across a body of research.

## **TEACHING/INSTRUCTION**

### **Indicators of excellence in teaching/instruction**

- Evidence of courses taught at a rigorous and challenging level, with recognized excellence
- Outstanding teaching performance over a significant period of time as evidenced by outstanding student ratings (> 4.5), interviews with students and student leaders, and outstanding peer evaluations (including peer reviews of classroom instruction). Such evaluations need to be considered in relation to course expectations (documented through course syllabi), grading practices in relation to comparable course levels/sections or other factors.
- Development of innovative pedagogical methodologies and materials, including high quality online courses, blended learning, or flipped classrooms
- Development of pedagogy to promote abstract problem-solving skills via case studies, simulations, and role plays, or
- Development of pedagogy to promote deep analytical thinking skills via use of datasets, empirical, and analytical modelling.
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials (e.g., textbooks, instructional software programs, cases, readings, simulations, and the like).
- Invitation to teach at international institutions of recognized excellence
- Development and/or coordination successful new executive development programs.
- *For lecturers:* Outstanding performance on bootcamps and tutorial sessions as evaluated by faculty and students
- *For lecturers:* Outstanding evaluations over a significant period of time as assistant to teaching faculty, as evaluated by both faculty and students

### **Indicators of good performance in teaching/instruction**

- Development of a new course(s) or major revisions of existing courses to become more contemporary.
- Above average teaching ratings (4.2-4.5) over a significant period of time
- Supervision of empirical student projects.
- Significant contributions to student development through student advising and mentoring
- Significant self-development activities, such as a faculty development workshop, leading to increased teaching effectiveness.

- Invitation to teach at other international business schools.
- Teaching in executive education programs
- For lecturers: Above average performance on bootcamps and tutorial sessions as evaluated by faculty and students
- *For lecturers:* Above average evaluations over a significant period of time as assistant to teaching faculty, as evaluated by both faculty and students

### **Indicators of satisfactory performance in teaching/instruction**

- Minor revisions of existing courses to become contemporary
- Average teaching ratings (3.8 – 4.2) over a significant period of time
- Assistance with student development through student advising and mentoring
- Assisting with teaching in any program with satisfactory or above performance.

## **SERVICE/INSTITUTION-BUILDING**

### **Indicators of Excellence in Service and Institution Building**

- Elected officer in a national/international professional organization.
- Program chair or similar position for a national/international meeting, other than at Great Lakes.
- For Program Directors: Outstanding student evaluations on annual feedback for program
- For Area Heads (defined as those leading a team of 5 or more faculty in a specific functional area): Outstanding student evaluations of area on annual feedback for program
- For Faculty performing other administrative roles: Demonstrated leadership and significantly high added value to institution and student experience, as evaluated by the Dean
- Consulting and sponsored research assignments from top Indian or global organizations
- Bringing top tier Indian or global organizations to campus for recruitment or L&D
- Attracting funding from government or private institutions for research grants, establishment of endowed chairs, or naming rights
- Service on government committee or task force
- Service on corporate boards
- For lecturers: Excellent performance on invigilation duties, as evaluated by Director, CAA

### **Indicators of Good Performance in Service and Institution Building**

- Elected Officer in regional or state professional organization.
- Committee member for a national/international meeting
- Program chair or similar position for meeting hosted by Great Lakes  
Service as an active member of the Faculty Senate.

- Service on Great Lakes committees and task forces.
- For Program Directors: Above average student evaluations on annual feedback for program
- For Area Heads: Above average student evaluations for area on annual feedback for program
- For faculty performing other administrative roles: Above average added value to institution and student experience, as evaluated by the Dean.
- Speeches and/or consulting for major corporates or practitioner groups.
- Service as consultant to business organization(s) and/or governmental agencies.
- For lecturers: Above average performance on invigilation duties, as evaluated by Director, CAA

### **Indicators of Satisfactory Performance in Service and Institution Building**

- Committee member for meeting hosted by Great Lakes
- Advisor to student organizations/committees.
- For Program Directors: Average student evaluations on annual feedback for program
- For Area Heads: Average student evaluations for area on annual feedback for program
- For faculty performing other administrative roles: Average added value to institution and student experience, as evaluated by the Dean
- For lecturers: Average performance on invigilation duties, as evaluated by Director, CAA

## **EXPECTED PERFORMANCE LEVELS BY RANK**

### **Assistant Professor**

Assistant professors are expected, at a minimum, to be SATISFACTORY to GOOD in instruction/teaching and to establish SATISFACTORY TO GOOD patterns of Research and publication.

Service contributions, while normally limited, should generally be focused on STUDENT ENGAGEMENT. Further, it is expected that assistant professors will display evidence of progress toward meeting the established criteria for promotion to associate professor.

### **Associate Professor**

Associate professors are expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate SATISFACTORY TO GOOD performance on all three dimensions. In addition, EXCELLENCE is expected in at least one area between instruction/teaching and research and publication. Associate professors, relative to assistant professors, are expected to exhibit increased contributions in service. Promotion to professor will be based on an assessment of all three performance dimensions, with research and publication typically carrying the heaviest weight.

### **Professor**

Professors are expected to demonstrate LEADERSHIP in the pursuit of EXCELLENCE and national prominence. This leadership may be demonstrated in a variety of ways, such as: (1) leadership in one or more of the areas of excellence in service; (2) leadership in one or more of the areas of excellence in instruction/teaching, which includes student development; (3) leadership in contributing to knowledge creation; (4) leadership in the development of junior faculty, namely, lecturers, assistant and associate professors. Professors may contribute in a variety of ways to the mission of the organization, but there will be continued expectation of EXCELLENCE in one or more performance areas.

## **JUNIOR FACULTY**

### **Lecturers**

Lecturers are expected, at a minimum, to achieve SATISFACTORY to GOOD performance in teaching/instruction, defined according to the role they perform in this function. Lecturers have no obligations in research, unless they aspire to be promoted, in which case, a SATISFACTORY rating on research and publication is also required. Service obligations such as invigilation must be performed, at a minimum, at SATISFACTORY to GOOD levels.

### **Research Associates**

Research associates are expected, at a minimum, to achieve SATISFACTORY to GOOD performance in research and publication. They are also expected to achieve SATISFACTORY ratings in teaching/instruction, defined according to the role they perform in this function, and SATISFACTORY ratings on Service.

### **Sr. Lecturers**

Senior lecturers are expected, at a minimum, to achieve GOOD performance in teaching/instruction, defined according to the role they perform in this function. Senior lecturers with aspirations for promotion to assistant professor must establish a research pipeline, and receive at least a GOOD rating on research/publication. Service obligations must be performed at GOOD to EXCELLENT levels.

### **Sr. Research Associate**

Sr. Research Associates are expected at a minimum to achieve GOOD to EXCELLENT performance in research/publication and must establish a research pipeline. In addition, they are expected to achieve SATISFACTORY to GOOD ratings in teaching/instruction, and GOOD to EXCELLENT ratings on Service. Sr. Research Associates with aspirations for promotion to assistant professor must strive to achieve at least a GOOD rating in teaching/instruction.



## **ANNUAL REVIEW**

Every member of the faculty shall undergo a mandatory annual review of performance. This must result in a written document of expectations for each faculty member, commensurate with his or her rank and seniority. Evaluations of performance relative to those expectations in scholarship, teaching, and service **must be communicated in writing** to the faculty member.

Area heads / program directors who determine that the performance of a faculty member is unsatisfactory should submit a written plan for near-term improvement, duly signed by both parties. This document must accompany the annual review submitted to the Dean.

## **FACULTY WORKLOAD GUIDELINES**

Great Lakes full-time faculty members are generally expected to be fully engaged in classroom activities during the academic year. All faculty will be required to meet the 200-point threshold across the three dimensions of performance. Failure to meet the threshold while taking on external assignments will be viewed seriously.

All faculty will have a teaching load of 100 hours, which can be earned by any combination of courses in the PGPM, PGDM, PGP Flex, and PGXPM programs. The maximum over-load teaching (including adjustments for large class sizes) is an additional 125 hours. We will therefore enforce a strict teaching cap of 225 hours, all-inclusive. This does not include teaching in CLD or BABI programs.

## **ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS**

All Great Lakes faculty will be evaluated on their performance on an annual basis. This review will typically occur in the spring of each year between March-April. There may be other occasions to evaluate an individual's overall record, such as when s/he is being considered for promotion.

The purposes of the annual performance review include:

1. Creating a logical and transparent basis for merit salary increase recommendations.
2. Providing feedback regarding how well the individual is currently performing relative to expectations for the individual's faculty position.
3. Providing feedback regarding areas where the faculty member may need to improve or enhance contributions in the future.
4. Providing feedback regarding progress toward promotion.

Each year the area head or program/director will request information from each full-time faculty member in each department or program about the activities and indicators of performance for the preceding year. All full-time faculty and junior faculty will use a

common reporting format developed and approved by the Great Lakes executive committee. Area heads/Program Directors have the discretion to request additional information. Area Directors and Program Directors will be directly reviewed by the Dean on the same criteria.

Senior faculty at the level of Professors and Associate Professors will be given an opportunity to provide feedback on the performance of assistant professors and junior faculty. The Area Head/Program Director will provide each faculty member with a detailed written assessment of his/her performance. Further, the document will be discussed by the area head or program director with the individual faculty member at a meeting to be arranged between the two, and must subsequently be signed by both individuals, and sent to the Dean's office for review. A copy will be placed in the individual's personnel file. Additional comments or responses may be placed on the record by the area head or program director.

The review of junior faculty will be the sole responsibility of the program director to whom the individual is attached. The program director will review measures of performance relevant to the expectations of each individual junior faculty. The assessment will be made and discussed with the faculty member, and a performance feedback letter will be provided by the program director, to be signed by both the individual faculty member and the program director and sent to the Dean's Office for review. A copy will be placed in the individual's personnel file.

During the review period, each area head / program director will submit recommendations to the Office of the Dean. Such recommendations must be accompanied by (1) a copy of the most recent reporting form completed by the faculty member, (2) a current CV for the faculty member, (3) a copy of the feedback document provided to the faculty member, and (4) a form developed and approved by the Great Lakes Executive Committee on which the area head or program director provides his/her own assessment of the individual's performance along each of the three dimensions plus an assessment of overall performance.

## **PROMOTION EXPECTATIONS**

### **Assistant Professors being Considered for Promotion to Associate Professor**

In order to be considered for promotion, Assistant professors are expected, at a minimum, to be GOOD to EXCELLENT in instruction/teaching and to establish at least a GOOD pattern of research and publication. Service contributions, while normally limited, should generally be focused on STUDENT ENGAGEMENT.

Promotion to associate professor will be based on an assessment of all three performance dimensions, with research and publication carrying the heaviest weight followed by instruction/teaching. Such considerations will be based on a holistic evaluation over the entire period of employment at Great Lakes. To be considered worthy of moving up the ladder, individuals must demonstrate a willingness and commitment towards continuous

improvement on all three dimensions. In other words, simply meeting the minimum criteria every year may not be enough; rather, individuals must show an improving pattern over time. In general, a fresh assistant professor is expected to take between 3-6 years to establish eligibility for promotion to associate professor, while those with previous experience may be eligible earlier depending on the merits of their case.

### **Associate Professors being Considered for Promotion to Sr. Associate Professor and Full Professor**

To be considered worth of promotion, associate professors are expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate continued levels of GOOD performance on all three dimensions. In addition, EXCELLENCE is expected on at least one of the two dimensions of research and teaching.

Promotion to professor will be based on the cumulative record, with special attention given to accomplishments since promotion to the rank of associate professor. In general, an associate professor is expected to take at least three years at the associate level to establish eligibility for promotion to full professor. Typically, it may take at least five years to establish a promotion-worthy record. Interim promotions to Sr. Associate Professor may however be entertained during this period. Individuals who establish an unusually strong record of accomplishment may request early consideration. Such requests must be routed through the area/head or program director, who will assess them and offer informal feedback on the likelihood of success. Formal requests may then be made to the Office of the Dean for consideration.

### **Lecturers being Considered for Promotion to Senior Lecturer**

Lecturers considered worthy of promotion are expected, at a minimum, to be GOOD in instruction/teaching and make significant service contributions such as invigilation. Promotion to senior lecturer will be based on an assessment of both performance dimensions, with teaching performance (such as leading bootcamps, workshops, and mini-classes) carrying the heaviest weight. The minimum requirements for promotion to senior lecturer at Great Lakes include the following:

Pattern over time of GOOD TO EXCELLENT in teaching as assessed by criteria applicable to lecturers.

Pattern over time of GOOD TO EXCELLENT in service as assessed by criteria applicable to lecturers.

Potential for continued excellence in teaching and service.

Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity.

In general, lecturers should expect to complete a minimum of 3 years before seeking promotion.

### **Research Associates Being Considered for Promotion to Sr. Research Associate**

Research Associates are expected, at a minimum, to be GOOD in Research/Publication and make significant service contributions such as invigilation.

Promotion to senior research associate will be based on an assessment of both performance dimensions, with research performance (such as publication and presentation in research workshops/conferences) carrying the heaviest weight. The minimum requirements for promotion to senior research associate at Great Lakes include the following:

Pattern over time of GOOD TO EXCELLENT in research as assessed by criteria applicable to RAs.

Pattern over time of at least GOOD in teaching as assessed by criteria applicable to RAs.

Pattern over time of GOOD TO EXCELLENT in service as assessed by criteria applicable to RAs.

Potential for continued excellence in research.

Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity.

In general, research associates should expect to complete a minimum of 3 years before seeking promotion.

### **Sr. Lecturers / Sr. Research Associates Being Considered for Promotion to Assistant Professor**

Sr. Lecturers and Sr. Research Associates are expected, at a minimum to be EXCELLENT in one of two dimensions - Research/Publication or Teaching/Instruction (and at least GOOD on the other dimension) as assessed by the criteria applicable to them. Promotion to assistant professor will be based on a very rigorous assessment of all performance dimensions. In particular, emphasis will be given to an assessment of the ability of the individual to teach independently at a standard expected of an assistant professor. Emphasis will also be given to an assessment of the individual to pursue an independent research agenda at a standard expected of an assistant professor. The minimum requirements for promotion to assistant professor at Great Lakes include the following:

Possession of a terminal degree (Ph.D.)

Pattern over time of EXCELLENCE in teaching as assessed by criteria applicable to Lecturers/RAs.

Pattern over time of EXCELLENCE in research as assessed by criteria applicable to Lecturers/RAs.

Pattern over time of GOOD TO EXCELLENT in service as assessed by criteria applicable to Lecturers/RAs.

Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity.

In general, Sr. Research associates or Sr. Lecturers should expect to complete a minimum of 3 years before seeking promotion.

## **PROMOTION PROCESS**

Every member of the faculty eligible for consideration for promotion, as deemed by the area head or program director, will prepare a dossier of his/her record on the three performance dimensions. As part of the dossier, the candidate should provide a brief statement (maximum of three pages, single spaced) of his or her goals, strategies, and areas of focus in meeting institutional expectations on teaching, research, and service. The dossier will be provided to the area head or program director (depending on the reporting relationship). The area head / program director will, in turn, nominate a senior professor at an appropriate level to conduct a peer review of the candidate's teaching in the classroom and an evaluation of the syllabus and pedagogy. The candidate's research record and service must also be reviewed. A recommendation from the area head/program director together with a comprehensive summary of the candidate's record must be provided to the Office of the Dean.

The entire dossier will then be reviewed by the Dean together with the rest of the Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee will meet once a year (unless otherwise warranted) to review all promotion cases and will transmit its recommendations and vote to the Board for final consideration.

## **FACULTY NOTIFICATION DURING PROMOTION PROCESS**

A faculty member shall be advised of the recommendation for or against promotion at each level of review. In case there is a negative recommendation, the faculty member is entitled to a written statement of the reasons for that decision.

The official decision by the board regarding the granting of a faculty promotion will be conveyed in writing to the faculty member as soon as possible after the board formally acts on the recommendation from the Personnel Committee.

## **APPENDIX: PROMOTION DOSSIER**

Candidates for promotion must take the lead in preparing a suitable dossier for review. Reviewing members may request or add more materials at various stages during the process. The dossier may be submitted either as a hard or soft copy, and may eventually be moved to completely digital format.

The dossier must be arranged in sections, details of which are given below:

### **Section 1: STATEMENT ON TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE**

The candidate is required to submit a brief statement (maximum 3 pages, single spaced) on his or her goals, principles, strategies, and focal points in carrying out his/her professional responsibilities in teaching, research, service and other activities, if any, that may be relevant to the position. This statement is only meant to provide a context for review and should be completely fact-based. It is not meant to be an argument for promotion.

### **Section 2: CANDIDATE'S CURRICULUM VITAE**

The candidate must include the most current and correct version of his/her curriculum vitae. This should be accompanied by a cover sheet where the candidate certifies that the submitted CV is the most current and correct version available.

The list of publications must be clearly organized into refereed and non-refereed categories. Refereed publications must state the ABDC ranking of the journals they were published in. Publications in Scopus non-indexed journals (or other types of creative works) should be listed separately. All lists must be suitably captioned. All listed publications must be supported by details including the journal, date/year of publication, issue number, and page numbers. Articles that have been accepted but not yet published should be listed separately.

### **Section 3: AREA PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

This document is typically prepared by a departmental peer. Subsequent reviewers should be able to find documented evidence for statements made in the report.

For evaluation of instruction/ teaching, the following are to be included, as applicable:

- Peer evaluation of syllabi, assignments, examinations, and grading methods to determine the scope, rigor and quality of the candidate's course offerings.
- Peer commentary on student ratings of teaching. The peer must summarize the evaluations, provide a longitudinal perspective to track trends and patterns relative to the norms for the area and the school. A table summarizing the student ratings over a five year period (or as available) must be provided.
- Peer evaluation of development of new courses or substantial revision of existing courses.

- Peer evaluation of special efforts made by the candidate to improve his/her teaching or to develop new teaching materials.
- List of external awards or recognition for teaching, with explanation if necessary.
- List of external invited presentations on teaching innovations.
- Evaluation of publication of instructional materials, including textbooks.
- Peer evaluation of the candidate's performance in classroom teaching situations.

#### Section 4: AREA EVALUATION OF RESEARCH

The key determinant of the evaluation of research will be the indicators of quality of research (defined on a continuum of Excellent to Not Satisfactory). Support for assertions of "quality" of publications and research must be given. Materials to be prepared and submitted by the candidate include:

- List of publications with complete citations (including data of publications and inclusive page numbers) organized as:
  - Refereed journal articles.
  - Books or chapters of books.
  - Proceedings and presentations.
  - Other, including non-refereed journals.
  - Work in progress
- Items that have been accepted, but not yet published, should be so labeled.
- Items that have been submitted, but not yet accepted, should not be shown unless they appear in a separately captioned list.
- Summary of reviewing and/or editorial activities.
- List of research grant(s) and contract(s) funded and report(s) to sponsor(s).
- Reprints (copies) of three of the most significant publications.

#### Section 5: AREA EVALUATION OF QUALITY OF SERVICE

Peer evaluation of the quality of service to the department, college, university, or other relevant constituencies is to be included.

#### Section 6: AREA REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

This section is to include the complete report from the area head/program director, and recommendation. The report may refer to information provided in sections 3, 4, and 5. There must be a clear recommendation from the areas head or program director on whether the candidate is to be promoted or not.

#### Section 7: RECOMMENDATION OF DEAN

This section is to include the independent recommendation of the dean