



To whom it may concern

I am writing this letter in order to state my professional opinion about (a) whether one of the external reviewers (Dr. David R. King), met the qualification requirements stated in the AFIT Standing Rules for the Academic Rank Promotion and Tenure Committee, and (b) whether the quality and impact of Dr. Schultz's academic contributions meet or exceed the standards of AFIT in comparison with three comparable members of the AFIT Department of Operational Sciences ("ENS") who have been granted tenure at the AFIT.

I am Professor and Dean at the Cambridge Judge Business School, and before assuming the Dean's role here, I was chaired professor at INSEAD, both are global top 20 business schools. I attach my short bio as an appendix. I think this bio unambiguously qualifies for the role of an external reviewer at AFIT. I have reviewed people's tenure cases at business schools such as Wharton, Chicago, INSEAD, MIT, and others over the years, and I have sat on tenure and promotion committees for 20 years at INSEAD and Cambridge, so I know the quality journals in all business fields.

Before answering the two questions, I will comment on how I see the academic record of Dr. Schultz. I preface this by saying that I have not worked directly with Dr. Schultz, and I have no relationship with him other than discussions at conferences and reading his work.

I professionally know Dr. Schultz and I am familiar with his research. In terms of his publication record, he has published 5 papers in top journals as they would be universally seen by any of the best business school in the world (Management Science and M&SOM), 6 articles in top field journals that would be considered as top journals in most (except the 20 most selective) business schools in the world (Journal of Operations Management, Production and Operations Management), and then several more publications in respected refereed journals (Interfaces, EJOR). This is a good record, which would certainly get Dr. Schultz tenure (although not the full professor rank) at my school. Moreover, Dr. Schultz has not just produced a quantity of research outputs, but he has influenced the Operations Management community with his research on behavioral (that is, not fully economically rational, and not "optimal") process and operations performance in real organizations. Dr. Schultz is widely known in this community as a thought leader and intellectual contributor in this research area, and I have known of him over the years, and met him several times, because of his reputation.

I now turn to answering the two questions.

(a) I will first express my view of Dr. King, the external reviewer. I have been asked to evaluate whether Dr. David King satisfies AFIT's rules for an external reviewer. The required qualifications of a reviewer in the AFIT regulations are that someone "possesses a relevant doctoral degree and is or has been a tenured, graduate faculty member at the rank of

Associate Professor or Professor within an academic department with educational and research activities similar, or superior in stature, to those of the candidate's department. The academic reviewer should hold prominence within the candidate's particular area of specialty and will predominantly belong to a Ph.D.-granting department."

Dr. King is the department head of the management of Florida State University (FSU). The FSU College of Business is a PhD-granting department, and Dr. King has a senior role as a department head. So, at face value, he fulfills the requirements of a reviewer for AFIT (although FSU is not a major university --- it is of lower status than the University of Florida and its college of business, which is a good business college but not top ranked). However, Dr. King's record is *inferior* to Dr. Schultz's: Dr. King has 3 publications in unambiguous top journals (one each in the Strategic Management Journal, Academy of Management Journal, and Organization Science), 2 in good field journals (Journal of Management, and Management Studies), and 3 in lower level refereed journals (Business Horizons and the Journal of World Business), plus one practitioner publication in the California Management Review. This publication record is *much* weaker than Dr. Schultz's, as anyone who has ever sat on a tenure committee at a major business school will confirm. Moreover, Dr. King's specialty is in the field of mergers and acquisitions (and post merger integration), a sub-field of inquiry in strategy. Thus, Dr. King is *not an expert* in Dr. Schutz's field of operations management, and even less so in Dr. Schultz specialty of behavioral operations.

I thus see a situation where an external evaluation of Dr. Schultz was written by someone who, although perhaps formally passing AFIT's reviewer requirements, is (1) not an expert in Dr. Schultz's field and can therefore not easily judge Dr. Schultz's contribution and (2) has a research record that is significantly weaker than Dr. Schultz's. This seems to me to be highly irregular --- how can someone who is lacking two essential features of a knowledgeable and impartial judge give an opinion on something as critical as denying tenure?

(b) I will compare the qualifications of Dr. Schultz with those of Drs. Cunningham, Ogden and Johnson, the three people who have been granted tenure in the ENS department of AFIT. In sum (as explained below), *all three have much weaker publication records*, as evaluated by widely accepted journal rankings in business, than Dr. Schultz.

Dr. Cunningham has a long publication list (although this needs to be normalized by the long career, after his PhD in 1986), however, *not a single publication either in a top business journal or a top field journal*. For example, Dr. Cunningham has many publications in the field of transportation, but they are all in secondary journals, such as Transport Policy, Airforce Journal of Logistics, and Journal of Transportation Management. The top field journal in transport research is Transportation Science, and it is absent from Dr. Cunningham's record.

Dr. Ogden's research record is, if anything, even weaker; he has again a reasonably long list but hardly any publication even in secondary journals that I know (the International Journal of Production Research, a tertiary journal, is a standout in his record).

Finally, the situation is similar for Dr. Alan Johnson --- he has done technical work on simulations and heuristics, and there is not a single publication in a top journal (the Journal of the Operational Research Society, a secondary journal, being a standout).

I therefore come to the conclusion that *to the eyes of a knowledgeable outside observer, the academic records of all three people are much weaker than Dr. Schultz's*. The first two have longer publication lists than Dr. Schultz, but at no leading business school can an absence of highly ranked publications be made up for by a large quantity of low-level publications.

Of course, as an outsider, I do not know the strategic criteria that AFIT used to choose its professors; possibly the emphasis was on consulting, or teaching, or institutional work, or something else. I can, therefore, not assess the internal consistency of AFIT's promotion decisions. However, I can state that Dr. Schultz has a much stronger academic record, in terms of its status and impact on the wide research community, than the three people who were promoted to Professor by AFIT.

I hope these observations are useful, and I am available for follow-up questions.

With best regards,

Cambridge, April 6, 2019



Professor Christoph H. Loch

Director (Dean)

Cambridge Judge Business School, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1AG, UK

(enclosures)

Appendix: Short Bio of Professor Loch

Professor Christoph H. Loch is the Director (Dean) of the Cambridge Judge Business School (CJBS). CJBS is a global top-20 business school, which is known as a thought leader in innovation, entrepreneurship, institutional theory of organizations, and Alternative Finance, and the business school of the Cambridge Cluster, the largest entrepreneurial cluster in Europe.

Professor Loch's research and consulting experience lies in the management of innovation in organizations, including technology strategy, strategy cascading, project selection, concurrent engineering, project management under high uncertainty, collaborative problem solving, and performance measurement. He also examines the motivation of professional personnel in organizations (such as R&D organizations), in particular, the emotional aspects of motivation and performance. His research impact has been recognized by the academic community through his appointments as department editor in leading scientific journals, such as *Management Science*, *Operations Research*, *Production and Operations Management*, *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management* (JETM) and *Research Technology Management*, and he was identified as one of the top ten researchers worldwide in innovation in the *Journal of Product Innovation Management* in 2012. He has published 60 articles in leading academic journals and 20 articles in practice oriented managerial journals; he has also co-authored four books on managing highly novel projects, on management quality in manufacturing, on management quality and competitiveness, and a handbook on the management of product development. Several of his case studies have been award winning and used in business schools across the globe.

Before 2011, Professor Loch was Chaired Professor of Technology and Operations Management at INSEAD. There, he served as INSEAD's Dean of the PhD program from 2006-2009, and as the director of the INSEAD Israel Research Center from 2008 through 2011. Prior to joining INSEAD, he worked as a consultant for McKinsey & Company in their San Francisco and Munich offices, after earning an engineering degree in Germany, an MBA at the University of Tennessee, and a PhD at Stanford University.