

A “spreadsheet approach” for monitoring faculty intellectual contributions

William Scroggins
Jacksonville State University

Carl Gooding
Jacksonville State University

Richard Cobb
Jacksonville State University

ABSTRACT

Sufficiency of faculty intellectual contributions (IC’s) is a critical aspect in preparing for the initial AACSB International accreditation or reaffirmation of a business program. School administrators are confronted with the task of making sure business faculty achieve adequate intellectual contributions. To have a successful Peer Review Team (PRT) visit, it is critical that individual faculty members be monitored and tracked to ensure they achieve sufficient IC’s for Academically Qualified or Professionally Qualified (AQ/PQ) status.

This paper offers a systematic process for: (1) schools going up for initial AACSB accreditation; and (2) schools preparing for reaffirmation, that is broken down into three components. The three components include: (1) categorizing IC’s into “A, B, C groups” to be used in determining AQ/PQ status, (2) the use of “faculty profiles” for documenting faculty IC’s and, (3) providing a “spreadsheet approach” for monitoring faculty intellectual contributions. The result is a systematic approach with three tools to help achieve and maintain faculty AQ or PQ status with respect to IC’s. This “spreadsheet approach” simplifies the process of monitoring and tracking faculty progress with respect to IC’s thru the critical five year review period.

Keywords: Monitoring faculty intellectual contributions

INTRODUCTION

A critical aspect in preparing for the initial AACSB International accreditation or reaffirmation of a business program is sufficiency of intellectual contributions (IC's). During the five year review period prior to the PRT visit, school administrators are confronted with the task of making sure that faculty members achieve adequate intellectual contributions. To have a successful PRT visit, it is critical that individual faculty members be monitored and tracked to ensure they achieve sufficient IC's for AQ or PQ status. In addition, all business faculty members collectively must be monitored to make sure the college's entire portfolio of IC's are continuous and spread evenly throughout the five year review period. The following sections provide a brief review of suggested criteria for determining AQ/PQ status along with a possible format for documenting faculty qualifications for a PRT, both of which were presented in earlier papers. The final section presents a "spreadsheet approach" for monitoring faculty intellectual contributions.

DETERMINING AQ AND PQ STATUS OF BUSINESS FACULTY

According to AACSB Standard #10 [FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS]: The faculty of the school has and maintains expertise to accomplish the mission and to ensure this occurs, the school has clearly defined processes to evaluate individual faculty member's contributions to the school's mission. The school specifies for both academically qualified and professionally qualified faculty, the required initial qualifications of faculty (original academic preparation and/or professional experience) as well as requirements for maintaining faculty competence (intellectual contributions, professional development, or practice) (2, p. 43).

The "basis for judgment" narrative that accompanies Standard #10, stipulates that "at least 90 percent of faculty resources are either academically or professionally qualified". Also, "at least 50 percent of faculty resources are academically qualified." Furthermore, the "basis for judgment" section states, "a school should develop appropriate criteria consistent with its mission for the classification of faculty as academically or professionally qualified. The interpretive material in the standard provides guidance only and each school should adapt this guidance to its particular situation and mission by developing and implementing criteria that indicate how the school is meeting the spirit and intent of the standard. Specific policies should be developed to provide criteria by which academically and professionally qualified status is granted and maintained." The "basis for judgment" taken from pages 43 and 44 of the current Standards (1, p. 43-44) indicates the criteria should address the following:

- Consistent with the stated mission, the types of development activities that are required to maintain academic or professional qualifications on an ongoing, sustained basis.
- The priority and value of different development activities reflecting the mission and strategic management processes.
- The quantity and frequency of development activities and outcomes expected within the typical five-year AACSB review cycle to maintain each status. (1, p. 44).

In a paper published in The Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education, the authors presented an approach for categorizing IC's and establishing criteria by which AQ and PQ status is granted and maintained. From this previous paper, the authors provide a listing in

Appendix I of various opportunities to produce intellectual contributions and development experiences which are considered “validating” for purposes of maintaining AQ or PQ status. Appendix I lists the intellectual contributions (validating experiences) in groups A, B, and C (3, p. 3-4). Each year all faculty are expected to cite their accomplishments within each of the groups and provide documentation, as requested, for each citation. The listings in Appendix I are not intended to be all inclusive. Appendix II presents the measures (specific combinations of “validating” experiences) for maintaining AQ or PQ status (3, p. 2-3).

DOCUMENTATION FOR STANDARD 10

The first item (bullet) in the “Guidance for Documentation” section that follows Standard #10 reads: “The school should provide information on academic and professional qualifications of each faculty member.” This section also indicates “the information may be provided in the form of academic vitae, but must include sufficient detail as to actions, impacts and timing to support an understanding of faculty development activities” (1, p. 44).

One of the authors has substantial experience as an AACSB PRT member and has experienced numerous situations where the necessary information was provided by the school in the form of faculty prepared academic vitae. Unfortunately, the vitae often did not follow a uniform format and PRT members had to waste valuable time sorting out whether or not they agreed with the AQ or PQ claims cited in the schools Fifth Year Maintenance Report (2, p.2).

In February 2008 an AACSB Peer Review Team (PRT) visited the College of Commerce and Business Administration at Jacksonville State University (JSU) and subsequently submitted a positive recommendation to AACSB which, in turn, led to maintenance of accreditation for the College. The authors received feedback from the PRT which indicated satisfaction with the approach described earlier and shown in Appendix I and II. In addition, the PRT expressed appreciation for the documentation provided in advance of the visit to support claims, based on the metrics, as to who was and who was not “academically” or “professionally” qualified (2, p. 2).

FORMAT OF DOCUMENTATION

This section provides a brief description of a three-ring binder developed to provide the PRT with supporting details of faculty qualification in an orderly, uniform format and with tables regarding journal articles to assist the team in evaluating the portfolio of aggregate faculty research productivity as specified in AACSB Standard #2 (1, p. 19).

The Table of Contents for the binder of supporting documentation is shown in Table 1 (Appendix III). Using vitae and annual reports already in the files, the department heads and their administrative secretaries prepared a draft of a five year profile for every person who held faculty rank, both full-time and part-time. The individual faculty members were then asked to carefully review their profiles and additions, and corrections were made as needed. This approach, as opposed to requesting self-prepared profiles, relieved the faculty members of this time consuming task and ensured the school’s administration that every profile was prepared following the same precise format. The purpose of this approach was to make the PRT’s task of assessing these documents less onerous. Table 2 (Appendix III) provides the standard content outline for the five year faculty profile (2, p. 3).

As indicated in Table 2 (Appendix III), each faculty member's "validating experiences" are sorted into four categories. These experiences are delineated in Appendix I. All of the entries in Categories A and B and a few of those in C are counted for inclusion in AACSB Table 10.1. These intellectual contributions are distributed in this table across the three areas: "learning and pedagogical scholarship" (L), "discipline-based scholarship" (D) and "contributions to practice" (P) and they are further distributed within these three categories as "peer reviewed journals" (PRJ) and "other intellectual contributions" (OIC). To facilitate the review process for PRT members, every intellectual contribution which is included in the cells of Table 10.1 is coded at the right margin of its listing on a faculty member's five year profile (2, p. 3).

"SPREADSHEET APPROACH" FOR TRACKING/MONITORING FACULTY INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS (VALIDATING EXPERIENCES)

In the case of business faculty at Jacksonville State University, most faculty members worked diligently during the prior five year review period to achieve adequate IC's in order to be classified AQ or PQ. However, after the successful PRT visit, some faculty significantly reduced their research activities. We believe these that faculty had the mindset that "all was well" and they would simply wait several years to resume their research activities. This presents two problems: (1) they may wait too long to become productive and end up classified as "other" and (2) AACSB standards stipulate that IC output is expected to be continuous, evenly distributed over the entire five year review period for the college. And, very importantly, 90% of faculty members are to be AQ or PQ at all times. These issues led to the development of a spreadsheet that could be used as a tool by the Department Heads and Dean to track and monitor the status of each faculty member's IC's. The spreadsheet also enabled us to observe the college's entire portfolio of IC's as a whole at any given point during the five year review period.

Table 3 (Appendix III) shows actual spreadsheet data used to monitor intellectual contributions (validating experiences) for selected faculty at JSU (faculty member names are fictitious). The spreadsheet reflects IC's in Groups A, B, and C from May 2005-April 2016. Every year the spreadsheet is "rolled forward" by adding a year (column) on the right side and eliminating the earliest year on the left. Very importantly, note the wide heavy vertical lines. These lines can be shifted from side to side to print out the status of faculty members for any five year period. As shown here, the heavy lines delineate the critical five year review period that precedes our anticipated PRT visit in early 2013.

As an illustration of an entry from the spreadsheet, faculty member Professor T. Brown published a peer-reviewed journal article in 2007 (our annual faculty evaluations cover the period May 1-April 30). This is designated by (+A1) in the column for 2007. Note in Appendix I that Group A validating experience item #1 is an "article in a peer-reviewed journal". Also note that five years hence, in 2012, this article drops out and is eliminated, as shown by (-A1). For each of the three consecutive years, 2008, 2009, and 2010, Professor Brown achieved two articles in peer-reviewed journals. This is reflected by the entry (+A1)² for years 2008-2010. Again, note these articles drop out beginning 2013, as shown by (-A1)² for years 2013-2015. Group B accomplishments are reported in the same row with Group A items. Professor Brown achieved a peer-reviewed proceedings in each of the three consecutive years of 2008-2010, as indicated by (+B5) for 2008 and 2009 and (+B5)² for 2010, since a total of two proceedings were published in 2010. In the case of Group C validating experiences, which are reported on

the second row, Professor Brown's 2007 cell reflects a (+C3) and his 2008 cell shows a (+C14). His 2009 cell reflects three items: (+C1), (+C3), and (+C17). Appendix I indicates these entries correspond to: an "in-house publication widely distributed beyond the university community" in 2007 (+C3); "attendance at a seminar/workshop in the area of one's teaching discipline" in 2008 (+C14); "presentation of a paper at a meeting of an academic professional association" in 2009 (+C1); an "in-house publication widely distributed beyond the university community" in 2009 (+C3); and "program chair for a professional association" in 2009 (+C17). Again, five years hence, these items drop out as shown by (-C14) in 2013 and (-C1), (-C3), and (-C17) in 2014.

Professor Brown is clearly "academically qualified" based on "Measures for Maintaining AQ or PQ Status" shown in Appendix II. He maintains AQ status by readily meeting the first measure in Appendix II, which requires: "at least three validating experiences from Group A" during the five year review period.

To illustrate further, unlike Professor T. Brown, who has worked steadily throughout the current five year review period to generate IC's, some faculty members have not. Refer to the last three faculty members listed in Table 3 (Appendix III): R. Maddox, K. Lynch and M. Reid. In the last five year review period (2003-2007) these three faculty generated sufficient IC's during 2006-2007 to be AQ, the year immediately prior to the 2008 PRT visit. Unfortunately, after the successful PRT visit, the three faculty virtually ceased research activities. They are currently classified as AQ. However, most of their IC's are now four years old and will "drop off" in 2011-2012, the year immediately prior to our next PRT visit in 2013. These faculty will become "Other" at the end of 2011-2012 unless they produce sufficient IC's very soon. Their department has had serious discussions with these faculty members to "cajole" them into a research mode to generate IC's, hopefully in sufficient time to maintain their AQ status. The spreadsheet served as a valuable tool to communicate the gravity of the issue and urgency for generating sufficient IC's to maintain AACSB accreditation.

This "spreadsheet approach" simplifies the process of monitoring and tracking faculty progress with respect to IC's thru the critical five year review period. When shared with faculty, the spreadsheet may serve as a possible motivation tool and also signal a "red flag" with the need for intervention (Department Head, Associate Dean, Dean, etc.) when IC's are insufficient. Overall, the "spreadsheet approach" provides a quick, detailed, up-to-date picture of individual faculty, departments, and very importantly, the college as a whole regarding sufficiency of IC's. Without the spreadsheet, the college may not be as certain of the faculty's status with IC's at a given point in time.

CONCLUSION

Guiding faculty so they maintain AQ/PQ status coupled with preparing for a successful PRT team visit is often an arduous task. This paper has offered a systematic process for: (1) schools going up for initial AACSB accreditation; and (2) schools preparing for reaffirmation, that is broken down into three components. The three components include: (1) categorizing IC's into "A, B, C groups" to be used in determining AQ/PQ status, (2) the use of "faculty profiles" for documenting faculty IC's and, (3) providing a "spreadsheet approach" for monitoring IC's. The result is a systematic approach with three tools to help achieve and maintain faculty AQ or PQ status with respect to IC's. In addition, this approach provides documentation of faculty information in a concise, uniform format for the PRT. Overall, this entire process may be easily modified and tailored to individual schools.

NOTES

1. A faculty member's experiences to meet these minimum specifications for maintenance of AQ or PQ status should be approximately uniformly distributed across the five year period to demonstrate a continuing commitment to maintaining currency in his/her teaching discipline.
2. A faculty member who has held a terminal degree for less than five years or who has been on the faculty as PQ for less than five years will be considered AQ or PQ, respectively. However, to contribute to the aggregate faculty portfolio, these faculty members should be completing validating experiences in approximate proportion to the number of years since completion of the degree (AQ) or initial employment (PQ).
3. The faculty's portfolio of intellectual contributions must include: contributions to learning and pedagogical research (L); contributions to practice (P); and disciplined-based research (D). Given the missions of JSU and CCBA, the relative emphasis should be on the first two of these areas. Each faculty member will be expected to indicate the appropriate area (L, P, or D) for each contribution.

REFERENCES

- Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation*, AACSB International, adopted: April 2003, latest revision: July 1, 2009.
- Gooding, Carl; Cobb, Richard; Scroggins, William. "Demonstrating Faculty Qualifications to an AACSB International Peer Review Team," Vol. V, Issue I, pp. 1- 4, Spring 2009, *The Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education*, Academic Business World, Martin, TN.
- Gooding, Carl; Cobb, Richard; Scroggins, William. "The AACSB Faculty Qualifications Standard: A Regional University's Metrics for Assessing AQ and PQ," Vol. III, Issue 1 & 2, pp. 1-6, Spring/Fall 2007, *The Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education*, Academic Business World, Martin, TN.
- Manual of Policies and Procedures*, College of Commerce and Business Administration, Jacksonville State University, Policy Number: 1:06, adopted: June 2007, latest revision: January 2011.

Appendix I Validating Experiences

Group A

1. Article in a peer-reviewed journal
2. Article in an editorially reviewed journal listed in a Cabell's Directory
3. Book (scholarly, applied scholarship, first-edition textbook)
4. Chapter in a peer-reviewed scholarly book
5. Peer-reviewed case published in a journal or a textbook

Group B

1. Publication in an editorially reviewed journal not listed in a Cabell's Directory
2. Chapter in an editorially reviewed book
3. Revision of a textbook

4. Research monograph such as a final report to a grand funding agency
5. Peer-reviewed proceedings from a meeting of an academic association
6. Significant technical report to a discipline-based association
7. Editor of a book of readings
8. Publication of a discipline-based software product
9. Presentation or posting (e.g. on MERLOT) of an innovative teaching module for external review
10. A book review published in a journal

Group C

1. Presentation of a paper at a meeting of an academic professional association (without proceedings)
2. Invited speaker or panelist at a meeting of an academic professional organization
3. An in-house publication which is widely distributed beyond the University community (e.g. an academic treatise in a publication of the JSU Center for Economic Development)
4. Business consulting report (non-proprietary)
5. A discipline-based academic report for a business, governmental, or quasi-governmental organization in the University's service region (such as an economic impact study)
6. Editor of a journal
7. Editor of a conference proceedings
8. Manuscript reviewer for a journal or proceedings (with substantial participation)
9. Creating and/or delivering an executive education seminar for a business organization or a discipline-based professional association (e.g. an accounting professor teaches a CEU course for the Alabama Society of CPA's; a management professor delivers a seminar on ethical leadership practices for a regional bank)
10. A faculty internship (where a faculty member works full-time for a business for at least four weeks and completes a project or a significant assignment)
11. Obtaining a new professional certification
12. Elected officer, board member or major task-force/committee member of an academic or discipline-based professional organization (with significant responsibilities).
13. Member of the board of a business organization
14. Attendance at a seminar/workshop in the area of one's teaching discipline (e.g., a business statistics professor attends a two-day workshop on how to use a software package in the classroom). Note: Attending a session at a professional meeting would not pass a "litmus test" regarding the scope of the activity.
15. Attendance at an AACSB seminar on assurance of learning, curriculum issues, etc.
16. Successfully performing the annual activities expected of an externally funded research grant.
17. Program chair or track chair for a professional association (including the responsibility for reviewing paper submissions).
Note: For continuing activities, such as being a member of the board of a business, each year may be considered a separate validating experience.

Group D

Some examples of research products and activities which would not be counted in areas A, B, or C are:

1. Service to a meeting of a professional association as a session chair, discussant, paper reviewer, local arrangements coordinator, etc.
2. Completion of annual requirements to maintain a professional certification
3. Working papers
4. In-house presentations at faculty research seminars
5. Newspaper editorials/letters
6. Attendance at in-house seminars (e.g. Using Blackboard)
7. Activities for local community service or religious organizations
8. On-campus service (Faculty Senate, committees, etc.)

Appendix II

Measures for Maintaining AQ or PQ Status

A faculty member may maintain AQ status by meeting one of the following four measures during the most recent five-year period. (Note: Tenured/tenure track faculty members should strive to meet the expectations of one of the first two measures. Exceptions should be rare).

1. At least three validating experiences from Group A.
2. At least five (5) validating experiences including at least two (2) from Group A.
3. At least ten (10) validating experiences including one (1) from Group A and at least three (3) from Group B.
4. At least fifteen (15) validating experiences including at least six (6) from Group B.

A full-time faculty member may maintain PQ status by meeting one of the following three measures during the most recent five year period.

1. At least three validating experiences from Group A.
2. At least five (5) validating experiences including at least two (2) from the combination of Group A and B.
3. At least 10 validating experiences.

Appendix III

**TABLE 1:
Faculty Qualifications, Supporting Information**

Table of Contents

Tab A: CCBA Policy re. Academic and Professional Qualifications

Tab B: List of Journal Articles with Acceptance Rates: 2003-2007

Tab C: Titles of Journal Articles: 2003-2007

Tab D: Accounting Faculty Five Year Profiles

Tab E: Economics Faculty Five Year Profiles

Tab F: Finance Faculty Five Year Profiles

Tab G: Legal Studies Faculty Five Year Profiles

Tab H: Management Faculty Five Year Profiles

Tab I: Marketing Faculty Five Year Profiles

Tab J: Statistics/Quantitative Methods Faculty Five Year Profiles

Tab K: Narrative Justifications Regarding AQ or PQ Status of Selected Faculty Members

**TABLE 2:
Outline of Five Year Faculty Profiles**

Name:	Primary Teaching Discipline:
Date of hire:	Participating or supporting:
Tenure status: (TT, NTT or date of tenure)	Full-time or part-time: AQ, PQ or Other:

Courses Taught (most recent 5 years only)

Education (all degrees and certifications with dates)

Employment History (current and prior employment – include dates of promotion for academic ranks)

Validating Experiences:

- Category A (peer reviewed journals and comparable contributions)
- Category B (other journals, proceedings, grant reports, etc.)
- Category C (presentations w/o proceedings, boards, faculty internships, etc.)
- Category D (professional activities not factored into the AQ or PQ decision)

Works in Progress (which will lead to intellectual contributions)

TABLE 3:
Spreadsheet – Status of Faculty Validating Experiences (Group A,B, & C)
for Maintaining Academic or Professional Qualifications

VALIDATING EXPERIENCES (GROUP A, B, & C)

VALIDATING EXPERIENCES (GROUP A, B, & C)											
	May 2005- April 2006	May2006- April 2007	May 2007- April 2008	May 2008- April 2009	Review Period May 2009- April 2010	May 2010- April 2011	May 2011 - April 2012	May 2012 - April 2013	May 2013- April 2014	May 2014 - April 2015	May 2015- April 2016
J. Jones A's & B's	(+A1)		(+A1)		(+A1)	(+A1) (-A1)		(-A1)		(-A1)	(-A1)
C's		(+C1) (+C6)	(+C4) (+C17) (+C6)	(+C6) (+C4)	(+C9) (+C17) (+C6)	(+C6)	(-C1) (-C6)	(-C17) (-C6) (C4)	(-C6) (-C4)	(-C9) (-C17) (-C6)	(-C6)
R. Roberts A's & B's			(+A1)	(+A1)		(+A1)	(-A1)	(-A1)	(-A1)		(-A1)
C's	(+C8)2	(+C8)				(-C8)2 (+C8)	(-C8)				
D. Davis A's & B's	(+A1)	(+A1)		(+B5)		(-A1)	(-A1)		(-B5)		
C's		(+C1)					(-C1)				
S. Smith A's & B's		(+A1)		(+A1)2	(+A1)	(+A1)	(-A1)		(-A1)2	(-A1)	(-A1)
C's		(+C1) (+C8) (+C12)	(+C8)(+C12)	(+C17) (+C12) (+C8)	(+C1) (+C8) (+C12)	(+C8) (+C12)	(+C8) (-C1) (+C12)		(-C17)	(-C1)	
T. Brown A's & B's		(+A1)	(+A1)2 (+B5)	(+A1)2 (+B5)	(+A1)2 (+B5)2		(-A1)	(-A1)2 (-B5)	(-A1)2 (-B5)	(-A1)2 (-B5)2	
C's		(+C3)	(+C14)	(+C1) (+C3) (+C17)			(-C3)	(-C14)	(-C1) (-C3) (-C17)		
R. Maddox A's & B's	(+A1)	(+A1)3				(-A1)	(-A1)3				
C's		(+C1)2 (+C4)	(+C4)	(+B6)			(-C1)2 (-C4)	(-C4)	(-B6)		
K. Lynch A's & B's		(+A1)	(+A1)	(+B10)			(-A1)	(-A1)	(-B10)		
C's		(+C1)					(-C1)				
M. Reid A's & B's	(+A1)	(+A1)3				(-A1)	(-A1)3				
C's		(+C1)					(-C1)				