



RUSCHE

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

AUGUST 2017



Experience Business.™

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN	3
RUSCHE COLLEGE OF BUSINESS: MISSION, VISION, VALUES, & STRATEGIC FOCUS	4
GUIDING PRICIPLES.....	5
Creating Student Success	5
Enhancing our Reputation	6
Attracting Resources	6
STRATEGIC PRIORITIES.....	6
AACSB STANDARDS AND CONSIDERATIONS.....	8
FACULTY SUFFICIENCY	8
FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS.....	9
FACULTY EVALUATIVE COMPONENTS.....	15
PERFORMANCE REVIEW PROCESS	16
FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS	16
Faculty Activity Reporting Process	19
Review of Merit Evaluation	20
CAREER PROGRESSION EVALUATION.....	20
Pre-Tenure Review	20
Tenure Review	21
Promotion Review	28
Post-Tenure Review.....	31
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT.....	31

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Faculty Development Plan is designed to serve as a resource and guide for faculty concerning the evaluation of annual performance and career progression in the context of the mission of the Rusche College Business and AACSB accreditation standards. Details concerning the annual review process, pre-tenure review, tenure and promotion requirements, and post-tenure review are presented. Furthermore, information concerning resource support is provided in order to assist with faculty development. While certain policies are presented here in abbreviated form, complete versions of college policies referred to in this document are provided on the cobcommon shared drive.

RUSCHE COLLEGE OF BUSINESS: MISSION, VISION, VALUES, & STRATEGIC FOCUS

MISSION

The mission of the Nelson Rusche College of Business is to create a challenging learning environment that will enable our students to launch their careers with the foundation for effective leadership.

VISION

Our vision is to show continuous improvement in three interrelated areas: creating student success, enhancing our reputation for excellence, and attracting critical resources; i.e. students, faculty, staff, and funding.

VALUES

We believe that applied learning within a personalized and collaborative setting is fundamental for creating a superior learning experience. We value high quality research and teaching, innovation, respect for colleagues and students, and hard work and integrity in everything we do.

STRATEGIC FOCUS

Learn

We are creating a personalized and applied learning environment supported by high quality faculty, staff, and administrators

Launch

We are creating experiences that will challenge and equip our students to find their place in a highly competitive and global environment

Lead

We are creating engaging experiences that will challenge and equip students to make a difference in the world around them.

GUIDING PRICIPLES

The guiding principles used in carrying out this mission are as follows:

Creating Student Success

We believe that student success is balanced on three pillars; student learning, career preparation, and the development of leadership skills. We refer to these pillars as “learn”, “launch”, and “lead.” Of these three pillars, learning is foundational. A fundamental understanding of business principles is crucial if one is to effectively launch a career and influence others. However, knowledge alone is insufficient for student success. Therefore, we also make it a priority to prepare students to launch their careers and to instill values and personal skills necessary for effective leadership. These pillars create a desirable value proposition for our students and a source of distinctive identity for our college.

Learn

Our intent is to provide a variety of learning experiences whose cumulative impact will transform student thinking. This is the core of what we do. The role of faculty will be to continue to deliver high quality instruction in current and relevant discipline specific content, seek improvement in teaching methods and curriculum, and stay current in our respective disciplines through impactful research. The role of staff and administrators will be to provide support in the form of resources, training, and services.

Launch

Our intent is to provide a foundation of business and discipline specific knowledge, combined with a variety of networking and “finishing” experiences that will help students embark on a career that is uniquely suited to their skills and personality. The role of faculty will be to provide current and relevant discipline specific content, to support college and university level “networking” events, to support students in their job search efforts, and where appropriate to encourage students in the development of career skills. The role of staff and administrators will be to provide resources, participation, and opportunities for networking and “finishing” experiences and seek continuous improvement in the number and quality of our “networking” events.

Lead

Leaders combine relevant business knowledge with effective personal skills to influence those around them. Our intent is to provide a foundation of business and discipline specific knowledge, combined with a variety of opportunities for the development of relevant personal skills that will provide the foundation for effective leadership. The role of faculty will be to provide current and discipline specific content, to create opportunities for students to develop relevant personal skills in the classroom and through extracurricular activities, and to serve as mentors and personal role models for students.

The role of staff and administrators will be to support and reward faculty efforts and to develop and participate in opportunities for students to learn from and be mentored by business leaders.

Enhancing our Reputation

In addition to our student success strategies, it is imperative that we develop strategies for enhancing our reputation. Our intent is to build awareness of the SFA and Rusche brand in the business community and academic communities. We will accomplish this by promoting the success of our students and alumni and the academic and professional success of our faculty and staff. Also, where appropriate we will engage in various community and service projects. In addition to the efforts of student, faculty, and staff, we will rely on various stakeholders outside the Rusche College such as alumni, university staff, and our executive advisory board to help enhance our reputation.

Attracting Resources

It is also crucial that we take an active role in developing strategies for attracting and retaining high quality students, attracting and retaining quality faculty, developing synergistic relationships with the business community and alumni, and attracting outside funding sources. The intent is to create an ever widening pool of resources that will allow greater opportunities to create student success.

In turn, this mission and accompany guiding principles give rise to a set of Strategic Priorities and associated Intended Outcomes for the college. These are as follows:

STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

1. STUDENT SUCCESS:

1a. Learn: Create a personalized and applied learning environment supported by high quality faculty, staff, and administrators.

Intended Outcomes

1a.1 Educate students: To deliver high quality instruction in current and relevant discipline specific curriculum.

1a.2 Transformative learning experiences: To provide students with opportunities for applied learning.

1a.3 Learning environment: To provide a physical environment and technology to create a collegial space where students, staff, and faculty can grow.

1b. Launch: Create experiences that will challenge and equip our students to find their place in a highly diverse, competitive, and global environment.

Intended Outcomes

1b.1 Finishing: We are providing support to students as they develop career readiness skills.

1b.2 Advising: To deliver quality academic and career advising to our students.

1b.3 Cultural competence and diversity: To provide a curriculum where students are prepared to engage in a diverse and global business environment and have created opportunities to interact with people from diverse backgrounds.

1c. Lead: Create engaging experiences that will challenge and equip students to make a difference in the world around them

Intended Outcomes

1c.1 By example: To provide service to the college, university, our professions, and our community as an example for our students of the importance of leadership.

1c.2 Student organizations: To create opportunities for our students to develop their leadership skills in student organizations and co-curricular activities.

1c.3 Integrity: To create an environment that values ethical and responsible leadership in our faculty, staff and students.

2. ENHANCE OUR REPUTATION:

Promote the success and impact of our students and faculty by communicating a consistent brand to prospective students, our alumni, and others in the community.

Intended Outcomes

2.1 Impact: To encourage and support impactful research contributions by our faculty.

2.2 Brand: To have a consistent brand that is known and communicated by students, employers, and others in the community.

2.3 Promotion: To promote the successes of our students, faculty, and alumni.

3. ATTRACT RESOURCES:

Attract and retain high quality students, and faculty and build relationships in the community to financially support student success.

Intended Outcomes

3.1 Community Engagement: To forge connections in the local community, and with businesses, alumni, and others to enhance our reputation, attract resources, and to develop a synergistic network for our students.

3.2 New funding sources: To create an ever widening pool of resources that will allow greater opportunities for student success.

3.3 Recruitment: To attract and provide support to an ever improving quality of student.

3.4 High quality faculty and staff: To attract, retain, and reward high quality and impactful faculty, staff, and administrators.

AACSB STANDARDS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The Rusche College of Business at Stephen F. Austin State University holds the distinction of being an AACSB accredited institution. Accreditation at this level requires strict adherence to quality control measures and continuous improvement, which is ensured and supported by the deployment of highly qualified faculty. Two general concepts related to ensuring the deployment of highly qualified faculty are *Faculty Sufficiency*, and *Faculty Qualifications*.

FACULTY SUFFICIENCY

Faculty within AACSB accredited institutions are classified into one of two broad categories. In this case, faculty are determined to be either “Participating” or “Supporting.” According to AACSB standard 5, at least 75% of the college’s teaching must be done by participating faculty. In addition, within each “discipline, location, delivery mode, or program” at least 60% of course delivery must be done by participating faculty. Based on guidance provide in the AACSB standards, essential elements of the principles used in determining this status are as follows:

Participating Faculty: Participating faculty “actively and deeply engage in the activities of the school in matters beyond teaching responsibilities.” Further, “normally, the school considers participating faculty to be long-term members of the faculty, regardless of whether their appointments are full-time or part-time in nature, whether or not their position with the school is considered the faculty member’s principal employment, and whether or not the school has tenure policies.”

Supporting Faculty: Supporting faculty do not “participate in the intellectual or operational life of the school beyond the direct performance of teaching responsibilities.” Such faculty members are typically not assigned to faculty committees, and are appointed for a one term or one academic year appointment.

In the Rusche College of Business, the determination of this faculty status is determined according to the following, as is presented in the college's Faculty Sufficiency and Qualifications Policy document.

Participating faculty actively engage in the activities of the College and University beyond teaching responsibilities. Indicators of college and university service might include, but are not limited to:

- Participating in college/university governance
- Serving on college and institutional committees
- Providing academic and career advising
- Directing extracurricular activities
- Participating in faculty development activities
- Participating in curriculum development
- Pursuing scholarly development and intellectual contributions
- Participating in assurance of learning processes

To maintain status as participating, faculty members with long-term teaching commitments must regularly participate in at least three of these activities in a five-year period.

Supporting faculty, in general, do not participate in scholarly development and intellectual contributions or the operational life of the college beyond direct performance of teaching responsibilities. Supporting faculty:

- do not participate in college/university governance
- do not serve on committees
- do not have formal student advising responsibilities
- have no responsibility for curriculum development
- are typically serving part-time appointments

FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS

Faculty in the College are expected to maintain qualifications and current expertise to accomplish the college's mission. According to AACSB standards, at least 90% of course delivery must be performed by faculty of qualified status. Qualified faculty sustain intellectual capital to support the college's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies, including teaching, scholarship, and other mission components by achieving and maintaining status as SA, PA, SP, or IP. Faculty who do not meet these criteria will be classified as Other and will be expected to develop a plan that will allow them to regain status in one of the four categories of qualified faculty.

Determination of qualified faculty status is based on (1) initial academic preparation and/or professional experience, and (2) sustained academic and professional engagement over a five year window. The dean, in consultation with the faculty member, will assign each faculty member to one of the following categories based on initial qualifications and sustained engagement:

Classification	Initial Preparation	Sustained Engagement
Scholarly Academic (SA)	Doctoral or terminal degree.	Academic research and related scholarly activities.
Practice Academic (PA)	Doctoral or terminal degree.	Applied/practice research and related activities.
Scholarly Practitioner (SP)	Master's degree with substantial professional experience.	Academic research and related scholarly activities.
Instructional Practitioner (IP)	Master's degree with substantial professional experience.	Applied/practice activities.

The table below details the AACSB recommended percentages for each category, and those adopted by the Rusche College of Business.

Classification	AACSB Recommended Percentage	College of Business Percentage Goal
SA	40%	50%
SA + PA + SP	60%	60%
SA + PA + SP + IP	90%	90%

Rusche College of Business Qualified Faculty Classifications

Scholarly Academic (SA)

Initial Classification

A faculty member is classified as scholarly academic if he or she meets one of the following criteria:

1. Faculty holding a doctorate in their primary teaching field, or a J.D. or M.S. in taxation for those teaching business law or accounting tax classes, respectively.
2. Faculty holding a doctorate outside their primary teaching field, but has a record of scholarly productivity and/or advanced course work in the discipline of the teaching assignment.
3. Faculty pursuing a doctorate that is directly related or closely related to the discipline and is hired as an “all but dissertation” student and who defends his or her dissertation within three calendar years of the date of hire.

Maintaining Classification

Faculty members classified as scholarly academic maintain their status through sustained academic research and related scholarly activities. Over the most recent five year period, faculty maintain SA status by satisfying one of the following criteria:

1. Doctorate, J.D., or M.S. in taxation earned within the most recent five years.
2. Participation in academic engagement activities (see appendix) during the most recent five years to secure a minimum total of 24 points, with at least 16 points earned from category A and a maximum of 2 points from category E.
3. Faculty with an extensive time commitment to administrative service (dean, associate dean, director, or chair) must secure a minimum of 16 points from participation in academic engagement activities, with at least 8 points earned from category A.

Practice Academic (PA)

Initial Classification

A faculty member is classified as a practice academic if he or she meets either of the two following sets of criteria:

Tenured faculty migrating from SA to PA status:

1. Faculty whose terminal degree is more than five years old.
2. Faculty who have or would have been previously classified as scholarly academic.
3. Faculty whose activities over the past five years (if newly hired, then past activities from prior employment) would result in his or her maintenance of PA status.

Faculty hired into PA status:

1. Faculty whose terminal degree is more than five years old.
2. Have worked in field related to the discipline in which they will teach during the most recent five years.
3. Meets the minimum requirements at the date of hire, defined as a minimum of 24 points with at least 8 points from categories A or D and at least 2 points from category E.

Maintaining Classification

Faculty members classified as practice academic maintain their status through a combination of sustained academic and professional engagement activities. Over the most recent five year period, faculty maintain PA status by satisfying one of the following criteria:

1. Participation in academic and professional engagement activities during the most recent five years to secure a minimum total of 24 points, with at least 8 points earned from category A or D.
2. Faculty with an extensive time commitment to administrative service (dean, associate dean, director, or chair) must secure a minimum of 16 points from participation in academic and professional engagement activities, with at least 8 points earned from category A or D.

Scholarly Practitioner (SP)

Initial Classification

A faculty member is classified as a scholarly practitioner if he or she meets all of the following criteria:

1. Master's degree in a field related to the area of the teaching assignment.
2. Professional experience at the time of hiring that is significant in duration and level of responsibility, and consistent with the teaching assignment.

Maintaining Classification

Faculty members classified as scholarly practitioner maintain their status through a combination of research, and academic and professional engagement activities. Over the most recent five year period, faculty maintain SP status by securing a minimum total of 16 points from academic and/or professional engagement activities, with at least 8 points earned from category A or D and a maximum of 2 points from category E.

Instructional Practitioner (IP)

Initial Classification

A faculty member is classified as an instructional practitioner if he or she meets all of the following criteria:

1. Master's degree in a field related to the area of the teaching assignment.¹
2. Professional experience at the time of hiring that is significant in duration and level of responsibility, and consistent with the teaching assignment.

Maintaining Classification

Faculty members classified as instructional practitioner maintain their status through ongoing professional development as evidenced by securing a minimum of 3 points from professional engagement activities.

Failure to Maintain Faculty Qualification Status

Faculty who do not meet the criteria for maintaining SA, PA, SP, or IP status are classified as Other. In consultation with their department chair, such faculty are expected to develop a written plan that will allow them to regain status in one of the four categories. The faculty's progress will be reviewed on a semi-annual basis until it is determined that he or she has regained status as a qualified faculty.

Point System for Academic and Professional Contributions

The categories of academic engagement activity categories (A, B, C) and professional engagement activity categories (D, E) are listed below. The associated point system by faculty qualification is summarized here:

	SA	PA	SP	IP
Relevant Categories	A, B, C, E	A, B, C, D, E	A, B, C, D, E	D, E
Minimum Total Points	24	24	16	3
Minimum Points per Category	16 from A	8 from A or D 2 from E	16 from A or D	2 from E
Maximum Points per Category	2 from E		2 from E	

¹ With the dean's approval, exceptionally well qualified candidates without a graduate degree can be considered IP.

Academic Engagement Activities

Category A (8 points per item)

- Refereed journal article
- Scholarly book or chapter in a scholarly book
- Original edition textbook
- Case and teaching notes published in a refereed journal

Category B (2 points per item)

- Non-refereed publications in academic, pedagogical periodicals such as trade books, trade journals, and industry magazines
- Conference presentation
- Conference proceedings
- Textbooks, textbook supplements
- Research monographs
- Papers presents at faculty research seminars
- Written cases with instructional materials
- Instructional software
- Service as program chair for academic conference that involves review of and decisions on numerous manuscripts
- Funded grants in excess of \$5,000

Category C (1 point per item)

- Editorial responsibilities for academic journal
- Reviewer for journal or academic publisher
- Coordinator of academic program
- Service as advisor, facilitator, or reviewer for extracurricular student competition
- Funded grants of \$5,000 or less
- Grant proposal for external, competitive, peer-reviewed grant
- Leadership in discipline-related academic association
- Faculty internships
- Discussant, session chair, or panel member at academic or professional conference
- Faculty advisor to student group
- Receive award related to teaching, research, or service

Professional Engagement Activities

Category D (8 points per item)

- Non-refereed publications in academic, pedagogical, or professional periodicals such as trade books, trade journals, and industry magazines
- Non-refereed cases and instructional materials

- Authoring reports from sponsored research that are widely disseminated
- Sustained publication of a newsletter or sequence of reports that are widely subscribed to by the business community

Category E (1 point per item)

- Consulting activities that are material in terms of time and substance, with points awarded annually per consulting job
- Service on corporate or non-profit boards
- Invited professional public speaking
- Obtaining or maintaining relevant professional certification or license in one's teaching area
- Sustained professional work that supports one's teaching area, with points awarded annually
- Development, presentation, or attendance in professional or educational workshop, seminar, or event
- Leadership in discipline-related professional business associations
- Faculty internships
- Service as editor or reviewer for professional journal or trade publication
- Expert testimony in legal proceedings
- Graduate coursework related to one's teaching or research
- Service on an administrative board
- Receive award related to teaching, research, or service

FACULTY EVALUATIVE COMPONENTS

Within the Rusche College of Business, the review and evaluation of faculty performance and career progression are linked directly to the faculty's member's contributions in advancing the mission of the college. The role of the faculty member in this regard is to pursue excellence in teaching, research/intellectual contributions, and service. Each faculty member is expected to perform in these three areas in a manner which is impactful, innovative, and engaging as they relate to constituents that are both internal and external to the college and university.

The evaluative components of faculty performance are centered on three essential duties:

Teaching

As a teaching centered institution, excellence in instruction holds a place of primacy in all activities of the college. Effective course management, high quality advising, innovative teaching/learning techniques, and impactful instruction are highly valued. Consistent with the mission of the college, teaching that involves experiential learning and engagement with the business community are especially valued. Teaching requirements and expectations are more

thoroughly discussed in both the Faculty Qualifications and Sufficiency Policy, as well as the Faculty Annual Review document.

Research/Intellectual Contributions

As an institution focused on teaching and learning, impactful research/intellectual contribution activity is vital, especially as it pertains to improving classroom learning. Although basic research is highly valued and rewarded, it is the added value that such research can bring to the education of students that is most relevant to the college. Pedagogical research is strongly encouraged and rewarded as means of meeting a faculty member's responsibility to engage in research. Varying to some to degree with the faculty member's classification, research/intellectual contributions may also be more broadly defined to include items that ensure faculty currency through engagement with external/corporate entities (consulting, service on boards, etc.). Research requirements and expectations are more thoroughly discussed in both the Faculty Qualifications and Sufficiency Policy, as well as the Faculty Annual Review document.

Service

Effective and impactful service to the college, university, profession, and community is an essential component of faculty responsibilities. In order to be an effective college that engages the greater community and has an impact on it, it is necessary that faculty embrace the responsibility of achieving excellence in service. This is done by emphasizing the role of the faculty member beyond the instruction of individual classes, to that of improving the instruction of the entire college, and maximizing its impact on the university, the greater community, and the profession.

PERFORMANCE REVIEW PROCESS

There are two primary processes related to evaluating faculty performance. Both of these processes are centered on teaching, research, and service, and are consistent with guidelines for faculty qualifications, as presented earlier in this document. The two processes are: 1) The annual review and planning process, 2) The evaluation of tenure and promotion.

FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS

The annual review of faculty occurs on a calendar year basis, as is governed by the Faculty Evaluation and Merit Pay Policy. Early in the spring semester of each year, each department chair schedules individual meetings with faculty in their respective departments to discuss performance during the previous calendar year, review the faculty member's workload assignment, and work with the faculty member to set goals for the upcoming year. The evaluation of faculty is based on data in the Faculty Activity Report as provided through Digital

Measures. Using this information, the department chair evaluates faculty performance based upon the Faculty Annual Review Policy, as outlined below:

Faculty Evaluation

Both the University's Administrative Evaluation form and the College's Faculty Evaluation Form will be used for the faculty evaluation process. On the Administrative Evaluation form, qualitative assessments will be made of the faculty member's performance in Teaching, Research and Service. On the Faculty Evaluation Form, numerical evaluation ratings will be assigned in the same three general categories, as well as any associated sub-categories: 1) Teaching, which includes the sub-categories of undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching, and student advising; 2) Research; and 3) Service, which includes the sub-categories of College/University service, professional service, and business/government service.

Faculty evaluation ratings may range from 1.0 (very weak/unacceptable performance) to 5.0 (exemplary performance), in increments of 0.25. Faculty members will be evaluated and assigned an appropriate numerical rating for each category and sub-category (if applicable) on the Faculty Evaluation Form for the most recent academic year, as well as for the most recent five year period. For each time period, the numerical ratings for each sub-category (if applicable) will be summarized into a numerical rating for each category; these category ratings will not necessarily be an arithmetic average of the ratings for each sub-category. For each time period, the numerical ratings for each category will then be summarized into one single rating for the faculty member; these summary ratings will not necessarily be an arithmetic average of the ratings for each category. Finally, the summary ratings for each time period will be collapsed into one single overall Net Final Rating. The Net Final Rating will not necessarily be an arithmetic average of the current year summary rating and the five year summary rating.

The Faculty Evaluation Form will also indicate whether or not the faculty member is maintaining his or her status SA, PA, SP, or IP, based on the College's current faculty qualifications standards; where applicable, the faculty member's progress towards tenure and/or promotion will also be noted.

Teaching

In keeping with the mission of the College and the University, good teaching is an inherent expectation of all faculty in the College. The successful candidate for teaching merit will document a high level of performance and demonstrated excellence in teaching and instructional development. Many elements may influence the determination of merit for teaching, including course assignments, teaching innovations, student learning, student satisfaction, teaching awards, curriculum and course materials development, and assessment of learning activities.

Starting with the administrative evaluations that will be conducted in the Fall of 2012 (covering faculty performance for academic year 2011-2012), a faculty member will need to demonstrate

one of the following elements: student engagement, innovation, or technology utilization in their teaching, in order to be **eligible** to receive a rating of 5.0 (exemplary performance) in the category of Teaching on the Faculty Evaluation Form.

Student engagement may include, but is not limited to, such activities as the use of formal case analysis, “real world” or other forms of applied projects, academic research projects, field trips, or guest speakers. Innovation refers a pedagogical innovation that is new to the faculty member and introduced into the course. Examples of technology utilization may include such things as the use of new databases, new software, social media, development of an online course, delivery systems (such as Blackboard), wikis, blogs, virtual world applications, instructional websites, and systems for delivering oral presentations in online courses.

It should be noted that including one or more of the above elements in one’s teaching does not guarantee the faculty member a rating of 5.0; including such elements is necessary, but not sufficient for receiving a rating of 5.0 in Teaching.

Research (Intellectual Contributions)

Contributions to one’s own knowledge and to the knowledge of one’s academic field through research and scholarly activities are considered a significant part of the role of faculty members in the College. Intellectual contributions may include discipline-based scholarship (basic research), contributions to practice (applied research), or learning and pedagogical research:

Discipline-Based Scholarship (basic research) contributions add to the theory or knowledge base of the faculty member’s field. Published research results and theoretical innovation qualify as discipline-based contributions.

Contributions to Practice (applied research) influence professional practice in the faculty member’s field. Articles in practice-oriented journals, creation and delivery of executive education courses, development of discipline-based practice and delivery of executive education courses, development of discipline-based practice tools, and published reports on consulting all qualify as contributions to practice.

Learning and Pedagogical Research contributions influence the teaching-learning activities of the school. Preparation of new materials for use in courses, creation of teaching aids, and research on pedagogy all qualify as learning and pedagogical research contributions.

Consistent with the Faculty Sufficiency and Qualifications document, research that leads to publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals (PRJ’s) is the top priority for meritorious performance in this category. In certain cases, other publications can be counted as equivalent to a PRJ, such as scholarly books, a chapter in a scholarly book, first edition textbooks, or cases with teaching notes published in a scholarly journal. Other intellectual contributions, such as paper presentations, published conference proceedings, textbooks, research monographs and other publically available materials can also contribute to meritorious performance in Research. Validating experiences which add value to a third party can also count towards attaining

meritorious performance in Research. No faculty member can be **eligible** to receive a rating of 5.0 (exemplary performance) in Research if he or she is not deemed to be either SA, PA, SP, or IP, whichever is appropriate. Being SA, PA, SP, or IP does not guarantee a rating of 5.0 in Research; it is a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for receiving such a rating.

Service Contributions

Faculty members have frequent opportunities to provide service to students, the College and University, their academic or professional fields, and the business and civic community. Through service to such groups and organizations, faculty members make available their professional knowledge and expertise beyond that provided through teaching and research.

The balanced nature of the mission of the College with its encouragement of theoretical and practical application of knowledge to specific business practices makes faculty activities in service more significant than is typical across the University. Service expectations and opportunities will vary across departments and disciplines. In evaluating meritorious service, consideration will be given to the scope, importance, and time commitment of each activity and not merely to the number of activities reported.

Faculty Activity Reporting Process

The prescribed process for Faculty Activity Reporting is as follows:

1. As directed in University Policy E-20A, all full-time faculty in the College are required to electronically submit a Faculty Activity Report (FAR) each year via the Digital Measures portal. In addition, each faculty member must submit copies of all Course Evaluation Summaries for each section taught during the previous academic year, along with any other documentation or supporting materials to his/her department chair/director (hereafter referred to as “chair”).
2. Based on the information provided by the faculty member, the respective department chair shall prepare an Administrative Evaluation using the University form as well as the College’s Faculty Evaluation Form. According to University Policy A-37.1, the overall performance of each tenured faculty member must also be marked as “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory” on the Administrative Evaluation.
3. The department chair shall meet individually with each faculty member to discuss the FAR, the Administrative Evaluation, and the Faculty Evaluation Form. Trends in performance, strengths, accomplishments, and areas needing improvement will be discussed, along with SA/PA/SP/IP status. Progress toward tenure and/or promotion will also be discussed, if applicable. Both the chair and faculty member shall sign the Administrative Evaluation and the Faculty Evaluation Form, and the faculty member will be afforded the opportunity to add written comments to either document.

4. The Administrative Evaluation and the Faculty Evaluation Form will be forwarded to the College Dean for review. The Dean may make changes or add his/her own comments. If the Dean does so, the faculty member will have the opportunity to read and respond in writing to the comments before both forms and any attached comments are sent to the Provost/VPAA. A signed copy of both forms will be returned to the Dean's office, the department chair, and the faculty member.
5. Should the College receive a merit pay allocation from the Provost/VPAA, the Dean, in consultation with the College Executive Committee, shall determine the allocations to the Dean's office, support personnel serving the entire college, and each department. Each department chair shall make an initial recommendation to the Dean regarding the merit pay increases (if any) for each faculty member, taking into account the faculty member's documented accomplishments in relation to the published merit criteria of the College and the respective department. At the discretion of each department, a review panel may act in an advisory capacity to make recommendations to the chair regarding merit pay allocations.
6. If approved by the Dean and higher administration, the merit pay increase will be added to the faculty member's contract for the following academic year.
7. Special consideration may be given to a faculty member for continuing efforts that span more than one year and for previous years' accomplishments for which no merit pay was awarded due to budget fluctuations.
8. Any equity pay allocations made to the College by the Provost/VPAA are not subject to the provisions of this policy.

Review of Merit Evaluation

A faculty member who disagrees with his or her merit evaluation may follow the procedures described in University Policy E-26A, *Resolving Faculty Disagreements in Issues Other Than Termination and Non-Renewal of Contracts*.

CAREER PROGRESSION EVALUATION

An integral part of performance evaluation is the review of faculty career progression, especially as it relates to tenure and promotion status. Policies and procedures outlining these processes for the Rusche College of Business presented in detail in the Rusche College of Business Tenure and Promotion Policy, and are outlined below:

Pre-Tenure Review

According to University Policy 7.29, pre-tenure review will occur for every tenure-track faculty member in the College. According to University policy, faculty fulfilling a six-year or five-year probationary period must be reviewed in the third year of probationary service. Faculty fulfilling

a four-year or three-year probationary period must be reviewed in the second year of probationary service. The performance criteria for tenure and review sequence described in the following sections also apply for pre-tenure applications, except that the due date for submission of the portfolio by the candidate occurs in the spring term and the review does not proceed beyond the College dean level.

The College dean provides written feedback to the candidate that includes the following:

- Highlighting of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, including recommendations for addressing weaknesses
- A statement as to whether the candidate is progressing satisfactorily toward tenure
- A recommendation concerning the continuation of the probationary candidate being reviewed

Non-Renewal of Probationary Contract

Procedures for non-renewal of probationary contracts and appeal of tenure decisions are governed by the University Policy, 7.29.

Tenure Review

General Provisions

The general provisions for earning tenure are described in the University *Tenure Policy*, 7.29. Beginning with the full-time appointment to the rank of instructor or above, the probationary period for a faculty member shall not exceed six years, including credit granted for appropriate full-time service in all institutions of higher education. The application must be submitted in the fall semester of the final year of probationary service, unless permission is granted by the provost/vice president for academic affairs (VPAA) for earlier or later submission. At the discretion of the University, prior full-time service at another university typically of no more than two years may be counted toward fulfillment of the required probationary period if specified in the faculty member's written appointment to a tenure-track position. All recommendations for granting tenure are subject to approval by the University Board of Regents.

Performance Criteria

According to University policy, tenure is awarded based on meritorious performance in teaching, research/scholarly/creative accomplishments, and service. Applicants for tenure must meet the definitions of "participating" and "qualified" according to the College's Faculty Sufficiency and Qualifications policy that reflects current AACSB accreditation standards. These status requirements serve as the minimal expectations for application, with additional and specific qualifications dependent on the faculty member's discipline, particular teaching assignment, and research and service expectations. Candidates are responsible for preparing and submitting a

portfolio that demonstrates how the candidate meets or exceeds the tenure criteria. Appendix A contains specific information about the contents of the portfolio.

According to University Policy 7.29, tenure is awarded after an appropriate probationary period on the basis of meritorious performance in teaching, research/scholarly/creative accomplishment, and service. Tenure is normally restricted to full-time faculty members who have earned the highest academic degree in their field of study. In evaluating candidates for tenure, a wide range of activities and contributions are relevant. Included below are examples of accomplishments that will be considered and assessed for each performance category. The activities listed are not intended to be all-inclusive or specific in terms of what constitutes sufficiency. Evaluation of specific activities and cumulative assessment of overall past performance as well as the prospect for future performance must be made on a case-by-case basis by those tenured faculty members charged with making the recommendation.

A. *Teaching*

The successful candidate for tenure will demonstrate a high level of performance in teaching and conducting classroom activities, continually striving for excellence and giving evidence of continuing development as a teacher. In evaluating teaching effectiveness, the recommending body may accept evidence related to the following areas, which are listed in no particular order:

- Courses taught
- Internships and special problems courses
- Course development and innovations, including online and hybrid delivery
- Classroom effectiveness as indicated by student assessment of instruction
- Other evidence of teaching effectiveness, such as written comments, communication from students, etc.
- Course materials including syllabi and readings, assignments, projects, etc.
- Indications of course workload and rigor
- Time spent with students outside of class in such activities as tutoring, test reviews and field trips
- Authorship of student guides, instructor's manuals, test banks, cases, practice sets, and other similar course-related materials
- Development of new academic programs and major revisions of existing programs
- Introduction of innovations both in teaching-learning methods and in conceptual or applied materials focused on enhancing student learning
- Recognitions or awards for distinguished teaching
- Integrative and cross-disciplinary experiences and examples used in class presentations and assignments; e.g., students in business communication write about topics in legal and social environment

B. Research and Scholarly Accomplishments

Contributions to one's own knowledge and to the knowledge of one's academic field through scholarly activities are considered a significant part of the role of faculty members in the College. Intellectual contributions should meet two tests:

- Exist in public written or recorded form
- Have been subject to scrutiny by academic peers or practitioners prior to publication

Intellectual contributions may include accomplishments in one or more of three areas:

Basic or Discovery Scholarship generates and communicates new knowledge and understanding and/or development of new methods. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact theory, knowledge, and/or practice of business and management. **Applied or Integration/Application Scholarship** synthesizes new understandings or interpretations of knowledge or technology; develops new technologies, processes, tools, or uses; and/or refines, develops, or advances new methods based on existing knowledge. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the practice of business and management. **Teaching and Learning Scholarship** develops and advances new understandings, insights, and teaching content and methods that impact learning behavior. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the teaching of business and management. The general expectation of the Rusche College is that the tenure candidate will have at least three articles accepted or published in discipline-related peer-reviewed journals during the period of probationary years counted toward tenure. Each department has its specific expectations as follows:

Research Requirements by Academic Unit

Academic Unit	Rank/Status Sought	Research Criteria
Accounting	Tenure	Minimum of three accepted or published articles in scholarly, peer-reviewed journals within the probationary period, plus a minimum of five additional scholarly activities during the probationary period
	Associate Professor	Minimum of three accepted or published articles in scholarly, peer-reviewed journals while assistant professor, plus a minimum of five other scholarly activities while assistant professor
	Professor	Minimum of three accepted or published articles in scholarly, peer-reviewed journals while associate professor, two or more of which must be considered "high quality" articles; minimum of five additional scholarly activities while associate professor

Business Communication & Legal Studies	Tenure	Minimum of three accepted or published peer-reviewed journal articles within the probationary period, with quality of articles and journals considered; minimum of five scholarly conference presentations during the probationary period
	Associate Professor	Minimum of three accepted or published peer-reviewed journal articles while an assistant professor, with quality of articles and journals considered; minimum average of one scholarly conference presentation per year while assistant professor
	Professor	Minimum of three accepted or published peer-reviewed journal articles while associate professor, with quality of articles and journals considered; minimum average of one scholarly conference presentation per year while associate professor
Economics & Finance	Tenure	Minimum of three accepted or published peer reviewed journal articles during probationary years of service, one of which must be in a discipline-based, peer reviewed journal; must demonstrate excellence
	Associate Professor	Minimum of three accepted or published peer reviewed journal articles while assistant professor, one of which must be in a discipline-based, peer reviewed journal; must demonstrate excellence
	Professor	At least three accepted or published peer reviewed journal articles while associate professor, one of which must be in a discipline-based, peer reviewed journal; must demonstrate excellence
Management & Marketing	Tenure	Continuing pattern of scholarship demonstrated by at least three accepted or published peer-reviewed research-based articles in journals or similarly weighted publications during the probationary period, plus other scholarly intellectual contributions
	Associate Professor	Minimum of three accepted or published peer-reviewed research-based articles in journals or similarly weighted publications while assistant professor; demonstrated excellence, with consideration of quality and quantity of contributions
	Professor	Minimum of three accepted or published peer-reviewed research-based articles in journals or similarly weighted publications while associate professor; demonstrated excellence, with consideration of both quality and quantity of contributions

While a firm expectation exists for publication(s) in peer reviewed journals appropriate to the applicant's teaching assignment, other research contributions are also considered. In all cases, quality as well as quantity of accomplishments will be considered. Examples of intellectual contributions and their relative order of importance are included in the College's Faculty Sufficiency and Qualifications policy.

As distinguished from intellectual contributions above, the following are activities that have either not yet produced contributions of verifiable quality or that primarily serve to develop teaching or research abilities.

- Article or conference paper submissions
- Participation in faculty internships, fellowships, or exchanges
- Periodic professional practice
- Self-study programs and courses taken for credit to expand or increase the depth of expertise of the candidate

Other examples of intellectual development activities are included in the College's Faculty Sufficiency and Qualifications policy.

C. Service

Faculty members have frequent opportunities to provide service to students, the College and University, their academic or professional fields, and the business and civic community. Through service to such groups and organizations, faculty members make available their professional knowledge and expertise beyond that provided through teaching and scholarly activities.

The balanced nature of the mission of the College with its encouragement of theoretical and practical application of knowledge to specific business practices makes faculty activities in this area more significant than is typical across the University. National service activities normally would be weighted more heavily than similar regional activities, which may be weighted more heavily than similar local service activities. Furthermore, University service activities normally would be weighted more heavily than similar College activities, which may be weighted more heavily than similar service activities at the academic unit level. Consideration will be given to the scope of service and time commitment of each activity and not merely to the number of activities reported. Examples in no particular order include:

- Academic advising
- Graduate student committee work
- Supervision of undergraduate and/or graduate student research projects
- Student club/group advising
- Career placement activities
- Student recruiting
- Committee and administrative assignments
- Academic/professional organization membership, officer, or director
- Business consulting and practitioner involvement

- Conference or session chair at professional meetings
- Presentations to civic clubs, professional organizations, etc.,
- Community service consistent with the candidate's faculty assignment
- Practicum and internship supervision

Review Sequence

The prescribed process for tenure review is as follows:

1. During the year of probation just prior to the tenure review year, the head of the academic unit meets with the candidate to discuss the tenure review process including requirements for the portfolio and due date for the portfolio which will occur during the following fall semester.
2. The candidate compiles a portfolio of relevant information and support documents to be submitted with his or her request for consideration for tenure. In cases in which both tenure and promotion is sought in the same year, the candidate need only submit one application. The portfolio should reflect documentation that the candidate clearly meets or exceeds department, College, and University criteria. While the specific method of presentation is left to the discretion of the candidate, care should be taken to ensure that the portfolio can be handled relatively easily by persons involved in the evaluation process. The academic unit head will inspect the portfolio for completeness before beginning the review process.
3. The portfolio is made available to all tenured faculty from the candidate's academic unit. With the exception of the unit head, all tenured faculty in the academic unit will form the tenure committee who will meet as a group to elect a committee chair and discuss the merit of the candidate's application. Each faculty member submits a written recommendation with substantiating comments to the committee chair, who compiles all the recommendations and prepares a memo to the academic unit head that summarizes the committee's comments and includes an anonymous tally of the votes as to whether the candidate should or should not be granted tenure. All committee members are required to read and sign the memo, validating that all relevant comments are reflected, before it is delivered to the academic unit head.
4. The academic unit head reviews the portfolio and the recommendation from the department's tenured faculty and prepares a recommendation with supporting comments. The written comments from individual faculty members are archived in the department office. Within five class days of the completion of the department review, the academic unit head notifies the candidate in writing as to the status of his/her application and provides a copy of the memo from the committee and the unit head's memo concerning recommendation for tenure. Within five class days of being allowed to review the written recommendation and supporting comments, the candidate may attach a letter of response addressing errors of fact in the recommendations. Such notification and any subsequent candidate response become part of the candidate's tenure portfolio.

5. The academic unit head forwards the candidate's portfolio to the College dean, including the recommendation memo signed by the department committee and the unit head's recommendation, as well as the candidate's response, if applicable.
6. The College dean refers the tenure application to the College tenure committee, who meets as a group to elect a committee chair and discuss the merit of the candidate's application in light of the College's tenure requirements. Each faculty member submits a written recommendation with substantiating comments to the committee chair, who compiles all the recommendations and prepares a memo to the dean that summarizes the committee's comments and includes an anonymous tally of the votes as to whether the candidate should or should not be granted tenure. All committee members are required to read and sign the memo, validating that all relevant comments are reflected, before the portfolio, individual College faculty comments, and the signed committee memo are delivered to the College dean.
7. The College dean reviews the portfolio and prepares his/her written recommendation. The individual committee member comments are archived in the office of the College dean. Within five class days of the completion of the College review, the College dean notifies the candidate in writing of the status of his/her application for tenure and provides a copy of the memo from the committee and the dean concerning recommendation for tenure. Within five class days of being allowed to review the written recommendations and supporting comments, the candidate may attach a letter of response addressing errors of fact in the recommendations. Such a notification and any subsequent response by the candidate become part of the portfolio. The College dean then submits the portfolio to the provost/(VPAA) along with the following supporting documents: the department committee's memo, the academic unit head's memo, the College committee's memo, and the dean's memo, as well as any comments from the applicant.
8. The provost/VPAA reviews the application and submits to the University president his/her recommendation, along with all the supporting recommendations and applicant comments generated at each stage of the process. At the same time, the provost/VPAA notifies the candidate of his/her recommendation.
9. The University president reviews the portfolio and related recommendations and comments and any other evidence deemed pertinent and makes a recommendation to the Board of Regents. Tenure is awarded by action of the University's Board of Regents. Within the next class day following the action of the Board of Regents, the candidate is notified in writing by the provost/VPAA of the action of the Board.

Promotion Review

University requirements for awarding of academic promotion are described in Policy 7.4, *Academic Promotion*. According to University policy, promotion is based upon a faculty member's meritorious performance in teaching, research or scholarly accomplishments, and service.

Applicants for promotion must meet the College's definitions of "participating" and "qualified" according to the College's Faculty Sufficiency and Qualifications policy that reflects current AACSB accreditation standards. These requirements serve as the minimal expectations for application, with additional qualifications dependent on the faculty member's discipline, particular teaching assignment, and research and service expectations. In evaluating candidates for new appointments or promotion in rank, consideration will be given to performance and contributions in the full range of activities as indicated in the Tenure sections of this document. General criteria for each rank are provided herein and represent basic qualifications to be met by each candidate. However, evaluation of specific activities and cumulative assessment of overall past performance as well as the prospect for future performance must be made on a case-by-case basis by those charged with making the recommendation.

Performance Criteria

Academic promotion in the College is governed by University Policies 7.2, 7.4, and 7.10. All academic promotions are subject to approval by the University Board of Regents.

Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor

As specified in University policy 7.2, the rank of Instructor is held by an individual who has not yet earned a terminal degree but with contract provisions specifying a completion date. Upon receipt of documentation that the terminal degree has been completed, the academic unit head recommends to the College dean that the faculty member receive a change in rank to that of Assistant Professor. The dean makes the recommendation to the provost/VPAA, who recommends the change in status for approval by the Board of Regents. Instructors are on a tenure track and must go through the tenure process described in this document.

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

According to University Policy 7.2, the rank of Associate Professor is held by an individual with a proven record of research/scholarly/creative accomplishments, effective teaching, and service to the academic and general communities. Applicants for the rank of Associate Professor in the College must have a doctoral degree and must meet the requirements for years in rank as specified in University Policy 7.4. As required in University Policy 7.4, candidates must demonstrate excellence in teaching, and

excellence in either research/scholarly/creative accomplishments or in service, with at least satisfactory performance demonstrated in the other category.

Excellence in teaching is evaluated using factors described in the Tenure section of this document. In assessing research accomplishments, the general expectation of the College is that the candidate will have at least three articles accepted or published in discipline-related peer-reviewed journal articles while holding the rank of Assistant Professor. Additionally, each academic unit in the College has specific research expectations which are summarized in the table included in the Tenure section of this document. Service accomplishments are evaluated using factors described in the Tenure section of this document, with emphasis on quality and significance of service as well as number of assignments. Minimally, the candidate will show evidence of satisfactory service at the department and the College levels.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

According to University Policy 7.2, the rank of Professor is held by an individual who has a sustained and distinguished record of research/scholarly/creative accomplishments, effective teaching, and service to the academic and general communities and whose contributions to the profession and/or field are substantial and are recognized beyond the campus. Applicants for the rank of Professor must have a doctoral degree, have fulfilled all of the qualifications for associate professor, and have met the requirements for years in rank as specified in University Policy 7.4. As specified in University Policy 7.4, the candidate must demonstrate excellence in all three categories of teaching, research/scholarly/creative accomplishments, and service.

The College expectation for teaching is that candidates will have distinguished themselves as master teachers through evidence of innovation, consistently strong student evaluations, and evidence of expertise in subject matter. Other evidences of teaching excellence are described in the Tenure section of this document. The College's general research expectation is that the candidate for the rank of Professor will have had at least three additional articles accepted or published in discipline-related peer-reviewed journals that were not considered in the application for promotion to Associate Professor. Additionally, each academic unit within the College has specific expectations for research which are summarized in the table included in the Tenure section of this document. Excellence in service is evaluated using factor described in the Tenure section of this document, with emphasis on service activities that extend beyond the College and University levels.

Emeritus Professor

According to University Policy 7.10, the title of emeritus professor is a position of great honor conferred only on retirees who have a record of distinguished service to the University. The title is not automatic upon retirement. The applicant must meet the requirements as specified in Policy 7.10, and must demonstrate distinction in teaching, research/scholarly/creative accomplishments, and service to the university and the

profession. A tenured member of the academic unit may nominate a faculty member for emeritus status by submitting a letter to the academic unit head. The nominated faculty member will submit evidence supporting eligibility, such as a complete curriculum vita. The application, which may be submitted at any time, will be reviewed according to the established procedures specified in University Policy 7.10 and in this document.

Procedures

Minimum Time in Rank

- Promotion in academic rank is based upon performance and demonstrated merit, rather than on a specified number of years of service. However, since performance which merits promotion must be exhibited on a continuing basis, a reasonable period of time must elapse to enable the individual faculty member to demonstrate competency and have it confirmed by periodic evaluations. Current university time requirements are specified in University Policy 7.4, which states three years in rank at SFA as the standard time period required for applying for promotion from assistant professor to associate or from associate to full professor. It should be clearly understood that promotion is not guaranteed upon completion of a given term of service.
- In exceptional circumstances when warranted by extraordinary performance, faculty members may be reviewed for promotion earlier, with the approval of the College dean and provost/VPAA.

Review Sequence

1. It is the responsibility of the candidate to compile a portfolio for promotion similar to that required for tenure (see previous sections). Only one portfolio need be prepared by a candidate concurrently pursuing both tenure and promotion. The candidate's portfolio is submitted during the appropriate fall semester according to the college's established calendar.
2. Initial recommendations for promotion are made by those full-time faculty members in the candidate's academic unit who are of higher rank than the candidate. If there are two or fewer faculty members holding rank higher than the candidate, the process outlined in University Policy 7.4 will be followed to assure at least three members on the academic unit promotion committee.
3. The timetable and other procedures for promotion will be similar to those for tenure as described previously in this document, except that the College dean will constitute two review committees to evaluate applications for promotion. Committee A will consist of one professor to represent each department in the College, and Committee B will consist of one professor or associate professor to represent each department in the College. Committee A will consider material from applicants for promotion to professor, while Committee B will consider material for applicants for promotion to associate professor. Membership on the two committees may overlap.

Post-Tenure Review

Tenured faculty members are evaluated in accordance with University Policy 7.6, *Administrative Evaluation of Faculty Performance and Consideration of Merit Pay*. All faculty are evaluated annually for their assigned duties, which may include teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT

In addition to funds which may be available to the college and departments via normal budget allocations, the Rusche College of Business awards professional development funds to faculty in order to assist faculty with advancing their careers, maintaining currency in their fields, and enhancing their skills as educators. These funds are awarded based on past research activity, with the distribution being dictated by the Rusche College of Business Professional Development Fund Awards Policy, the essentials of which are outlined below:

The Research Excellence Committee is responsible for allocating professional development funds to Rusche College of Business faculty based on the publication of peer reviewed journal articles or equivalent publications as described in the college's current Faculty Qualifications policies.

Eligibility for Publication Award Funding

For the relevant academic year, a peer reviewed journal article/case/book/book chapter considered for funding must meet **one** of the following requirements:

- Was published within the period of **September 1 through August 31** and is reflected as such in Digital Measures.
- Was accepted (**excluding revise and resubmit**) for publication in a journal with a formal acceptance letter dated within the period of **September 1 and August 31**, and is reflected as such in Digital Measures.

An official list of category A & B journals for the time period covered by this round of funding submissions is attached is available on the COB Common shared drive. Any peer-reviewed publication listed in the *Cabell's Directory* but that does not fall into categories “A” or “B” on the “COB Journal Quality List” on COB Commons, will be classified as a “C” journal. For other journals that are NOT included in the college list or in the *Cabell's Directory*, the faculty member must provide equivalent supporting documentation to the committee for appropriate classification. *Note: effective for articles generated during 2016-2017 and beyond - for publications not listed in Cabells, or in some other listing source with a significant journal vetting practice in place, a maximum of four will be eligible for funding.*

Submission Process

The Research Excellence Committee will review all applications, make its decision, and notify you of the results.

Required items for each *published* article or equivalent accomplishment:

1. Completed application form (attached)
2. A copy of the “cover page” and “table of contents” of the publication in which your article or case has been published
3. A copy of the article/case/chapter in its entirety (cases and case notes published in different issue of a publication count as one submission)

Required items for each *accepted* article and or case:

1. Completed application form (attached)
2. A copy of the **formal** acceptance letter or email for a manuscript that has been accepted for publication with the acceptance message dated within the period of **September 1, and August 31** (a revise and resubmit response does not meet the requirement for acceptance)
3. A **complete copy** of the manuscript/case/chapter that has been accepted for publication

If submitting **more than one article submission**, the submissions **should not be stapled or clipped together**. Otherwise, those not on the top may be overlooked.

Award Guidelines

- While the dollar value of the award pool may vary from year to year due to the availability of funding, the relative value of a publication will be constant:
 - “A” level journal article/case: 4 points
 - “B” level journal article/case: 2 points
 - “C” level journal article/case: 1 point
- In a given year, the total of the points accrued by all submissions will be divided into the available funding pool to determine the value of each point. A faculty member with multiple article submissions will receive the dollar value of all of his/her points combined. *Note: effective for articles generated during 2016-2017 and beyond - a maximum of five total publications may count toward professional development funding, including a maximum of four from non-Cabells journals.*
- An individual faculty member may choose whether to submit an article for funding in the year accepted **or** the year published. Accepted articles that were granted publication awards based on formal acceptance letters in a previous year are not eligible for funding in the year published.
- Funds awarded may be used for travel to professional conferences, training courses, books, database subscriptions, professional memberships, or other activities and items that enhance the faculty member’s research, teaching, or service.