Proposed Faculty Workload Development Guidelines for the College of Business

To integrate well-established and successful College of Business (COB) Faculty Workload Guidelines with the common process developed by the Division of Faculty Success in Academic Affairs, the College of Business appointed a College Committee to comport with updated System and University policies. The committee first convened on October 18, 2019 to deliberate on the guidelines for Faculty Workload Policy. A subcommittee was tasked with framing a College Policy for Faculty Workload Guidelines. Our well-established policies comply with lofty standards set forth by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) and the workload policies have received high praise for their integration with appraisal, promotion, and tenure. To establish the basis for our COB Workload proposal, we will address several perspectives on the Faculty Workload Guidelines.

I. Accreditation

We preface our review with information from the most recent AACSB review of the COB in 2017. Our Peer Review Team (PRT), chaired by the Business Dean at Michigan State University, stated: “The College has well established policies and procedures for faculty appraisal, tenure, promotion, and workload.” The PRT went on to say: “The College is to be commended for undertaking the bold but difficult step to link faculty workload policies with its appraisal system. This will foster consistency in evaluation processes across the college.” Less than five percent of the world’s business schools are AACSB accredited and even fewer have both business and accounting accreditation. The COB at UTSA holds both distinctions.

The College of Business has well-established Guidelines for Faculty Workloads, as affirmed in its last accreditation review, that are consistent across seven departments and are highly integrated with the active annual review standards, tenure policy and promotion decisions. In agreement with the Guidelines set forth by Academic Affairs, we their efforts to foster student success and institutional advancement through research excellence. Standards in the College, due to disciplinary needs and accreditation standards, may differ from those of other colleges based on student success and the University’s efforts to become a Carnegie R1, research institution and an “NRUF” university.

We propose to merge College policies with those set forth by the Provost to ensure that the College of Business has workload guidelines and College/departmental annual review standards that align with institutional policy.

The COB workload policy must provide the dean with a pool of discretionary course credits similar to the old system of discretionary WLCs to facilitate the University’s goal to reach the level of a Carnegie research level I institution.

We propose to follow HOP 2.14. This section states that the “Texas Education Code Section 51.402 recognizes that important elements of workload include classroom teaching, basic and applied research, and professional development.” It further states that the “The Intent of this policy is to set forth equitable and fair guidelines that permit each department chair, under the supervision of the dean and oversight of the Provost, to best deploy departmental faculty to foster student success and advance UTSA’s academic mission and excellence, in compliance with Regents’ Rule 31006.” To adhere to this code of conduct, the Provost advances ideas for full deployment of the faculty for the benefit of its students and the enhancement of the University’s prestige through research, extramurally funded research and faculty-led student research. According to the HOP 2.14, the Dean needs to oversee the distribution of the College’s talent for the betterment of its students and gains in its ambition to become
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an “R1” institution and an “NRUF” university. To this end, the Dean must balance resources with needs and limits exist to which the College can accede to both faculty and student petitions.

While Department chairs can see the needs of their departments, the distribution of assets at the direction of the Dean, must “fully utilize our faculty resources in ways that achieve the greatest possible educational benefit.”

II. Student Success

As addressed in the common process developed by the Division of Faculty Success in Academic Affairs, the College of Business documents some metrics to help drive decision-making with respect to student success. Among the needs of students, access to classes qualified academic faculty, and student support measure rank highly in relation to student success.

The College of Business, in fall 2019, taught 65,952 undergraduate semester credit hours and 7,580 graduate semester credit hours that generated almost eight million dollars in formula funding almost thirteen million dollars in student tuition, and more than four million dollars in fees to fund the university.

In fall 2019, the Dean used 56% of his discretionary allocations to support instructional related releases. We petition the Dean to continue the use of course releases to support administrative, instructional, and non-funded research related releases. Support for the proposed solution:

1. The College of Business has been an innovator in many strategic program areas such as Cyber Security, Data Analytics, etc. and numerous academic support areas such as certificates in business analytics. To retain this competitive edge, we request that latitude with workload releases continue to belong to the College Dean to support the expansion into new areas and the initiatives of the university as it expands programs, course offerings, etc.

2. Class size in the College of Business tends to be quite high at the undergraduate level. For example, in fall 2019 the College had 32 sections with enrollments that exceeded 145 students. The College, at the direction of the Dean, makes concerted efforts to maximize efficiency while maintaining one of the highest four-year and six-year graduation rates. Many graduate classes have enrollments exceeding 50 students. The College is operating very efficiently.

3. The College has been at the forefront of student success in one-year student retention rates with numerous programs to increase student academic performance and to integrate them into the many student activities housed within the College. The retention ranking from FY 2017 assesses the College to be in the middle of the rankings. We look forward to updated rankings in which we hope that student success will be even greater. It is quite helpful to see that all colleges have one-year retention rates of at least 70%, as this represents an incredible shift in student success that confirms the effect of institutional policies on student success.

4. The College of Business ranks second only to the College of Architecture, Construction and Planning, in six-year and four-year graduation rates (as of FY 2012 and 2014, respectively). As measures of student success, we are happy that we are near the top of these rankings and we are devoted to increasing these rates in future rankings.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>1 year retention rate (F17 cohort) %</th>
<th># in cohort</th>
<th>4 year graduation rate (F14 cohort) %</th>
<th># in cohort</th>
<th>6 year graduation rate (F12 cohort) %</th>
<th># in cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Construction &amp; Planning</td>
<td>78% [92]</td>
<td></td>
<td>36% [121]</td>
<td></td>
<td>57% [79]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>77% [821]</td>
<td></td>
<td>34% [611]</td>
<td></td>
<td>54% [399]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>81% [531]</td>
<td></td>
<td>26% [513]</td>
<td></td>
<td>43% [346]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>76% [588]</td>
<td></td>
<td>17% [546]</td>
<td></td>
<td>40% [379]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal &amp; Fine Arts</td>
<td>77% [784]</td>
<td></td>
<td>34% [554]</td>
<td></td>
<td>52% [523]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>70% [106]</td>
<td></td>
<td>33% [129]</td>
<td></td>
<td>49% [85]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>81% [1183]</td>
<td></td>
<td>29% [1190]</td>
<td></td>
<td>42% [809]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Research

The proposed institutional workload and appraisal policies specify a research expectation of two (2) PRJs per year. In some disciplines, it is customary to publish in peer-reviewed conference proceedings or in journals that are not consistent with the administration’s goal of being a Carnegie research level I institution. Peer-reviewed journals are not equal. Reducing the sufficiency of scholarly contributions to a simple count of the number of publications does not address the quality of publication, the variances between and among disciplines, and does not advance the “R1” and “NRUF” ambitions of the University at large. This proposal is inconsistent with business school research and accreditation expectations/standards. Although these may be appropriate in some disciplines that publish short articles and research notes, business faculty do not have comparable research outlets and such works are not compatible with “R1” business school research standards.

Research expectations need to be discipline-specific and there should not be adverse incentives to publish in low-quality journals.

- In its accreditation reviews, AACSB assesses business faculty research over the previous five years. The current period for COB faculty research output is five years and not annually. We are consistent with AACSB expectations.
- Second, for a 2–2 WL, the COB has a standard that emphasizes quality over quantity. This is in keeping with accreditation expectations. For example, our 2012 AACSB PRT Report stated: “The College aspires to become a tier one research college with a quality PhD program. Given that goal, the team expects AQ standards to emphasize higher quality publications by the next accreditation review.” AACSB emphasizes quality over quantity of PRJs, and the COB made that adjustment for the 2017 review. We must maintain this high standard in order to maintain accreditation.

The research standards in disciplines within the College of Business conform to the highest standards specified by accredited schools and colleges of business. Disciplines strive to publish in nationally and internationally prestigious journals. For the College of Business, the Academic Journal Guide (AJG) published by the Chartered Association of Business Schools serves as our guideline. The primary research directive for at least the last five academic years necessitates publication in prestigious venues according to the AJG. AJG ranks journals and, by departmental faculty review, committees
assigned journals to four distinct levels that must adhere to the AJG ranks. Articles published outside these venues receive a lower assessment.

The COB has already established its own research goals to be an “R1” institutions and “NRUF” university in its disciplinary domains. The institutional guidelines indicate, “Table 4 provides a baseline of activities,” which imply colleges have latitude. Given these are institutional guidelines, we petition to keep our current research standards. Again, please note that our current COB research requirements are actually higher than those in the institutional policy, since we focus on quality rather quantity.

IV. Fiduciary Responsibility

The College of Business works diligently under the direction of the Dean, Dr. Gerry Sanders, to be good stewards of university resources and at the forefront of revenue generation. The College generated more than $48,061,909 in FY 2017 for the University. In FY 2020, University projections forecast the College of Business to generate $66,740,633. This university forecast predicts a net increase of eighteen million dollars with the same number, or fewer, tenure-track faculty. Dean Sanders has worked diligently to increase revenue generation through enrollment increases in several new programs such as:

- the BS in Cyber Security,
- the MS in Data Analytics and
- the MS in Business,

while increasing enrollments in almost all majors across the college. Without increases in our tenure-track faculty and terminally-degreed academically-qualified faculty, the college cannot maintain its enrollment expansion. We contend that the College of Business is both cost efficient and effective.

Every COB faculty member who meets the current (2019) COB 2-2 Workload requirements, which exceed the proposed institutional requirements, will be designated “Graduate Faculty Members” in departments with and those without doctoral programs. This maintains the Ph.D. in Business as a College-wide doctoral program drawing upon all faculty in the COB.

The institutional WL proposal removes the “4-4” WL track and replaces it with a “5-5” WL track in Table 1. Replacement of the “4-4” workload with a “5-5” workload will have serious implications for the COB’s next accreditation review in 2021-22. For example, our AACSB PRT Report in 2007 stated: “One of the requirements for Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty with terminal degrees to be AQ is to publish 1 refereed journal article over the last 5 years. For NTT faculty teaching “4-4,” this could be difficult, if not impossible. The College should consider reducing the teaching load to “4-3” for a limited period to give time for a NTT faculty member to produce the required refereed journal article.”

The 2012 AACSB PRT Report highlighted that “Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty teach some very large sections for core business classes and they teach a heavy load of four courses per semester [emphasis added]. In addition, they are being pushed to attain AQ status. These teaching faculty members receive little support for research activities and they receive “contracts” that stipulate that their pay can be cut if courses do not materialize. While this faculty are loyal to the College their low pay and heavy loads may drive them away.”

We do not include a 5-5 workload track as it clearly does not support a move toward “R1” or “NRUF” standard. The table below reflects the current teaching loads of faculty, by faculty designation,
and the equivalent teaching loads under the proposed system. It is clear that the current 4-4 workload faculty on average carry the workload of “5-5.” Course releases, given to Chairs, Assistant Chairs, Graduate Advisors, etc., cannot be dismissed with the expectation that the College will continue to operate efficiently. These releases are essential to the well-being of the programs administered by the College of Business. In addition, a proposed “5-5” teaching load would be a death knell to the College’s accreditation standing with AACSB. Our students benefit from this accreditation in seeking employment upon graduation as less than 5% of the schools of business hold accreditation with AACSB standards and a separate AACSB accreditation of our Accounting Programs.

The COB will utilize a 4-4 WL track in support of AACSB requirements. This track is especially important for assistant, associate and full “Professors in Practice.”

The College currently maintains five teaching designations for its faculty:

Course loads

i. 2-1(tenure track)

These loads are reserved for tenure-track faculty who have recently joined the college and exceptional research faculty in pursuit of grants, extraordinary, research, etc. at the discretion of the Dean. These faculty members are assessed on a 45-45-10 scale. The teaching expectation is a course load of two in fall semester and one in spring semester (or vice versa).

ii. 2-2 (tenured – research intensive)

This research-intensive designation meets the standards set forth in the Guidelines given to the College. The research requirements are attached for your review. Faculty are assessed on a 40 – 40 – 20 allocation. The teaching expectation is a course load of two classes per semester.

iii. 3-3 (tenured) – some combination of teaching/research/service

This balanced research and teaching load requires that faculty actively pursue teaching, research and service.

iv. 4-4 (tenured) – predominantly teaching

v. 4-4 (non-tenure-track) (note: we need to adjust our current workload structure to include the new titles for NTI.)

The committee recommends retention of the first two levels to continue the college’s efforts to support institutional advancement through research excellence. The Dean, in accordance with highly valued
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assigns to research active based on an internationally accepted standard. The research standards in
disciplines within the College of Business match the highest standards specified by accredited schools
and colleges of business. Here, disciplines strive to publish in prestigious journals, where international
peer review entities, such as the Academic Journal Guide (AJG) published by the Chartered Association
of Business Schools determine prestige based on national and international objective standards.
Publication in prestigious venues has been the primary research directive for the College of Business for
the last five academic years. Departmental faculty review refines the AJG ranked list into four distinct
levels and publications outside these venues receive modestly little credit.

V. Student Assessment

The proposed workload and annual appraisal policies require student assessment of teaching as
an integral part of the Faculty Workload Policy. In the interest of student success, we propose that the
Faculty Workload Policy use Student Assessment as well. Poor teaching should not be rewarded. If a
faculty member receives an overall student rating of one’s weighted-average classes below 4.00, the
faculty member cannot receive the highest teaching rating of “Exceptional.” Moreover, no one with a
weighted-average student rating below 3.00 can receive a teaching assessment higher than
“Satisfactory.”

d. Differential weights

This Faculty Workload Requirement Policy supports the mission and goals of the college – focusing on
student success, innovative curriculum development, professional engagement and the impact of high-
quality research productivity. This policy integrates faculty workload assignments with the college’s
annual faculty performance evaluation. Faculty workload assignments are based on faculty performance
outcomes in research, teaching and service. The College Faculty Annual Appraisal Rubric will be used to
evaluate faculty performance, and whether or not faculty ‘meets standard’ for research, teaching and
service expectations.

College faculty assessment requires the completion of The College of Business Faculty Annual Evaluation
process, and the assessment links performance to the mission and goals of the College. Key elements of
the system are that it:

a) Ensures some commonality in evaluations across departments per the Provost’s directive;
b) Ensures a large measure of transparency/objectivity in the annual appraisal process;
c) Provides individual faculty with a reasonable idea of how their performance before their annual
   appraisal;
d) Links appraisals to what is needed to meet the mission/goals of the COB, including the
   programmatic needs of students, etc.;
e) Objectively rewards faculty for “going the extra mile” in teaching, research, service;
f) Allows each faculty member to participate directly in the process through an initial self-
   assessment, including personal statements, before the departmental faculty review
   committee and department chair perform their professional assessments;
g) Provides for explicit, multiple layers of review in the appraisal process.

Determination of Faculty Workload Assignments

Faculty are assigned to workload assignments based on several strategic efforts:

- Student needs related to departmental and College of Business degree programs
- The goals of the department and the College of Business
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- Faculty performance as documented in the annual faculty performance evaluation rubric
- Department and College of Business budgetary resources

Faculty workload assignments are subject to the approval of the Dean of the College of Business. The past performance or potential for faculty members to make significant impact across areas of teaching, research and service constitute the basis for faculty workload assignments. These assignments must be submitted in writing, signed and approved at appropriate levels. The Department Chair and the Dean of the College of Business conduct reviews of workload assignments annually. Consistent with AACSB Accreditation reviews, workload assignments will be re-evaluated based on the faculty member’s evaluation performance for the previous five years. The department chair, with the approval of the Dean, may change a faculty members’ workload assignment if:

1. The individual is not meeting their workload assignment milestones within the five-year period or
2. The individual is meeting workload assignment milestones for a different track and requests to be reassigned or
3. The changes in an individual’s workload assignment are deemed essential to meet COB goals or resource constraints

The College of Business has the following faculty workload assignment tracks for the following course loads:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Intensive (4-4)</th>
<th>Balanced (3-3)</th>
<th>Research Intensive (2-2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track A: 80% - 10% - 10%</td>
<td>Track A: 40% - 40% - 20%</td>
<td>Track A: 40% - 40% - 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track B: 80% - 0% - 20%</td>
<td>Track B: 40% - 30% - 30%</td>
<td>Track B: 45% - 45% - 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track C: 90% - 10% - 0% (part-time only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty workload assignment tracks are for an annual period, and the standard, balanced teaching workload for tenured faculty in the College of Business is the equivalent of six courses per year. This benchmark is modified to enhance our academic career system and provide a portfolio of academic tracks that aim to produce maximum educational benefit to our students, and meet college goals. To align with University guidelines, workload assignments have an expectation of each faculty member achieving minimum course equivalents for the year. College of Business faculty will meet the UTSA Workload Guidelines per Table 1: Faculty Workload Tracks and Course Equivalents. As outlined in the University Workload Guidelines Table 1, 2, and 3 course equivalents include not only direct instructional activity for an organized course but activities outside an organized course (e.g. advisor of record) … . Specifically for the College of Business, large undergraduate classes [defined as enrollments of 250 or more students] will receive 2.0 course equivalents and graduate classes [defined as enrollments of 60 or more] will receive 1.5 course equivalents.

The Dean of the College of Business has the authority and responsibility to oversee course releases in support of College of Business goals. These college-level goals include meeting student and degree program needs, supporting the college’s business and accounting accreditation efforts, achieving research outcomes on par with Carnegie R1 institutions “NRUF” universities, and alignment with university strategic initiatives for student success. To align with university initiatives for funded research,
assessment of grants or patents are documented using college criteria as outlined in the faculty annual appraisal rubric. These criteria are based on numerous factors as documented in Table A below.

**Faculty Assignments:**

*Untenured tenure-track faculty* are assigned to the Research Intensive Track B during their probationary period, and will normally teach courses on a 2-1 basis during the year. With approval of the Department Chair and Dean of the College, variations to the established 2-1 course allocation may be made to address departmental and/or college needs.

*Tenured faculty members receive one of the following workload tracks:*

Research Intensive Track A – faculty members will normally teach courses on a 2-2 basis during the year. This track is available so long as the faculty meets research productivity outcomes, teaching and service performance outcomes as outlined in Table B. With approval of the Department Chair and Dean of the College, variations to the established 2-2 course allocation may be made to address departmental and/or college needs.

Balanced Track A - faculty members will normally teach courses on a 3-3 basis during the year. This track is available so long as the faculty meets research productivity outcomes, teaching and service performance outcomes as outlined in Table B. With approval of the Department Chair and Dean of the College, variations to the established 3-3 course allocation may be made to address departmental and/or college needs.

Balanced Track B - faculty members will normally teach courses on a 3-3 basis during the year. This track is available so long as the faculty meets research productivity outcomes, teaching and service performance outcomes as outlined in Table B.

With approval of the Department Chair and Dean of the College, variations to the established 3-3 course allocation may be made to address departmental and/or college needs.

Teaching Intensive Track A - faculty members will normally teach courses on a 4-4 basis during the year. This track is available so long as the faculty meets research productivity outcomes, teaching and service performance outcomes as outlined in Table B. With approval of the Department Chair and Dean of the College, variations to the established 4-4 course allocation may be made to address departmental and/or college needs.

*Full-time faculty (non-tenured) may be assigned to the following workload tracks:*

Teaching Intensive Track A - faculty members will normally teach courses on a 4-4 basis during the year. This track is available so long as the faculty meets research productivity outcomes, teaching and service performance outcomes as outlined in Table B. With approval of the Department Chair and Dean of the College, variations to the established 4-4 course allocation may be made to address departmental and/or college needs.

Teaching Intensive Track B - faculty members will normally teach courses on a 4-4 basis during the year. This track is available so long as the faculty meets research productivity outcomes, teaching and service performance outcomes as outlined in Table B. With approval of the Department Chair and Dean of the College, variations to the established 4-4 course allocation may be made to address departmental and/or college needs.
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Part-time faculty (non-tenured) will be assigned to the Teaching Intensive Track C and will normally teach courses on a 4-4 basis during the year. This track is available so long as the faculty meets research productivity outcomes, teaching and service performance outcomes as outlined in Table C. With approval of the Department Chair and Dean of the College, variations to the established 4-4 course allocation may be made to address departmental and/or college needs.

Administrative Appointments
In accordance with the Workload Guidelines, faculty may receive administrative assignments at the department, college, or university level. Administrative assignments support the mission and goals of the college. Administrative assignments are subject to the approval of the Dean of the College of Business. The Dean of the College of Business has the authority and responsibility to oversee faculty administrative appointments. The College of Business Faculty Annual Evaluation process will also be used to evaluate faculty with administrative assignments, with the corresponding percent allocation to administrative duties. Refer to Table 6 of the University Workload Guidelines for allocations (e.g. Department Chair 50%).

Table A
Funded Research Outcome Equivalency

The quality assessment of the research grant or patent must be documented using the evaluation criteria below and is subject to approval by the Department Chair and the Dean. The Evaluation of External Grants will be based on numerous factors, including, but not limited to the following:

- Source of Grant – Federal, State, or Local
- Cumulative Grant Amount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Source</th>
<th>Cumulative Grant Amount (Total)</th>
<th>Publication Equivalency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal/State/Industry</td>
<td>$ 0 up to 100,000</td>
<td>AJG Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 100,000 up to 200,000</td>
<td>AJG Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 200,000 up to 500,000</td>
<td>AJG Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 500,00 up to 750,000</td>
<td>AJG Level 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 750,000</td>
<td>Elite Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Workload Track</td>
<td>2. Minimum Expectations as documented in the Annual Faculty Performance Appraisal Rubric</td>
<td>Engagement Activities and/or Intellectual Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Intensive Track A:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Practice oriented intellectual contributions (ICs) detailed in Standard 2 (see AACSB Table 2-1; peer-reviewed journal articles, research monographs, academic/professional meetings, competitive research awards, textbooks, cases, teaching materials, other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: 80% R: 10% S: 10%</td>
<td>At least two (2) engagement activities or intellectual contributions (ICs) from column 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meets Standards</td>
<td>Meets Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Intensive Track B:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Documented continuing professional education experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: 80% R: 0% S: 20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balanced Track A:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Developing and presenting or executive education programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: 40% R: 40% S: 20%</td>
<td>(a) Two Peer Reviewed Journal Articles (PRJs) OR (b) an authored scholarly book that is determined to be of good quality* <strong>Plus</strong> At least one additional engagement activity or IC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meets Standards</td>
<td>Meets Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balanced Track B:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Participation in professional events that focus on the practice of business, management, and related issues; and other activities that place faculty in direct contact with business or other organizational leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: 40% R: 30% S: 30%</td>
<td>(a) One Academic Journal Guide (AJG) Rank 4 (or elite) publication; <strong>plus</strong> at least one other AJG Ranked publication; <strong>plus</strong> at least two additional validations from Col. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meets Standards</td>
<td>Meets Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Intensive Track A:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Significant participation in business professional associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: 40% R: 40% S: 20%</td>
<td>(a) One Academic Journal Guide (AJG) Rank 4 (or elite) publication; <strong>plus</strong> at least one other AJG Ranked publication; <strong>plus</strong> at least two additional validations from Col. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meets Standards</td>
<td>Meets Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Intensive Track B:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: 45% R: 45% S: 10%</td>
<td>(b) Two AJG Rank 3 publications <strong>plus</strong> at least two additional validations from Col. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meets Standards</td>
<td>Meets Standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| c) One AJG Rank 3 publication plus two AJG Rank 2 or higher publications **plus** at least two additional validations from Col. 3  
| or  
| d) an authored discipline-based (academic) scholarly book that is determined to be of exceptional quality* and at least two publications (AJG Rank 2 or higher) **plus** at least two additional validations from Col. 3 |
| 6. Relevant, active service on boards of directors  
| 7. Faculty internships  
| 8. Scholarly activities leading to the production of scholarship outcomes as documented in AACSB Standard 2  
| 9. Relevant, active academic journal and/or other business publication editorships and/or editorial board/committee service  
| 10. Validation of status through leadership positions and participation in recognized academic societies and associations, research awards, academic fellow status, invited presentations, etc. |

* Subject to review and approval by the Department Chair and Associate Dean of Research

Note: The most recent Academic Journal Guide (AJG), published by the Chartered Association of Business Schools, is available on the COB Intranet
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Table C
Part-time Faculty Workload Tracks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Workload Track</th>
<th>2. Minimum Expectations as documented in the Annual Faculty Performance Appraisal Rubric</th>
<th>3. Engagement and Practice Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Intensive Track C:</td>
<td>Meets Standards</td>
<td>1. Documented continuing professional education experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: 90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: 10%</td>
<td>Meets Standards</td>
<td>2. Developing and presenting executive education programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: 0%</td>
<td>Meet Departmental Teaching Criteria Plus Item 5 in Col. 3 Or At least two activities from Items 1-4, 6-8 in Col. 3 on a continuing basis</td>
<td>3. Participation in professional events that focus on the practice of business, management, and related issues; and other activities that place faculty in direct contact with business and other organizational leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Significant participation in business professional associations and societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Sustained professional work supporting status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Documented professional certifications in the area of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Relevant, active service on boards of directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Faculty internships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>