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I. ASSESSMENT

A. BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN BUSINESS PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of Bachelor of Science in Business (BSB) program assessment is to develop, evaluate, and continuously improve the quality of BSB program to prepare graduates for successful careers.

2. BSB Degree Program Assurance of Learning Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goal 1</th>
<th>Graduates will be knowledgeable of fundamental concepts about general business areas (accounting, economics, management, quantitative analysis, finance, marketing, legal/social environment, international, information systems) and be able to communicate effectively in at least one of these content areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Objective 1</td>
<td>Students achieve a desired level of performance on a test of their knowledge. Outcome: An overall mean score at or above the 80th percentile and a score at or above the 75th percentile for each of the nine assessment indicators on the Major Field Test for Business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Objective 2</td>
<td>Students deliver a complete, concise business presentation that accurately explains the concepts of the content area. Outcome: Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a measure of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale of a rubric-scored course-embedded task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Objective 3</td>
<td>Students prepare a complete, concise business document that accurately explains the concepts of the content area. Outcome: Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a measure of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale of a rubric-scored course-embedded task.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goal 2</th>
<th>Our graduates have acquired analytical abilities and critical thinking skills applicable to business decisions and solutions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Objective 1</td>
<td>Students analyze problems and critically evaluate options for a given business situation. Outcome: Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a measure of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale of a rubric-scored course-embedded task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Objective 2</td>
<td>Students achieve a desired level of performance on a test of their ability to reflectively analyze, interpret, evaluate, infer, and explain plans and results of business activities. Outcome: Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a score in the moderate or higher category according to BCTST scale scores for total score and for each of the five critical thinking skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Learning Goal 3:

Our graduates are cognizant of ethical and social responsibility principles and their implications.

**Learning Objective 1:** Students explain the consequences and impact of business decisions on contemporary social issues.

**Outcome:** Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a measure of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale of a rubric-scored course-embedded task.

**Learning Objective 2:** Students evaluate dilemmas in business organizations applying ethical and social responsibility principles.

**Outcome:** Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a measure of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale of a rubric-scored course-embedded task.

### Learning Goal 4:

Graduates are knowledgeable about aspects of doing business in the international business environment.

**Learning Objective 1:** Students identify relevant global issues in fulfilling management-related responsibilities.

**Outcome:** Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a measure of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale of a rubric-scored course-embedded task.

**Learning Objective 2:** Students analyze the impact of global business issues on business objectives and formulate recommendations to address these issues.

**Outcome:** Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a measure of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale of a rubric-scored course-embedded task.

### Learning Goal 5:

Graduates have the ability to utilize current business technology in making and communicating business decisions.

**Learning Objective 1:** Students analyze data for business decision-making using various resources, including but not limited to, the internet, information resource data bases, and commonly used business software.

**Outcome:** Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a measure of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale of a rubric-scored course-embedded task.

**Learning Objective 2:** Students articulate the results of technology-based data analysis in business terms.

**Outcome:** Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a measure of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale of a rubric-scored course-embedded task.
B. MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of the Master of Business Administration (MBA) program assessment is to develop, evaluate and continuously improve the quality of the MBA program to prepare graduates for successful careers.

2. MBA CURRICULUM GOALS

MBA Learning Goals

Learning Goal 1: Our graduates will be knowledgeable and skilled in the theory and practical application of the core business disciplines—accounting, economics, finance, information systems, management, marketing, quantitative analysis, and strategy.

Learning Objective 1: Our graduates perform at a desired level of proficiency on a nationally-normed test of business knowledge for graduate students.

Outcome: An overall mean score at or above the 65th percentile and a score at or above the 65th percentile for each of the five assessment indicators on the graduate Major Field Test.

Learning Objective 2: Our graduates prepare a written analysis in which they apply critical thinking in the development of an optimum solution to an important business problem.

Rubric traits: well-organized, concise, informative, appropriate supporting data and/or evidence, conclusions, implications, and consequences.

Outcome: Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a measure of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale of a rubric-scored, course embedded assignment.

Learning Objective 3: Our graduates orally present a thorough analysis of a business situation.

Rubric traits: well-structured, well-sourced, thoughtful, engaging, informative.

Outcome: Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a measure of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale of a rubric-scored, course embedded assignment.

Learning Goal 2: Our graduates will have the necessary skills to effectively interact in the global business environment.

Learning Objective 1: Our graduates evaluate issues by taking into account the differences in social, cultural, ethical, and legal parameters that they might encounter when working in a global setting.

Outcome: Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a measure of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale of a rubric-scored, course embedded assignment.
Learning Goal 3: Our graduates will have developed the leadership skills of teamwork, ethics and social responsibility in the context of formulating, implementing and evaluating business decisions.

Learning Objective 1: Our graduates examine an important business problem and prepare a written analysis of the ethical and social responsibility issues using a framework for evaluating solutions or alternatives.

Outcome: Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a measure of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale of a rubric-scored, course embedded assignment.

Learning Objective 2: Our graduates collaborate in the research and presentation of a solution for a business issue.

Rubric Traits: Contributions such as self-sacrifice, service to the team, and/or willingness and ability to guide the team in a needed direction.

Outcome: Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a measure of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale of a rubric-scored, course embedded assignment.

C. MASTER OF ACCOUNTING PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

1. Purpose
   a) The purpose of the Master of Accounting (MAc) program assessment is to develop, evaluate and continuously improve the quality of the MAc program to prepare graduates for successful careers.

2. MAc Curriculum Goals
   a) Graduates will have a broader knowledge of the accounting regulatory environment and standard setting process (related required course - AC 853 Accounting Theory).

      Learning Objectives:
      (1) Students conduct research presentations on specified topics in the context of standard setting or the regulatory process.
      (2) Students analyze a current issue (ex. new standard, exposure draft, tax regulation) and provide information suitable for comment letters.

   b) Graduates will be knowledgeable of the ways information systems support the accounting function in an organization (related required course - AC 860 Advanced Accounting Information Systems).

      Learning Objectives:
      (1) Students prepare an analysis of a case dealing with an ERP Systems Analysis and Design and prepare a detailed systems analysis and design plan.
      (2) Students analyze a current issue (ex. Accounting systems analysis and design).
c) Graduates will understand the role and use of management accounting control systems in support of multiple levels of an organization.
(Related required course – AC 840 Advanced Management Accounting)

Learning Objectives:
(1) Students prepare analysis of cases dealing with management accounting control systems.
(2) Students analyze a current issue (ex. Management control systems topics).

Learning Objectives:
(1) Students prepare analysis of cases dealing with management accounting control systems.
(2) Students analyze a current issue (ex. Management control systems topics).

Learning Objectives:
(1) Students prepare analysis of cases dealing with ethical dilemmas and discuss consequences
(2) Students analyze a current issue dealing with auditing topics.

d) Graduates will be able to evaluate an ethical dilemma related to accounting and consider alternative courses of action and consequences (related required course – AC 833 Advanced Auditing).

Learning Objectives:
(1) Students prepare analysis of cases dealing with ethical dilemmas and discuss consequences
(2) Students analyze a current issue dealing with auditing topics.

e) Graduates will have knowledge of federal income tax related to corporations and other complex entities and understand research techniques (related required course – AC 821 Federal Tax Research).

Learning Objectives:
(1) Students conduct research presentations on specified topics in the context of tax procedures and policy.
(2) Students analyze a current issue (ex. tax law or regulation) and use research tools.

D. COMPUTER SCIENCE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

1. The purpose of the Computer Science (CS) program assessment is to develop, evaluate and continuously improve the quality of the CS program to prepare graduates for successful careers.

2. CS Curriculum Goals

| Learning Goal 1: | Graduates will have analytical abilities and critical programming skills applicable to current technologies. |
| Learning Objective 1: | Students will be able to apply logic, fundamentals of computing, software science, software development methodology and tools to developing computer systems and applications. |

Outcome: Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will complete a functional software application that measures 3 or higher on a 5 point scale of a rubric-scored project.

Learning Objective 2: Students will be able to communicate ideas and arguments in a well-organized, clear, efficient and precise way both orally and in writing, using appropriate computing terminology while working in a team environment.
**Outcome:** Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will complete a functional software application that measures 3 or higher on a 5 point scale of a rubric-scored project.

**Learning Objective 3:** Students will be able to analyze, design, implement, and evaluate a computerized solution to a real life problem using appropriate tools.

**Outcome:** Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will complete a functional software application that measures 3 or higher on a 5 point scale of a rubric-scored course embedded task.

**Learning Objective 4:** Students will be able to apply strong logical, analytical and mathematical skills to a wide variety of new venues needing computing solutions.

**Outcome:** Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will complete a functional software application that measures 3 or higher on a 5 point scale of a rubric-scored course embedded task.

---

**Learning Goal 2:** Graduates will be knowledgeable of fundamental mathematical concepts.

**Learning Objective 1:** Students will be able to demonstrate competence in fundamental mathematics content

**Outcome:** Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will complete a functional mathematical application that measures 3 or higher on a 5 point scale of a rubric-scored course embedded task.

**Learning Objective 2:** Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to understand and develop mathematical proofs

**Outcome:** Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a measure of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale of a rubric-scored course-embedded task.

**Learning Objective 3:** Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate mathematics

**Outcome:** Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a measure of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale of a rubric-scored course-embedded task.
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II. COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION

A. Faculty Recognition Committee (FRC)
   1. The FRC is comprised of one representative from each of the curriculum committees, which representative is elected by the curriculum committee, but must be at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor to sit on the FRC. The Committee elects its own Chair. This Committee is responsible for making recommendations for promotion and tenure, with the option of merit, retention, sabbatical leaves, and post tenure review (see Faculty Recognition Policy, The Evaluation Process).

B. Graduate Programs Committee (GPC)
   1. This committee is comprised of four faculty members who are graduate faculty. The faculty members are elected by the full faculty body. The Associate Dean and/or the Director of Graduate Programs also sit on the committee. The advisor for graduate programs sits on the committee as ex-officio. The Committee will elect one of the faculty members as Chair. This Committee considers and makes recommendations to the Dean regarding all issues affecting the graduate programs, including curriculum issues, admission requirements, requests for waivers, appeals, etc. The Committee also participates in alignment of the curriculum to achieve program goals.

C. Discipline-Based Curriculum Committees (DCC)
   1. The DCCs are discipline-based committees set up for curricular and disciplinary functions within the School. The makeup exists of Information Systems, Accounting, Management, Business Administration, and Marketing. When a faculty member teaches in two or more areas, the Chair will determine which committee the faculty member will reside. The committee will recommend to the Chair of Faculty the selection of the chair of each committee upon the conclusion of the first meeting in the fall term, which is to commence no later than the third week of classes. The Chair of the DCC will meet with the Chair of Faculty, outlining responsibilities and expectations whereby upon mutual consent the appointment will be confirmed.

D. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC)
   1. The UCC is comprised of the chairs of each of the curriculum committees. An advisor from the Business Advising Center also sits on the committee as ex-officio. The UCC elects its own chair. The UCC is responsible for reviewing all undergraduate curriculum proposals approved by a curriculum committee and making recommendations to the Dean as to whether or not the proposal should be approved. Other matters of curricular nature may be referred to this committee at the discretion of the Dean.
E. Student Learning Committee (SLC)
1. The committee is comprised of the Associate Dean and from five to ten faculty members appointed by the Dean. A faculty member will be appointed Chair by the Dean. This Committee is responsible for all BSB, MAC, MBA, and Computer Science program assessments. The Committee oversees all assessment activities; evaluates the outcome measures of all assessments; and provides input and recommendations for closing the assessment loop. The Committee also conducts the annual assessment forum.

F. Faculty Qualifications and Development (FQD) Committee
1. The FQD is comprised of four faculty members appointed by the Dean and a Dean’s representative from an administrative position. The FQD elects its own Chair. The FQD is responsible for review and recommended changes for the Faculty Recognition Guidelines, Professional Qualifications and Engagement Policy, and the Reduced Teaching Load Policy. The Committee also evaluates and selects the recipients of the Annual Faculty Awards. This Committee may also plan and execute faculty development activities.

G. Strategic Planning Committee (SPC)
1. This committee is comprised of six faculty members appointed by the Dean. The Associate Dean also sits on the committee. The Dean shall appoint the Chair. The purpose of this committee is to continuously review the strategic plan, recommend updates, and monitor accomplishment of plan goals.

H. Operations and Student Activities Committee (OSAC)
1. This committee is comprised of six persons appointed by the Dean including both faculty and staff; the Associate Dean; and two student members. The Committee is chaired by the Associate Dean. This Committee is responsible for oversight of the School of Business Faculty and Staff Procedures Manual by providing recommendations for revisions to this Manual. This Committee also plans and executes the annual fall Career Day for high school students.

I. Timing of Committee Assignments
1. The elections occur during the first Department meeting of the fall semester. The UCC and FRC representatives are elected during the first meeting of the curriculum committees. Committee appointments by the Dean, including the designated term, occur during the spring semester.
III. CORE VALUES, VISION, MISSION, AND GOALS

A. Core Values
1. High Quality – we value intellectual challenges, acquisition of knowledge, problem solving, and creative and critical thinking.
2. Ethics – we value personal integrity, accountability to others, compliance with laws, and social responsibility.
3. Respect – we value collaboration, human diversity, trustworthiness, freedom of thought, and freedom of expression.
4. Commitment – we value engagement with the individual student, the University, and the global community and environment we serve.
5. The School of Business will provide high-quality professional education to assist students in developing their full potential as global citizens. We will engage in research and service to support this vision.

B. Mission Statement
1. Our mission is to provide access to innovative business preparation for limitless opportunities in the region and beyond.

C. Vision Statement
1. The School of Business will produce technologically advanced graduates with a holistic, professional education for a dynamic, global environment.

D. GOALS
1. Develop a strategy to increase enrollment in School of Business
2. Develop an outreach plan with the business community and alumni
3. Work with university personnel to upgrade facilities within the School of Business
4. Develop and maintain a faculty/staff recruiting, mentoring, and succession plan
5. Evaluate, expand or modify, and support academic programs within the School of Business
6. Increase the use of technology throughout the business curriculum
7. Develop and expand student services through the Business Resource Center

Approved March 6, 2014, Updated November 14, 2014
IV. UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Curriculum review and development is one of the most important activities of faculty members. Curricular review and planning is an on-going process as individual courses, major requirements, and degree requirements are under continuous review. It is the responsibility of the department chair to initiate the discussion at the beginning of each academic year and encourage/oversee/support the curriculum development process. The following steps are to be followed to add structure to the curriculum process.

B. First Academic Year Meeting Agenda

1. Prior to October 1 of each Fall Semester, the chair, in conjunction with the Curriculum Committee Chair (if elected and/or available), shall attend the Curriculum Committee’s first meeting to validate and verify that the following general items are discussed with respect to the status of the following responsibilities.
   a) Curriculum Committee Chair selection (if needed)
   b) Discussion of overall academic major program
   c) General Education impact on the major program
   d) Appropriateness of course prerequisites to eliminate unneeded topic redundancy
   e) Currency of material within the major
   f) Discussion of multiple section–multiple course content consistency
   g) Welcome and integration of new faculty into the course rotation schedule
   h) Similar items to be included in all syllabi based on the School of Business/University Guidelines, but faculty have full freedom to include additional course related material

   NOTE: a similar discussion will be initiated at the first Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting with respect to the business core courses

C. Process Suggestions and Responsibilities

1. Based on the curriculum review discussion, the committee will recommend changes to the department chair. The following is a list of the committee responsibilities in the process of curriculum changes.
   a) The discipline based curriculum committee chair will initiate the appropriate university forms for all of the proposed curriculum changes
   b) Faculty teaching multiple section – multiple courses will coordinate the minimum content established by the curriculum committee to fully support the major programs. This minimum content can include a
standardized syllabus along with an agreed upon textbook.

c) The department chair is responsible for scheduling the appropriate approval meetings and monitoring the approval process for all curriculum changes which includes approval by the appropriate DCC, the UCC, Faculty/Department, Chair, Dean, and Provost.

d) The Provost’s office must receive the form no later than April 1st for the change to be included in the catalogue for the next academic year.

e) The Provost issues the proposed change to campus for review.

f) Once the Provost has approved the curriculum change and notifies the Dean and Chair, the Chair is responsible for sending a Curriculum Record Form to the Registrar’s office. Once the Curriculum Record Form has been processed by the Registrar’s office the process is complete.

g) The catalog is updated by the chair to reflect the change necessary.

Approved February 14th, 2014, Updated November 14, 2014
V. FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT

A. AACSB Standard 15 (as approved by AACSB April 8, 2013):

The school maintains and strategically deploys participating and supporting faculty who collectively and individually demonstrate significant academic and professional engagement that sustains the intellectual capital necessary to support high-quality outcomes consistent with the school’s mission and strategies.

B. Interpretation:

Academic qualification, including Scholarly Academic qualification and Practice Academic qualification requires a combination of initial academic preparation (degree completion) and sustained academic or professional engagement. Practitioner qualification, including Scholarly Practitioner and Instructional Practitioner, requires a combination of initial professional and academic preparation and sustained professional or academic engagement.

1. Qualifications

a) At the time a faculty appointment is made, all full-time ESU School of Business faculty members teaching in a program subject to AACSB accreditation are expected to have at initial employment and to maintain during employment the qualifications of a Scholarly Academic (SA), Practice Academic (PA), Scholarly Practitioner (SP) or Instructional Practitioner (IP) in their instruction field and those who do not meet the requirements in any of these categories are designated as Other (O). The Dean or Dean’s designee will classify each faculty member. In addition, each faculty member must satisfy requirements established by other external accrediting agencies that accredit the programs of Emporia State University and the ESU School of Business.

2. Standards

a) Standards for Academic Qualification (SA/PA)

(1) Academic qualification (SA/PA) requires a combination of initial academic preparation (degree completion) and sustained subsequent activities that maintain and augment currency and relevance in the teaching field.

(a) Initial Academic Qualification: A faculty member has initial Academic Qualification if the faculty member has any one of the following:

(i) A PhD or DBA in the instruction field (e.g., for someone instructing Finance, a PhD in Finance or a PhD in Business or DBA with an emphasis in Finance);

(ii) A graduate degree in law (e.g., a JD, LLM) for someone who primarily teaches business law or legal environment of business;
A specialized graduate degree in taxation (e.g. Individuals with a graduate degree in taxation or a combination of graduate degrees in law and accounting will be considered academically qualified to teach taxation);

A doctoral degree in a business field other than the primary instruction field with scholarly work in the instruction field and other academic or career experiences in the instruction field;

A doctoral degree outside of business with instruction responsibilities related to the area of academic preparation and with scholarly work in the instruction field. (e.g., PhD in Economics for someone who teaches Finance or a PhD in Industrial Psychology for someone who teaches Human Resource Management);

A doctoral degree outside of business (with instruction responsibilities outside of the area of academic preparation) with significant other academic or career experiences in the instruction field. Completion of a bridge program or the equivalent of 15 hours of graduate-level courses in the instruction area satisfies the “significant other preparation” criteria;

Successful completion of all required doctoral course work and the doctoral comprehensive exams (ABD) in the instruction field with a limit of three years to complete the degree in this status.

Academic Qualification upon Initial Appointment: A faculty member who obtained a doctoral degree or specialized graduate degree as indicated in a-g above in the last five years prior to appointment will be qualified for SA status. A faculty member whose degree was awarded more than five years before the date of appointment will be qualified as SA or PA, in accordance with the criteria set forth below in “Sustaining Academic Qualification,” or as “Other.”

Sustaining Academic Qualification: In addition to initial academic preparation, to sustain Academic Qualification beyond the periods specified in section 2, a faculty member must pursue activities that maintain and augment currency and relevance in the field of teaching.
3. **Scholarly Academics (SA)**

To satisfy this requirement for maintaining Academic Qualification, a faculty member must have produced during the previous five years a minimum of three intellectual contributions or academic engagement activities related to the teaching assignment, and at least two of them must be peer-reviewed journal articles. Peer reviewed in the School of Business is defined as being reviewed by at least two independent reviewers before being accepted. The requirement of two peer-reviewed journal articles may be reduced to one peer-reviewed journal article if that peer-reviewed journal article illustrates a high quality designation. A high quality peer-reviewed journal designation is granted automatically upon inclusion of a 3 or 4 category in the Cranfield Journal Ranking List or an A* or A designation in the Australian Business Dean’s Council Journal Quality list or by special appeal made via the FRC, Associate Dean, Chair, and Dean of granting such exception if the journal does not appear in either listing. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to substantiate and document their position in the appeal. The faculty member applying for an exception is encouraged to apply prior to publication to insure a timely decision.

a) Peer-reviewed journal articles must be related to the Mission of the School. To produce a peer-reviewed journal article, for purposes of this policy, means the article has been made publicly available either in print or online.

b) Other intellectual contributions include other journal publications; text publications; international, national, and regional paper presentations; proceedings publication; published cases, book chapters and monographs; grant funding; post-doctoral coursework; professional certification and/or continuing professional education to maintain professional certification. Evidence of high quality and impact of other intellectual contributions includes, but is not limited to, published journal rankings; acceptance rates; invitations to participate in research conferences; use of academic work in doctoral seminars; grant awards; awards received for publications or presentations; citations, etc.

c) Activities that may be considered as demonstrating sustained academic engagement include, but are not limited to, active editorships with academic journals; service on editorial boards or committees; leadership positions in academic societies and associations or academic committees within the University or School; significant administrative appointments (e.g. deans, associate deans, department head/chairs, directors, etc.); research awards; and invited presentations.

4. **Practice Academics (PA)**

To satisfy this requirement for maintaining Academic Qualification, a faculty member must have published at least one peer-reviewed journal article related to the Mission of the School and engaged in two or more of the following during the previous five years: significant administrative appointments (e.g. deans, associate deans, department head/chairs, directors, etc.); consulting and other practice-related activities that are material in terms of time and substance; a faculty internship; development and presentation of an executive education program; significant participation in business professional associations; practice-oriented intellectual or research contributions; active service on a board of
directors; continuing professional education; participation in professional events that focus on the practice of business, management, and related issues; or participation in other activities that have placed the faculty member in direct contact with business or other organizational leaders.

C. Standards for Practitioner Qualification (SP/IP)

1. Professional Qualification (SP/IP) requires a combination of initial professional and academic preparation and continued professional experience or academic activities related to the current instruction field.

   a) Initial Practitioner Qualification: A faculty member has initial Practitioner Qualification if the faculty member has both of the following:

      (1) A master’s degree in a field related to the teaching assignment.

      (2) Professional or business experience, significant in duration and level of responsibility, related to the current teaching field. Other activities that may lead to a faculty member’s qualification as a practitioner will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

   b) Practitioner Qualification upon Initial Appointment: A faculty member who has met the requirements in a and b above will be qualified for IP status. However, if the faculty member has also engaged in substantive scholarly activities in their field of teaching, s/he may be granted SP status.

   c) Sustaining Practitioner Qualification: In addition to initial professional preparation, to sustain Practitioner Qualification, a faculty member must pursue activities that maintain and augment currency and relevance in the field of teaching.

      (1) Scholarly Practitioner (SP): To be qualified as a SP, the faculty member must, during the five years preceding the designation, have satisfied the Sustaining requirements for Scholarly Academics set forth in A.3.a) above.

      (2) Instructional Practitioner (IP): During the previous five years, a faculty member must have engaged in three or more of the following: consulting activities that are material in terms of time and substance; a faculty internship; development and presentation of an executive education program; significant participation in business professional associations; practice-oriented intellectual contributions; active service on a board of directors; continuing professional education; participation in professional events that focus on the practice of business, management, and related issues; or participation in other activities that have placed the faculty member in direct contact with business or other organizational leaders.
D. Evaluating Qualifications and Conversions

1. The initial qualification of a faculty member will be determined at the time of appointment.

2. As a part of the Annual Performance Evaluation the Chair, in consultation with the faculty member being evaluated, will designate the faculty member as SA, PA, SP, IP or other.

   a) The Chair shall advise any faculty member if his/her qualification is likely to be converted at the next year’s Annual Evaluation.

   b) When warranted, based on the faculty member’s performance during the preceding five year period, that faculty member’s qualification may be converted in accordance with the Sustaining Qualification criteria set forth above.

   c) A faculty member whose qualification has been converted during an Annual Performance Evaluation may at any time during the subsequent year request a re-evaluation based on intervening sustaining activities.

   d) The faculty member should inform the Chair whether the faculty member is engaged in activities intended to maintain his/her qualification or in activities that would in due time justify a reclassification. Based on those activities and a discussion with the faculty member, the Chair will include in the Evaluation a statement that the faculty member is making satisfactory progress in maintaining his/her qualification or satisfactory progress towards a conversion to another classification.

As approved by the School of Business Faculty on February 14, 2014 and Updated November 14, 2014.
Approved by the University on November 17, 2014
VI. FACULTY RECOGNITION POLICY

A. These guidelines specify for the School of Business the procedures and criteria used for Faculty Recognition within the parameters of the University guidelines as included in the University Policy Manual.

1. PURPOSES

   a) To develop faculty recognition guidelines to promote and accomplish the School of Business and Emporia State University missions.

   b) To evaluate qualifications and develop recommendations for:

      (1) Retention of tenure-track faculty.
      (2) Merit salary of all regular faculty.
      (3) Tenure.
      (4) Promotion.
      (5) Sabbatical Leave.
      (6) Post tenure review

   c) To define the process to be used in evaluating retention, merit salary, tenure, promotion, sabbatical leave, and post tenure review decisions.

   d) To define and identify the procedures relating to dismissal of tenured faculty due to chronic low performance.

2. CONTRIBUTIONS AND ACHIEVEMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED

   a) In making recommendations relative to faculty recognition in the School of Business, the mission of the School is of primary importance. As such, instructional activities will receive the highest priority. Second priority will be given to scholarly activities and a third priority is assigned to service to the region, the profession, and the university.

   b) Instruction

      (1) Evidence to be used in evaluating a candidate’s instruction activities must be provided from the evaluation period. The evidence should indicate the delivery of high quality instruction and a commitment to continuous development in the delivery of instruction. Evidence to be provided may include, but is not limited to, the following:

      (2) Instructional Effectiveness

         (a) Norm-based student evaluations of instruction (IDEA)
         (b) Other student surveys or evaluations
         (c) Evaluations by the department chair
         (d) Peer-evaluations
         (e) Alumni surveys
         (f) Examples of instruction including examinations or assignments
(3) Instructional Development
(a) Upward trend in IDEA scores
(b) Curriculum Development (as demonstrated by revisions to syllabi, development of new courses or programs, or incorporation of technology-based course enhancements)
(c) Continuing education in relevant content area(s)
(d) Continuing education related to instruction delivery
(e) Publication of course related materials
(f) New certifications

c) Scholarly Activities
(1) Evidence to be used in evaluating a candidate's scholarly activities may include but is not limited to (1) publications in the candidate's discipline and/or in areas in which a candidate teaches and/or in areas in which the candidate is preparing to teach; (2) papers presented to academic and professional groups; (3) reports of research in progress; (4) activities aimed toward research, training, and public service grants and fellowships (5) supervision of student research; and (6) relevant continuing education. The items below are examples, but not an exclusive list, of scholarly activities in the School of Business. Peer-reviewed publications are given higher priority in faculty evaluations. Peer reviewed in the School of Business is defined as being reviewed by at least two independent reviewers before being accepted.
(a) Journal articles (academic, professional, and pedagogical),
(b) Proceedings from scholarly meetings,
(c) Presentations at academic or professional meetings,
(d) Scholarly books,
(e) Chapters in scholarly books,
(f) Textbooks and supplements,
(g) Research monographs,
(h) Reviews/critiques,
(i) Written cases with instructional materials,
(j) Instructional software,
(k) Publicly available research working papers,
(l) Papers presented at faculty research seminars,
(m) Publications in trade journals or in-house journals,
(n) Other publicly available materials describing the design and implementation of new curricula or courses
Reflecting the mission of the School of Business, the scholarly activities of the faculty, taken as a whole, should primarily emphasize contributions to management practice and pedagogical research. This should be established by the content of the scholarly activity.

d) Service

Service to the profession, the region, and university is a necessary part of a faculty member’s responsibilities and is considered in making faculty recognition decisions. Evidence to be used in evaluating a candidate’s service includes but is not limited to:

(a) Contributions to school and/or university committees, councils, and other official bodies,
(b) Contributions toward student development (such as sponsoring student organizations and recruitment activities,
(c) Service in professional organizations,
(d) Professional contributions to the community at large,
(e) Speaking to educational, service, or social organizations,
(f) Serving as a consultant,
(g) Contributions to academic advising,
(h) Other service activities (Unless obvious, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to justify these activities as appropriate service).

B. ANNUAL EVALUATION FOR SALARY RECOMMENDATION AND RETENTION

1. The general goals of the School of Business are first and foremost, effectiveness in instruction, secondly a commitment to scholarly activities, and finally service to the profession, the region, and the University.

2. The evaluation of each faculty member will be based on instruction, scholarly activities and service as defined in the "Contributions and Achievements to be Considered" section of this document. Each faculty member must receive an annual evaluation letter addressing the three areas (instruction, scholarly activities, and service) identifying strengths and weaknesses as well as recommendations for improvement. For faculty recognition purposes, the School of Business establishes 50/30/20 weights for instruction/scholarly activities/service contributions respectively. The faculty member must sign an acknowledgement of receipt. The chair is responsible for ensuring that a signed copy of each annual evaluation letter is provided to the Dean’s office for inclusion in the personnel file.
C. TENURE

1. Emporia State University shall award tenure on the basis of merit which has been substantiated by academic credentials and by the results of a systematic evaluation of the faculty member involved. Tenure is not automatic but must be earned.

2. All faculty members being considered for tenure have the obligation to demonstrate they are qualified to serve the university on a continuing basis in instruction, scholarly activities, and service. Accordingly, such faculty members must provide the evaluating body with appropriate evidence of how they have discharged their responsibilities.

3. Eligibility for Tenure: To be eligible for tenure a faculty member shall fulfill all the requirements set forth in sections 1, 2, and 3 of “Contributions and Achievements to be Considered” above. Section 4 below lists exceptions.

4. The committee shall base its recommendation on systematic evaluation of the candidate in the areas of instruction, scholarly activities and service. In addition, the systematic evaluation of the candidate (by the Faculty Recognition Committee and at each additional university level of review) must be aligned with and not violate the terms and conditions of the appointment. The Faculty Recognition document for the department in place at the beginning of faculty employment will be used for tenure and/or first promotion. If a different Faculty Recognition document goes through the approval process and has received final approval by the provost/vice president for academic affairs before tenure and/or first promotion, the faculty member shall have the right to choose which document will be used. The chair of the department will ensure that each newly hired tenure track faculty member will receive the Faculty Recognition document within two weeks of employment.

a) Degree Requirement

   (1) The terminal degree deemed appropriate by the discipline is the expectation. Faculty holding a terminal degree outside of their instruction area must show significant achievements in regard to scholarly activities in their instruction field.

b) Professional Expectations

   (1) Expectations for the granting of tenure shall embrace excellence in the areas of instruction, scholarly activity, and service to the university, the region, and profession.
Instruction is of primary importance to the academic mission of the School of Business and the University. Therefore, any person considered for tenure in the university should above all be a highly effective teacher. Demonstrated excellence must be offered by the candidate for tenure. Candidates are required to submit evidence of both Instructional Effectiveness and Instructional Development. The evidence will be evaluated for purposes of tenure as follows:

(a) Instruction Effectiveness: All IDEA scores will be submitted and reviewed for the review period. Those who submit IDEA evaluations showing a summary evaluation (adjusted) score of 45 or higher (average of all classes evaluated during the evaluation period) will be presumed (it is more likely than not) to have demonstrated high quality instruction and eligibility for tenure for instruction effectiveness. That presumption may be overcome by specific and substantial evidence showing that the candidate is not delivering high quality instruction. A candidate who submits IDEA evaluations showing a summary evaluation (adjusted) score of less than 45 (average of all classes evaluated during the evaluation period) must submit other evidence of instruction effectiveness described in the section “Contributions and Achievements to be Considered” above (Categories b – f). IDEA evaluation scores less than 45 and other evidence (Categories b – f) will be evaluated in accordance with the quantity and specificity of the information contained therein that demonstrates the delivery of high quality instruction and eligibility for tenure.

(b) Instruction Development: Those who submit evidence of continuous and substantial curriculum development will be presumed (more likely than not) to have demonstrated a commitment to continuous development in instruction and eligibility for tenure. That presumption may be overcome by specific and substantial evidence showing that the candidate is not committed to continuous development in instruction. Other evidence as described in the section “Contributions and Achievements to be Considered” above, (Categories g – l), will be evaluated in accordance with the quantity and specificity of the information contained therein that demonstrates a commitment to continuous development in instruction. The quantity and quality of evidence of instruction development required to demonstrate eligibility for tenure will vary depending on the degree of instruction development shown by the candidate.
(3) Faculty members holding the terminal degree in their discipline of instruction must have, as part of their scholarly portfolio, a minimum of three peer-reviewed journal articles plus two additional scholarly activities as listed under “Contributions and Achievements to be Considered” above related to the discipline in the previous five years.

(4) Faculty members with the terminal degree outside their instruction areas will be expected to have scholarly activities greater than the minimum to be tenured as described below.

(a) A faculty member with a terminal degree in a business field, but primary instruction responsibility in a business field that is not the area of academic preparation will be required to publish a minimum of four peer-reviewed articles, plus two additional scholarly activities as listed under “Contributions and Achievements to be Considered” above which are related to the area of primary instruction responsibility. All these scholarly activities, including peer-reviewed articles, must have been done in the previous five years.

(b) A faculty member with a terminal degree outside of business, but primary instruction responsibilities that incorporate the area of academic preparation will be required to publish a minimum of four peer-reviewed articles in the area of primary instruction responsibility, plus two scholarly activities as listed under “Contributions and Achievements to be Considered” above which are related to the area of primary instruction responsibility. All these scholarly activities, including peer-reviewed articles, must have been done in the previous five years.

(c) A faculty member with a terminal degree outside of business and primary instruction responsibilities that do not incorporate the area of academic preparation will be required to have completed at least 15 graduate hours of additional coursework in the area of primary instruction responsibility, and publish a minimum of five peer-reviewed articles directly in the area of primary instruction responsibility, plus two additional scholarly activities as listed under “Contributions and Achievements to be Considered” above which are related to the area of primary instruction responsibility. All these scholarly activities, including peer-reviewed articles, must have been done in the previous five years.
Additionally, the faculty member must be a Scholarly Academic as defined in the Faculty Qualifications and Engagement Policy. The FRC will confirm with the chair that the applicant is a Scholarly Academic at the time of the application if in the School’s business programs.

The Faculty Recognition Committee (FRC) will determine in which category (c, d(1), d(2), or d(3) above) that faculty member belongs. The FRC will also determine whether a faculty member with a terminal degree outside their instruction area has sufficient additional qualifications to be considered for tenure.

The faculty member’s record is expected to reflect an average of two service contributions per year and include service from more than one of the categories identified in paragraph 3 of the “Contributions and Achievements to Be Considered” section of this document. The faculty member’s record must demonstrate at least one leadership role or significant contribution to these service activities.

c) Probationary Period

(1) All faculty shall serve a probationary period of six years of full-time employment. Normally, this period will consist of six regular annual academic year appointments at the rank of assistant professor or higher, plus reappointment for the seventh year. Applications for tenure are due during the sixth year (the last probationary year). All UPM and Regent’s policies apply related to delay of tenure application.

(2) In accordance with Board of Regents policy, if an untenured faculty member becomes a parent through birth, adoptive placement, or adoption of a child under the age of five prior to May 1st of the fifth year of the probationary period, that faculty member, upon notification to the provost/vice president for academic affairs, shall be granted a one-year delay of the tenure review. Notification must occur within 90 days of the birth, adoptive placement, or adoption. Faculty members retain the right to opt out of this interruption policy.

(3) Under unexpected special extenuating circumstances, prior to the sixth year of service, the provost/vice president for academic affairs may grant an extension of the tenure clock for a maximum of one year. Such request shall be routed through the department chair and dean.

(4) No more than two extensions of the tenure clock may be granted to a faculty member for any reason. Nothing in this provision shall be construed to guarantee reappointment of an untenured faculty member.
Systematic evaluations are conducted each year. The decision to award tenure shall be made during the sixth year of service. In cases where tenure is denied, the seventh year of service is the terminal year of appointment.

Tenure is not granted at the rank of instructor or lecturer or for a temporary or part-time position. Regular annual appointments typically at the rank of instructor do count, upon promotion, toward meeting the probationary requirements of a higher rank. Service in a part-time position typically does not count toward the probationary period.

Faculty coming to ESU with prior service at other institutions at ranks earning tenure at ESU may have some or all of these years of service count toward the probationary period. For persons employed in the rank of assistant professor, no more than three years of prior service at another institution may count toward the probationary period. For persons employed at the rank of associate professor, no more than four years of service may be counted. For persons employed at the rank of professor, no more than five years of service may be counted. Faculty-based administrative appointments can vary, based upon the Dean’s consultation with the FRC and Provost approval.

d) Statement of Exception

The minimal expectation for the granting of tenure emphasizes the need for excellence in the areas of instruction, scholarly activity, and service. To this expectation, there can be no exception. Granting of exception to other eligibility requirements set forth in this document, including the length of the probationary period, may be made only if the candidate exhibits extraordinary merit, demonstratively beyond the rule of excellence.

D. PROMOTION

1. Promotion in rank is not a matter of routine, seniority, or time served. Rather, it is the recognition of the cumulative professional record of a faculty member as well as his/her potential for continued growth and contribution. Although promotion shall not be granted solely on the basis of time in rank, the completion of five years of service in the preceding rank is regarded as the normal time necessary before a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the next rank (instructor to assistant professor to associate professor to professor).

2. Application for promotion is typically made during the sixth year of service (after the completion of the probationary period). Early promotion will be considered only when there is acceptable evidence of truly exceptional contributions in teaching, scholarly activities, and service to the university, the profession, and the region.
3. It is the policy of the School of Business to hire faculty with terminal degrees (or expected terminal degree) at the rank of assistant professor or higher, depending on credentials. Further, a faculty member without a terminal degree who is qualified as a Scholarly Practitioner in accordance with the Faculty Qualifications and Engagement Policy and who meets all the requirements for promotion to associate professor other than the terminal degree may be promoted to associate professor.

4. The criteria to be used for evaluating faculty members for promotion are presented below.

5. Associate Professor
   a) A terminal degree is the minimum expectation for promotion from assistant to associate professor. Evaluation for promotion to the rank of associate professor shall emphasize a sustained commitment to excellence in Instruction. Candidates are required to submit evidence of both Instruction Effectiveness and, Instruction Development, as well as Scholarly Activities, and Service during the five year period preceding the year of application. The evidence will be evaluated for purposes of promotion according to the same standards used to evaluate evidence of Instruction Effectiveness, Instruction Development, Scholarly Activities, and Service in an application for tenure (Part D.2. above).

6. Professor
   a) A terminal degree deemed appropriate by the discipline is the minimum expectation for promotion from associate to professor. Evaluation for promotion to the rank of associate professor shall emphasize a sustained commitment to excellence in Instruction. Candidates are required to submit evidence of both Instruction Effectiveness and Instruction Development during the five year period preceding the year of application. The evidence will be evaluated for purposes of promotion according to the same standards used to evaluate evidence of Instruction Effectiveness and Instruction Development and Service in an application for tenure (Part D.2. above).

   b) In addition to maintaining excellence in his/her instruction, the candidate shall also have provided leadership in creating an intellectual environment. Accomplishments shall be recognized by professional peers either from within or outside the university. For promotion, a faculty with the terminal degree in the instruction field will be expected to publish, as part of their scholarly portfolio, a minimum of five peer-reviewed journal articles plus four additional scholarly activities as listed under “Contributions and Achievements to be Considered” above related to their instruction discipline since the last promotion.

   c) Faculty with a terminal degree outside their instruction area will have to meet additional expectations as described below

(1) A faculty member with a terminal degree in a business field, but primary instruction responsibility in a business field that is not the area of academic preparation will be required to publish a minimum of six peer-reviewed articles, plus four additional
scholarly activities as listed under “Contributions and Achievements to be Considered” above which are related to the area of primary instruction responsibility. All these scholarly activities, including peer-reviewed articles, must have been done since the last promotion.

(2) A faculty member with a terminal degree outside of business, but primary instruction responsibilities that incorporate the area of academic preparation will be required to publish a minimum of six peer-reviewed articles in the area of primary instruction responsibility, plus four additional scholarly activities as listed under “Contributions and Achievements to be Considered” above which are related to the area of primary instruction responsibility. All these scholarly activities, including peer-reviewed articles, must have been done since the last promotion.

(3) A faculty member with a terminal degree outside of business and primary instruction responsibilities that do not incorporate the area of academic preparation will be required to have completed at least 15 graduate hours of additional coursework in the area of primary instruction responsibility, and publish a minimum of seven peer-reviewed articles directly in the area of primary instruction responsibility, plus four additional scholarly activities as listed under “Contributions and Achievements to be Considered” above which are related to the area of primary instruction responsibility. All these scholarly activities, including peer-reviewed articles, must have been done since the last promotion.

(4) The School of Business Committee as defined in the section on “The Evaluation Process” below will determine in which category that faculty member belongs. This Committee will also determine whether a faculty member with a terminal degree outside their instruction area has sufficient additional qualifications to be considered for promotion to the rank of Professor.

d) Additionally, the faculty member must be a Scholarly Academic as defined in the Faculty Qualifications and Engagement Policy.

e) Furthermore, there shall also be an established record of significant contributions in the form of university and professional service. The faculty member’s record is expected to reflect an average of two service contributions per year and include service from more than two of the categories identified in paragraph 3 of the “Contributions and Achievements to be Considered” section of this document. The faculty member’s record must demonstrate at least two leadership roles or significant contributions to these service activities.
E. SABBATICAL LEAVE

1. Leave with pay is a well-established policy designed to improve the professional competencies of university faculty. Sabbatical leave is for the purpose of increasing the faculty member's usefulness to the university by enhancing his/her academic performance. The School of Business adheres to the UPM in all matters related to sabbatical leave, and reference should be made thereto.

F. THE EVALUATION PROCESS

1. Recommendations, as described below, shall be made by the department’s regular full-time tenured faculty members. Promotion and tenure recommendations shall be made by specifically designated committees as described below. For purposes of the evaluation process: 1) the dean, associate dean and department chair are not eligible; 2) “Associate professor” refers to regular full-time tenured faculty members holding the rank of associate professor; and 3) “Professor” refers to regular full-time tenured faculty members holding the rank of professor.

2. By September 15, faculty who will submit applications for retention, tenure, promotion, or sabbatical shall notify the Chair.

3. Prior to October 1 of each Fall Semester, the chair shall validate that all regular full-time tenure track or tenured faculty are part of a Curriculum Committee. The chair shall attend the Curriculum Committee’s first meeting where the committee will elect their representative to the Faculty Recognition Committee (FRC). This representative shall be at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. However, if an application for promotion to full Professor has been submitted, the representative shall not participate in the evaluation of that application unless he or she is a Professor.

4. Once the FRC membership has been determined, the department’s faculty shall vote by secret ballot on whether the FRC shall make recommendations to the chair regarding 1) merit, 2) sabbatical leave, 3) retention of untenured faculty members, and 4) post tenure review; or whether these recommendations will be made by the department chair alone without input from the FRC.

5. Before the evaluation of any candidate, the chair shall advise the FRC membership of the names of all applicants for tenure and promotion. A member may for good cause decline to serve on the FRC, whether or not good cause has been shown is to be determined by the Dean. Once a faculty member has agreed to serve on the FRC s/he cannot later recuse him or herself from the evaluation process or decline to sign a recommendation letter (see below).
6. Recommendations for promotion and for tenure shall be made by the FRC, except if the FRC has fewer than three members who are at the rank of professor and a faculty member is applying for promotion to professor, the recommendation will be made by a three-person committee comprised of the full professors on the FRC and one or more professors elected by all the professors in the department.

7. An applicant may request that a member of the FRC recuse him or herself from evaluating his or her application. If good cause is shown by the applicant seeking a recusal, the decision on which will be made by the Dean, that member will be excused from the applicant’s evaluation, and the chair will call a special election of all faculty to nominate a replacement.

8. The evaluation committee shall elect a chair during its deliberations. If none of the members of the committee belong to the discipline in which the faculty being evaluated teaches, the chair shall invite a faculty member in that discipline to advise the committee in conducting its evaluation, provided the School has another faculty member in that discipline.

9. All recommendations shall be deemed confidential personnel records.

10. The committees shall base their recommendations on systematic evaluation of the candidate in the areas of instruction, scholarly activity, and service. It shall be the responsibility of the candidate to supply the committee with supporting documentation in each of these areas. Supporting evidence to be considered is listed in the “Contributions and Achievements to be Considered” section above.

11. After the initial evaluation, the FRC shall vote whether to approve or disapprove the application. The committee shall submit a letter to the candidate within two weeks (10 school days\(^1\)) after its initial vote, setting forth the committee’s preliminary vote and explaining the reasons for the opinion of the FRC or, if the vote was not unanimous, the reasons for the opinion of the majority. The candidate may respond in writing, addressing those reasons, and may submit additional supporting documentation. The candidate’s response shall be provided to the committee within ten school days from receipt of the letter from the committee. The committee shall review the response before making its final decision and submitting its letter of recommendation to the Chair, which letter must be submitted within five school days. Each member of the committee shall sign the letter of recommendation, thereby confirming that the recommendation therein represents the decision of the majority. Dissenting members may submit a separate letter explaining the reasons for disagreeing with the majority. All documents exchanged between the committee and the candidate shall be forwarded to the chair of the department.

\(^1\) School days is defined as days of operation at Emporia State. It excludes weekends and days of closure by the University.
12. The chair of the department shall review the recommendation letter(s) from the committee and the candidate’s supporting documentation, then form an independent recommendation. The chair shall notify the candidate in writing of both the committee's and his/her recommendations at least five days before forwarding copies of the committee’s and the chair’s letters of recommendation to the dean.

13. The dean of the School of Business shall review the recommendations and forward them along with his/her recommendation to the provost/vice president for academic affairs. In addition, the dean shall inform the candidate, in writing, of his/her recommendation.

14. The provost/vice president for academic affairs shall review the recommendations and forward them with his/her recommendation to the President of the University. In addition, the provost/vice president for academic affairs shall inform the dean, department chair, and the candidate, in writing, of his/her recommendation.

15. The president of the university shall make the final recommendation. With regard to promotion and tenure, he/she shall notify the Kansas Board of Regents if the decision is affirmative, and shall inform the dean, department chair, and the candidate whether or not promotion and/or tenure is granted.

16. At every level in the recognition process for tenure, promotion, or sabbatical leave decisions, a faculty member may withdraw a request for recognition. Such a withdrawal must be in written form. Throughout the procedure, the right of due process is recognized for all candidates.

17. After the initial submissions, no new information or evidence should be added to the file submitted upon application. However, if a faculty member wishes to issue a rebuttal upon receipt of any recommendation, s/he can attach additional evidence to this rebuttal within the one week window prior to the next level of recommendation.

18. All materials must reside in the Dean’s office during the review period and shall not be removed during the review period, except during FRC meetings for which the Chair of the FRC will check out the materials and return them after the meeting.
G. PROCEDURES RELATING TO DISMISSAL OF TENURED FACULTY DUE TO CHRONIC LOW PERFORMANCE

1. Statement of Principle
   a) Emporia State University and its School of Business are committed to recruiting only those faculty who show clear promise of success in the academic setting. The University and School are committed to the principles of academic freedom and, within those principles, to the system of tenure. Tenure is an important part of academic freedom, but does not accord freedom from accountability. Just as the University and School are committed to recruit excellent faculty and to insure the excellence of their performance, so too, are the University and School dedicated to faculty renewal and development. Thus the concept of regular, rigorous faculty review is a part of the University's and School’s commitment to providing support to its entire faculty.

2. Statement of Policy - University
   a) The Faculty Senate of Emporia State University hereby recognizes that the University requires adequate performance of certain duties by the faculty member. Tenure, in its protection of academic freedom, while it shields faculty from discriminatory, unfair, arbitrary or capricious dismissal, is not designed to shield them from the consequences of inadequate performance or non-performance of their duties.
   b) Every faculty member's performance is subject to review to determine whether each faculty member has fulfilled his or her duties. Sustained failure of a faculty member to carry out his or her academic responsibilities, despite the opportunities for University faculty development or other appropriate interventions, is cause for consideration of dismissal from Emporia State University, with due process.

3. Individualized Expectations
   a) Consistent with the Regents’ policy, Emporia State University’s policy provides for differential allocations of effort among tenured faculty in the areas of their academic responsibilities. The individual’s performance responsibilities and expectations for the period are determined by the allocation of effort and the departmentally-established responsibilities in an academic area. These responsibilities and expectations will serve as the basis for the individual’s Annual Evaluation.

4. Chronic Low Performance
   a) Low performance of a tenured faculty member is demonstrated when the faculty member fails in his/her professional responsibility as identified in annual evaluations. Chronic low performance (i.e., failing in instruction and at least one other area in three consecutive years or four out of six years or converting from the status of Scholarly Academic as set forth below), despite all assistance provided, may be considered an adequate cause for dismissal.
5. Failure in Instruction
   a) A faculty member may have demonstrated failure in instruction if his/her converted average scores on teaching evaluations (IDEA) over a two-year period average below 45, at least one score is below 38, and there are other indications of failure in instruction such as regular complaints to the department chair by students, systematic failure to begin class on time or ending class early, or failure to cover content in a course that has been designated by the discipline's faculty. The written comments on the student evaluation of teaching (IDEA) must also be considered when evaluating whether a significant deficiency in instruction exists. The faculty member can overcome the demonstration of failure in instruction by submitting clear and convincing evidence of effectiveness in instruction as set forth in the section on “Contribution and Achievements to be Considered” paragraph 1, Instruction. Mitigating or unusual circumstances that may affect instruction should be considered in the determination that the demonstration of failure in instruction has been overcome by a faculty member.”

6. Failure in Scholarly Activity
   a) Every faculty member is expected to be engaged in scholarly activity. Faculty members who can achieve or have achieved Scholarly Academic status as defined in the Faculty Qualifications and Engagement Policy are expected to be engaged in scholarly activity related to achieving or maintaining Status. All other teaching faculty members are expected to be engaged in scholarly activity related to SA or PA status. Mitigating or unusual circumstances that may affect scholarly activity shall be considered in the evaluation.

7. Failure in Service
   a) Service to the University, School of Business, region, and profession is expected of each faculty member. Faculty members engaged in extensive scholarly activities and or time-consuming instruction responsibilities may not be as active in service; however, faculty members are normally expected to conscientiously serve on at least two committees (university-, school-, or department-level) every year. Failure to do so is presumed to be failure in service. The faculty member can overcome that presumption by submitting clear and convincing evidence of having met expectations of service.

8. Conversion in Status
   a) A faculty member who converts from the status of Scholarly Academic to “other,” as defined in the Faculty Qualifications and Engagement Policy, shall be deemed to have demonstrated chronic low performance notwithstanding the existence of satisfactory performance in other professional obligations. A faculty member who converts from the status of Scholarly Academic to Practicing Academic may be deemed to have demonstrated chronic low performance, notwithstanding the existence of satisfactory performance in other professional obligations, if the maintenance of accreditation is at risk due to this conversion.
9. Implementation

a) Annual and Special Evaluation

(1) The department’s chair and the tenured faculty share the responsibility in evaluating tenured faculty who might be failing in any area of responsibility as defined above. This is a Special Evaluation that is not tantamount to a reapplication for tenure. Instead, this process is intended to ensure professional self-direction and the success of faculty who already have earned tenure. It encourages the department to exercise its collective wisdom in determining if serious problems actually exist and seeking effective solutions when they occur.

(2) As part of the regular annual evaluation, the department chair shall determine whether a tenured faculty member is performing in accordance with expectations or is failing in performance. If the chair makes an initial determination that a tenured faculty member may be failing in instruction and at least one of the other two areas of responsibility, scholarly activities and service, or converted in status, the tenured faculty member must be informed of the concerns on or before March 15 of any given year. At the same time, a Special Evaluation Committee, composed of three tenured faculty of which at least two are full professors, will be convened to conduct an independent evaluation of possible failures in performance. The Special Evaluation Committee cannot include either non-tenured individuals or anyone who is a chair or above (e.g., chair, associate dean, dean, Vice President). Before the Special Evaluation Committee is first convened, the chair shall inform the affected faculty member that the Committee has been formed, and the affected faculty member shall have the right to challenge the participation of one Committee member and upon such challenge that person shall be substituted with another faculty member.

b) Access to Information and Input from the Faculty Being Evaluated

(1) The faculty member shall have access to all pertinent information. Furthermore, copies of all relevant documents shall be provided to the faculty member. The faculty member shall have the right to respond to any of these documents.

(2) The faculty member shall have the right to provide input to the Special Evaluation and any other committee involved in this process, to comment in response to evaluations, and to request the record be corrected, if in error. Furthermore, the faculty member shall have the right to invite a representative to participate in any discussions with an administrator (e.g., department chair) or any hearings by a committee.
c) Delivery of the Draft of the Independent Evaluation to the Faculty Member

(1) The Special Evaluation Committee’s independent evaluation shall be provided to the faculty member in writing at least ten class days prior to its delivery to the chair. That independent evaluation shall state whether the Special Evaluation Committee has found that the faculty member is, or is not failing in instruction and at least one of the other two areas of responsibility, scholarly activities and service, and/or that the faculty member has converted in status. The faculty member has the right to respond to the Special Evaluation Committee’s independent evaluation. Based on the faculty member’s response, the Special Evaluation Committee may modify its evaluation. If the committee modifies the evaluation, the faculty member, shall have ten class days to respond.

d) Delivery of the Independent Evaluation to the Department Chair

(1) The Special Evaluation Committee’s Independent Evaluation shall be delivered to the department chair. The department chair shall prepare a Draft Annual Evaluation of the faculty member in which the chair states whether s/he agrees or disagrees with the Independent Evaluation.

e) Delivery of the Draft of the Evaluation by the Chair and the Independent Evaluation to the Faculty Member

(1) The chair shall provide the Special Evaluation Committee’s Independent Evaluation and the Draft Annual Evaluation to the faculty member within five class days of the receipt of the Independent Evaluation. It is important to recognize that the Annual Evaluation of a faculty member whose performance is in question must be a combined product of the chair and the Special Evaluation Committee. Although these may seemingly appear to be two separate documents, together they form the department’s evaluation.

f) Determination That Academic Responsibilities Are Not Being Met

(1) If the chair and the Special Evaluation Committee agree that the individual failed in instruction and at least one of the other areas of responsibility, scholarly activity or service, and/or converted in status, then a determination has been made that academic responsibilities have not been met for the year included in the Annual Evaluation, and this determination is submitted to the dean and provost/vice president for academic affairs. Throughout this process, a failure in performance must be substantiated with clear and convincing evidence to which the tenured faculty member has a right to respond. The burden of demonstrating adequate cause rests with those who contend a tenured faculty member has failed in his/her responsibility. If the chair and the Special Evaluation Committee do not agree in this determination, but either the chair or the Special Evaluation
Committee has determined that the tenured faculty member has fail in performance, the matter is referred to the School of Business Performance Review Committee.

(2) The Performance Review Committee will be formed as follows: The dean will randomly select three tenured faculty members. The dean, associate dean, and the chair cannot be members of the Performance Review Committee. The faculty member will have the right to strike preemptively any member (or members) of the Performance Review Committee who also served on the department’s Special Evaluation Committee. If a member of the Performance Review Committee is stricken, the dean will randomly select another tenured faculty member from the department. A separate Performance Review Committee will be formed for each tenured faculty member charged by the chair or the Special Evaluation Committee as failing in instruction and either scholarly activity or service and/or converted in status.

(3) Within 20 class days of the referral, the Performance Review Committee will make a determination of whether academic responsibilities are being met. If the Performance Review Committee agrees that the individual failed in instruction and at least one of the other areas of responsibility, scholarly activity or service, and/or converted in status, then the determination has been made that academic responsibilities have not been met for the year included in the Annual Evaluation, and this determination is submitted to the dean and provost/vice president for academic affairs. If the Performance Review Committee does not agree in this determination, then the matter is closed for the current year and the faculty member shall be deemed not to have failed in performance for the year included in the Annual Evaluation.

(4) The department chair shall consult with the academic dean, and the dean shall consult annually with the provost/vice president for academic affairs, on the progress of any faculty member who falls within the category of failure to meet his/her professional responsibilities.

g) Appropriate Interventions, Including Faculty Development Options

(1) Faculty development is the term used for the University’s and the School’s investment in its faculty. While primarily relied upon to promote development, it may be utilized for corrective action. Effective faculty development in this context is intended to refresh and restore vitality and it may develop, expand, or enhance other talents. Early and accelerated faculty development is encouraged, when a tenured member of the School’s faculty begins experiencing difficulty in any area of responsibility. Such corrective action need not wait for the annual evaluation to be implemented.
If a determination has been made, pursuant to the procedures set forth herein, that a tenured faculty member has failed in any of his/her professional responsibilities (i.e., instruction, scholarly activities, or service, or conversion in status), a written plan of action to improve the faculty member’s performance shall be developed as a product of mutual negotiation between the chair and the faculty member. This corrective faculty development plan should have the objective of raising the faculty member’s performance to acceptable levels or higher within three years. It shall respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and it shall be flexible enough to allow for subsequent alteration or even its own abandonment. Good faith is expected from all parties which includes a commitment to improve by the faculty member and adequate support of that improvement by the university. The plan should not require a literal fulfillment of a set of nonnegotiable demands or rigid expectations by any party, quantitative or otherwise. If the chair and the faculty member cannot agree on a plan, the Special Evaluation Committee shall assist by offering recommendations and/or reviewing the plan. If a mutually agreeable plan cannot be developed, the faculty member may appeal to the School of Business Performance Review Committee, the dean, or the provost/vice president for academic affairs to assist in the development, and provision of additional resources, of such a plan. Beyond appropriate provisions for faculty development, such as a sabbatical (if eligible), campus opportunities for faculty continued renewal and development, a change in instruction assignments, or reassigned time dedicated to improvement, the plan may seek other appropriate interventions away from campus, including funding for professional travel to participate in workshops, seminars, conferences, or other opportunities that might be expected to help the faculty member develop. Non-academic options may be part of the plan when appropriate (e.g., counseling or medical leave).

Normally, a corrective plan should be approved by the faculty member to whom it applies, department chair, Special Evaluation Committee, and others who are to provide resources for such a plan (e.g., dean or provost/vice president for academic affairs). The plan normally should provide continuous faculty development for three years. The faculty member may reject an approved plan recommended to aid performance levels, but the faculty member must understand that a sustained overall failure in his/her responsibilities is a basis for dismissal.
h) Recommendation for Dismissal

(1) If a determination has been made, pursuant to the procedures set forth herein, that a faculty member has failed in performance in instruction and at least one of the other areas of responsibility, scholarly activity or service, or failed to re-convert to Scholarly Academic status in three consecutive years or four out of six years, the department chair may recommend to the dean that a tenured faculty member be dismissed, provided the faculty member has had the opportunity for corrective faculty development for the commensurate amount of time (i.e., for three consecutive years or four out of six years). The dean shall forward the chair’s recommendation to the provost/vice president for academic affairs, as well as the dean’s own recommendation as to whether the faculty member should be dismissed, or not. In making this recommendation, the department chair shall forward all supporting documentation including the Independent and Annual Evaluations for each year and must state the nature of the failure, the reasons for this failure, the number of years that the faculty member has failed, the level of discernible improvement in the faculty member’s performance after being notified of any failure in performance, and the extent to which the faculty member has complied with the terms of an approved plan developed to improve the faculty member’s performance.
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VII. REDUCED TEACHING LOAD GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY

A. The full-time teaching load at ESU is twelve hours. Faculty designated as Scholarly Academic under the Faculty Qualifications and Engagement Policy (AACSB standard 15) who also have a minimum of six intellectual contributions as defined in that Policy during the preceding five-year period are eligible for reassigned time. In addition, faculty designated as Scholarly Academic upon their initial appointment to the faculty are eligible for reassigned time for a period of five academic years following that appointment regardless of the number of intellectual contributions produced during that five-year period. Regardless of their qualification, faculty who teach graduate-level classes are entitled to reassigned time in accordance with the University Policy in this regard. Absent extraordinary circumstances warranting a different teaching load, the regular full-time teaching load of Scholarly Academics with a minimum of six intellectual contributions is nine hours per semester.

B. Decisions with regard to reassigned time are made by department chair in consultation with the Dean and are reflected in the documentation submitted to the Dean’s office with the proposed schedule of classes each semester. Only if the faculty member is designated as a Scholarly Academic at the time the proposed schedule of classes is submitted to the Dean is that faculty member eligible for reassigned time. Reassigned time decisions are made consistent with the Schools reduced teaching load guidelines. The School does not have a specific amount of reassigned time, but has the authority to grant reassigned time as part of the overall faculty planning process in meeting the mission and objectives under this policy of the School and is based on funding limitations.
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VIII. POST TENURE REVIEW

A. Post Tenure Reviews of all tenured faculty members shall be conducted at 7 year intervals, with the first review in the 7th year after tenured employment is initiated with some necessary exceptions as set forth in the Post Tenure Review Policy.

B. The School of Business adheres to the UPM in all matters related to Post Tenure Review, and reference should be made thereto.
IX. SENIORITY

A. Seniority in the Department/School shall be determined in the following order:

1. Rank (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor, in descending order).

2. Years at ESU within the rank.

3. Where several members received the same rank on the same date, inception of current service at ESU shall determine seniority. Where such data is common, the earliest date of completion of the terminal degree shall be the determining factor.

4. All other things being equal and as a last resort, a faculty member's standing in his field as judged by his professional activities shall be used to determine the seniority.
X. STUDENT EVALUATIONS

A. All faculty are required to conduct IDEA student evaluations of teaching.

B. At the beginning of the semester, the instructor will complete the FACULTY INFORMATION FORM (FIF) for each class being evaluated. The evaluation form cannot be processed without a completed FIF.

C. In addition to the evaluation form, an open-ended questionnaire will be provided to the student for his/her comments on the course and the instructor.

D. Each department office, through the department secretary and appropriately trained graduate students, should handle all aspects of the administration of the student evaluations, i.e., reading the directions for completion of the evaluations, distributing the forms, collecting the forms after completion, and returning the forms immediately to the department office in the provided envelope.

E. This evaluation must be completed in the last three weeks of the course.

F. If an instructor desires to be evaluated prior to the end of the semester, he/she may do so on a voluntary basis, but such evaluation will be in addition to the end of the semester evaluation which will be required.

G. The instructor must be evaluated at least once in every course taught in each academic year.

H. Any off-campus course taught by an instructor must be evaluated at least once per academic year. If the instructor teaches multiple sections of the same course or the same course both semesters off campus, evaluation of one class is sufficient.

I. For off-campus courses, the department secretary will post the evaluation form online with instructions for the students for completing the evaluation.

J. The instructor should have the right to choose the classes in which he/she will be evaluated, subject to the aforementioned limitations.

K. All instructors, tenured and non-tenured, will fall within these rules.

L. Part-time instructors and adjunct instructors should be evaluated in every class.
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