

8-22-2016

Accounting, Economics, and Finance Promotion and Tenure Documentation

The College at Brockport

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/apt>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Repository Citation

The College at Brockport, "Accounting, Economics, and Finance Promotion and Tenure Documentation" (2016). *Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation*. 100.

<https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/apt/100>

This Document is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @Brockport. It has been accepted for inclusion in Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @Brockport. For more information, please contact kmyers@brockport.edu.

Appendix A

Guidelines, Standards and Procedures for Re-Appointment, Continuing Appointment and Promotion

(Excerpt from Governance Document)

Revision Date: August 22, 2016

Contents: Appendix A

I. Overview: Re-Appointment, Continuing Appointment, and Promotion Process:	Page
1. Role of the APT Committee.....	A-1
2. Role of the Faculty	A-1
3. Application Contents.....	A-2
4. Criteria to be Considered.....	A-2
5. Application Of Criteria Weights In The Review Process	A-2
6. Distribution of APT Committee Reports	A-2
7. Voting Process	A-3
II. Standards and Procedures for Evaluating Teaching	
1. Review of the Faculty's Teaching Portfolio	A-4
2. Classroom Evaluation	A-5
3. Student Opinions of the Faculty	A-5
4. Professional Development and Interaction	A-5
5. Basis For Judgment	A-6
III. Standards and Procedures for Evaluating Scholarship	
1. Standards for Scholarly Achievement.....	A-6
2. Basis for Judgment	A-6
3. Tenure-track Faculty Seeking Reappointment	A-8
4. Faculty at the Rank of Lecturer	A-8
5. Burden of Proof	A-8
6. Non-traditional Forms of Scholarship	A-9
7. Impact of Teaching Load on Expectations for Scholarship	A-9
8. 'Grandfather Clause'	A-9
9. Required Supporting Documentation.....	A-9
10. Definitions of Terms and Explanation of Concepts	A-10
IV. Standards and Procedures for Evaluating Service	
1. Scope of Department/School Service Activities	A-11
2. Standards For Contributions To Department/School Service	A-11
3. Adjustments to Expectations for Department/School Service	A-12
4. Standards for College, Professional, and Community Service.....	A-13
5. Reporting and Recording of Service Contributions	A-13
6. Process: Evaluation of Service in Personnel Actions	A-14
V. Review and Revision of Standards and Procedures.....	A-16
VI. Attachment 1: Classroom Observation Rating Sheet.....	A-18
VII Attachment 2: Checklist/Inventory of Materials Submitted.....	A-24

Guidelines, Standards, and Procedures For Re-Appointment, Continuing Appointment, and Promotion

Department of Accounting, Economics, and Finance
School of Business Administration and Economics
The College at Brockport

Adopted: 11/15/99
(Subsequent changes are indicated in Appendix G)

This appendix to the Governance Documents describes the procedures, criteria, and standards, used by the Department of Accounting, Economics, and Finance of the School of Business Administration and Economics, in the evaluation of faculty requests for re-appointment, continuing appointment, and promotion.

Additional procedures, criteria, or standards are used by the Department Chair, the Dean of School of Business Administration and Economics, and the College in evaluation of faculty for re-appointment, continuing appointment, promotion, and other personnel actions. Candidates are urged to consult with the Department Chair regarding these additional requirements.¹

I. Overview of Application and Review Process:

1. **Role of the APT Committee:** The APT Committee is charged with the review of all applications for re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion within the Department. The review process will consider the performance of the Candidate with respect to teaching, scholarship, and service as specified in the sections below.

The outcome of the APT Committee review process will be a written report and recommendation to the Department faculty. Said report shall include 1) the Committee's recommendation, 2) the Committee vote on the personnel action being considered, and 3) a supporting narrative summarizing the Committee's conclusions as they pertain to the criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service. In cases where the APT Committee authors multiple reports for multiple candidates, the Committee should seek to produce reports that are consistent in format, style, and organization.

Each member of the APT Committee agreeing with the recommendation shall sign the report. A Committee member not agreeing with the recommendation is not required to sign the report. If a member chooses not to sign the report, it is deemed an abstention unless the Committee member chooses to attach a written statement to the contrary. Members of the Committee not agreeing with the recommendation may prepare a written, signed statement that will become a permanent attachment to the report. Dissenting opinions are to be attached prior to the distribution of the report to the faculty.

¹ Added 3/9/07 from Departmental meeting.

2. **Role of the Candidate:** Requests by full-time faculty, to be considered for re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion, are to be made in writing to the APT Committee in accordance with current administrative deadlines. It is the responsibility of each individual seeking re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion within the Department to prepare a complete and organized package of materials supporting his/her request. Further, it is the responsibility of each individual to know and understand 1) the terms of his/her current appointment and 2) application deadlines for contract renewal, continuing appointment, and promotion.

Application Contents: Materials supporting the Candidate’s request for re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion, shall be organized and indexed in accordance with any administrative guidelines in effect at the time of the application.

- The application contents should comply with the requirements of the College.²
 - Letters of recommendation that are not marked “personal,” “confidential,” “private” or in other similar ways must be given to the candidate. The candidate will determine how they should be used. Letters of recommendation that are marked “personal,” “confidential,” “private” or in other similar ways must be returned to the author with the request that the “personal,” “confidential,” “private” or other similar designation be removed, the letter withdrawn, or an alternative letter not marked “personal,” “confidential,” “private” or in other similar ways be sent. Responses from the author of such letters may be received by fax, e-mail, or postal service. Such alternative letters or responses must be received by the application deadline in order to be included in the candidate’s application file.³
 - Letters of recommendation (solicited or unsolicited) obtained from students prior to their graduation shall not be included in the portfolio.⁴
 - Any letters of recommendation received by the Department Chair or by an APT Committee member after the application deadline will not be included.⁵
3. The faculty member should strive to ease the burden of those reviewing the faculty member’s request through the use of a clear, concise, and consistent labeling scheme for all supporting documents. Where guidelines do not exist, the following ordering of materials shall be used:
 - A “Checklist/Inventory of Materials Submitted” listed at the end of Appendix A of the Governance Documents, shall be printed out and completed by the candidate for Reappointment/Continuing Appointment/Promotion, and placed at the front of the candidate’s first binder. Each item in the checklist shall cross-reference the binder and page number where the item can be found.⁶

² modified 3/3/04

³ modified 5/14/04

⁴ modified 5/14/04

⁵ modified 5/5/04

⁶ modified 5/11/05

- Candidates for reappointment, continuing appointment and/or promotion shall include an Executive Summary (maximum 2-3 pages) as part of their package.⁷
- Letter of application, including criteria weights to be applied;
- Inventory of materials submitted;
- Annual reports for the period under review, including comment and signature pages;
- Teaching Portfolio;
- Supporting documents related primarily to scholarship;
- Supporting documents related primarily to service;
- Grade distributions for all of their courses taught during Fall and Spring semesters for the three most recent years prior to the application, or for applicants with fewer than three years of service, for all Fall and Spring semesters prior to the application submission.⁸
- Other documents and appendices included by the faculty member.

Where possible, materials should be organized into three-ring or equivalent binders that are clearly labeled. A faculty member should not expect individuals reviewing his/her materials to sift through unorganized and loose materials contained in boxes.

4. Criteria to be Considered: The report and recommendation of the APT Committee will focus on the Candidate's record in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service as it pertains to the personnel action under consideration. Implicit in the Department's standards is the requirement that teaching comprises the majority of a faculty member's effort, followed by scholarship and service, in that order. The Department's standards are thus completely consistent with and compliant with the 1998 standards set by the Faculty Senate Roles and Rewards Committee,⁹ as follows: *"As a general rule, the Faculty Senate Roles and Rewards Committee Final Report mandates that teaching must always be weighed at least 50%, and scholarship must be weighed more heavily than service."*¹⁰

5. Application of Criteria Weights in The Review Process: Members of the APT Committee are charged with applying the weights, as supplied by the faculty member, as they consider the faculty member's request for re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion. Each member of the APT Committee is responsible for ensuring that his/her vote takes into account the weights specified by the faculty member.

6. Distribution of APT Committee Reports: The APT Committee members are responsible for conducting the review process and preparing the Committee report in conformance with published administrative deadlines. Further, accommodation of a

⁷ modified 5/11/05

⁸ modified 3/3/04

⁹ Modified 3/2/05

¹⁰ modified 4/27/05

period of review, by the faculty member and the Department, must be made as described below.

The written report of the Committee will be shared with faculty member prior to forwarding the report to the Department. If the faculty member believes that the report contains errors of fact or omission, the candidate will detail his/her concern, in a written memo not to exceed three pages,¹¹ and forward the concerns to the Chair of the APT committee within two business days of receipt of the report. The APT committee will then be convened to discuss the faculty member's concerns and make modifications, if any, to the report. The APT Committee will prepare a written response to the faculty member. The faculty member may, at his/her discretion, ask that his/her letter and APT Committee written response be included in the package that will be reviewed by the Department faculty, Department Chair and College Administration.¹² A final signed copy of the report will then be made available to the faculty member and the faculty. The signed report must be distributed at least five working days before any vote on the Committee's recommendation.

It is understood that the faculty member has the option of withdrawing his/her request at any time prior to when the recommendation is presented by the Committee to the Department for formal vote, provided that the faculty member withdraws his/her request in writing. The identity of the faculty member who chooses to withdraw his/her request will be kept confidential.

Except in cases where the faculty member chooses to withdraw his/her request for re-appointment, continuing appointment, or promotion, the Committee will submit its written report to the Department Chairperson and the Department for the purpose of a Department vote on the recommendation. The signed Committee report must be distributed to the faculty at least 5 working days before any faculty vote on the Committee's recommendation.

For a reasonable period of time prior to the vote, the faculty member's application and supporting documentation, including an inventory of the contents provided by the faculty member, will be kept on file in the Department office for examination. Materials removed for examination will be recorded on the inventory. All materials will be returned to the faculty member by the appropriate College official or will be retained in the Department office pending disposal.

7. **Voting Process:** The members of the Department vote on the recommendation of the APT Committee. During the faculty meeting at which a vote on the Committee recommendation is taken, the faculty member will have an opportunity to speak to the Department concerning the Committee's recommendation and to address the Department as the faculty member sees fit. The Department will also have the opportunity to ask questions of the faculty member; the faculty member will then be asked to leave the room.

¹¹ Modified 10/5/05

¹² Modified 9/28/05

The Department will then have the opportunity (1) to ask questions of the APT Committee and (2) for general discussion. The members of the Department will then vote by secret ballot. The result will be announced to the Department, and then to the faculty member, immediately after the balloting and be recorded in the minutes of the meeting. The Chairperson's recommendation will then be made known to the Department at this time. The Committee's recommendation, along with the Department vote on the recommendation, will be forwarded to the Dean.

II. Standards and Procedures for Evaluating Teaching

As described below, the APT Committee will formulate its recommendation, as it pertains to teaching, based upon the following:

- The faculty member 's teaching portfolio;
- Classroom evaluations;
- Student opinions of the faculty member; and
- Evidence provided concerning professional development and interaction, as it concerns teaching.

5. A Thorough And Complete Review Of The Faculty Member's Teaching Portfolio:

The faculty member 's teaching portfolio shall contain the following:

- a) A written statement that explicitly addresses each of the following:
 - (i) The faculty member's philosophy of education,
 - (ii) The faculty member's educational goals relative to specific courses the faculty member currently teaches or has taught during the review period and how those goals relate to the mission of the School and the College,
 - (iii) How the materials compiled by the faculty member demonstrate teaching excellence and continued growth as an instructor.¹³
- b) A reflective statement indicating how the materials compiled by the faculty member demonstrate teaching excellence and continued growth as an instructor.
- c) A written statement on the faculty member's educational goals relative to specific courses the faculty member currently teaches or has taught during the review period and how those goals relate to the mission of the School and the College.
- d) The following course materials:

¹³ Modified 10/05/05

- (i) One copy of the faculty member's syllabus (from any semester during the review period) for each course taught during the review period.
- (ii) One complete set of examinations (i.e., all semester exams and the final exam, if given) for one section of each course taught during the review period. The faculty member may, optionally, also include samples of student work, such as papers or term projects.
- e) Computer printouts of the four global questions for all Instructional Assessment System (IAS) teaching evaluations given during the review period.
- f) Evidence as to the faculty member's involvement with course development and/or instructional innovation.
- g) Evidence of interaction with the professional community during the review period.
- h) Any items the faculty member feels will help the Committee with its deliberations.

No materials relating to summer teaching are required for inclusion in the portfolio. They may be included, however, at the option of the faculty member.

For the purposes of compiling a teaching portfolio, the term "review period" is defined as follows:

- a) **As to re-appointment:** The time period since the faculty member was last reviewed by the Department for re-appointment or, if this is the faculty member's first re-appointment, the time period since the faculty member began full-time employment with the Department.
 - b) **As to continuing appointment:** All academic years the faculty member has been on a "tenure track" line. The faculty member may, however, include information from any academic year he or she was on a non-tenure track line at SUNY-Brockport.
 - c) **As to promotion:** a minimum of the previous five academic years (not including sabbaticals or leaves) or time at current rank, if less than five years.
6. **Classroom evaluation:** Each member of the APT Committee is to observe at least one of the faculty member's classes. Each of the faculty member's courses (excluding internships, independent study, and directed study) must be observed at least once by at least one member of the Committee. If the faculty member teaches multiple sections of a course during the semester the evaluation is taking place, the faculty member may require that at least one member of the Committee observe additional sections of that course. All classroom observations will be arranged with and agreed to by the faculty member prior to each visit. The APT Committee will initiate arrangements for classroom visitation. When conflicts arise due to teaching schedules, a minimum of three APT Committee members must observe a candidate. The *Classroom Visitation Appraisal Instrument* for this purpose is attached, at the end of this document (pp. A17-21). Each member of the Committee will use these guidelines as the basis for his or her evaluation. Committee members are free to supplement his/her evaluations with any other written comments they deem appropriate. Future APT

Committees wishing to modify Attachment 1 may do so, subject to formal departmental approval.¹⁴

In undertaking a classroom evaluation, Committee members are to look for evidence as to how the faculty member applies his or her teaching philosophy and attempts to meet the educational goals stated in his or her teaching portfolio, along with evidence of course development and instructional innovation.

The intent of using a standard classroom evaluation form is to 1) promote consistency in the evaluation process and to 2) help a Committee member recall his/her reaction and experience during the classroom evaluation, which may have preceded committee deliberations by a significant period of time. Classroom evaluation forms are intended to support the Committee's deliberation concerning a Candidate and, as such, may be reviewed by any member of the APT committee. However, at the end of the Committee's deliberation, the classroom evaluation form and any supporting notes remain the property of the individual APT committee member that conducted the classroom observation, i.e., evaluation forms are not attached to the Committee report.

7. **Student Opinions Of The Faculty Member:** The IAS form is the mandated survey instrument until such time that an alternative document is developed and approved by both the Department and the College. The faculty member may, at his or her option, provide the Committee with any additional survey instruments used (i.e., additional questions given along with the IAS or essay questions) and any correspondence received from students.

Committee members will review the IAS results submitted for the purpose of determining if the faculty member's scores meet the minimum acceptable range of 2.25 or lower, as established by the Department.

8. **Professional Development and Interaction:** The faculty member should provide the Committee with evidence that the faculty member is remaining current in his or her instructional field(s), including interaction with business practitioners, for the purpose of both academic and professional growth.
9. **Basis For Judgment:** For a faculty member 's application to be considered "favorable" by an individual APT Committee member, three of the four following standards must be met in the area of teaching:
 - a) The faculty member's teaching portfolio - Evidence presented by the faculty member must show that the faculty member's educational goals, as stated in his/her portfolio, are consistent with the School and College mission statements and have been met or are in the process of being met.
 - b) Classroom evaluations - A majority of the responses recorded by an individual APT Committee member on his or her survey instrument (Attachment 1) must be either positive (i.e., "yes") or "not applicable".
 - c) Student opinions of the faculty member - At least seventy percent of the individual global questions included in the review period must have a mean rating of 2.25 or lower. The

¹⁴ modified 4/21/04

faculty member has the opportunity to provide the Committee with supplemental student surveys, including IAS responses to the "non-global" questions.

- d) Professional development and interaction, as it concerns teaching - The faculty member must present some evidence of continuous professional development supporting the assertion that the faculty member is remaining current in his or her instructional field(s).

III. Standards and Procedures for Evaluating Scholarship

As described and explained below, the APT Committee will formulate its recommendation, as it pertains to scholarship using the following guidelines:

1. **Standards for Scholarly Achievement:** It is not possible to anticipate every possible path that a candidate might follow when undertaking the pursuit of scholarship. The Department recognizes several possible profiles that faculty might assume in meeting expectations for scholarly activity. These include:

Example 1: The Scholar who writes in multiple media;

Example 2: The Scholar who writes articles in moderation;

Example 3: The Scholar who creates the rare breakthrough and publishes it;

Example 4: A portfolio comparable in scholarly worth to examples 1, 2 or 3 above.

2. **Basis For Judgment:** All of the above scholarly profiles are recognized and valued equally. Examples conveying minimum expectations for each of these profiles are set forth in the tables below. Faculty who demonstrate that his/her work meets or exceeds the levels of productivity shown in the examples below will have met the School's expectation for scholarship. Since individuals may not exactly fit into any of the first three categories, the APT Committee must be flexible in its interpretation of where the faculty member fits and **not** require a faculty member to fit exactly in any of these slots.

The table below provides **examples** of how faculty can meet the minimum "Scholarly Activity" requirements for **Continuing Appointment and/or Promotion to Associate Professor**.

IV) Example 1 (Diversified portfolio of scholarship)	V) Example 2 (Constant stream of traditional publications)	VI) Example 3 (Very high quality scholarship)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 publications in peer-reviewed journals plus any 5 of the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Refereed conference proceeding ◆ Published book review or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 publications in peer-reviewed journals plus any 3 of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Refereed conference proceeding ◆ Published book review or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 articles in "top-tier" journals <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 seminal publication

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> article summary ◆ Textbook chapter ◆ Chapter(s) of scholarly book(s) ◆ Published textbook ancillary ◆ Published instructional materials ◆ Additional journal article 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> article summary ◆ Chapter(s) of scholarly book(s) ◆ Additional journal article <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 publications in peer-reviewed journals plus a scholarly¹⁵ book 	
---	---	--

The table below provides **examples** of how faculty can meet the minimum "Scholarly Activity" requirements for **Promotion to Full Professor**.

Example 1	Example 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 seminal publications <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ publications in "top-tier" journals, ◆ scholarly texts, ◆ significant instructional texts <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A combination of the above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 publications in peer-reviewed journals plus a scholarly¹⁶ book <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 publications in peer-reviewed journals plus any 6 of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Refereed conference proceeding ◆ Published book review or article summary ◆ Chapter(s) of scholarly book(s) ◆ Textbook chapter ◆ Published textbook ancillary ◆ Published case, teaching materials, etc. ◆ Additional journal article

Note: The numbers shown in the above table for promotion to Full Professor are cumulative, i.e., they include the numbers already achieved at the Associate Professor level.

3. **Tenure-track faculty seeking reappointment** need to demonstrate continuous and substantive progress towards meeting the standards suggested in the tables above.
4. **Faculty at the rank of lecturer** are expected to meet the scholarship obligations negotiated at the time the individual was hired or, alternatively, the obligations that have since been

¹⁵ As attested to by external sources.

¹⁶ As attested to by external sources.

mutually agreed to by the Department Chair and the faculty member. Faculty at the rank of lecturer are expected to remain current in his/her instructional field. To the degree that scholarship helps keep individuals abreast of the literature, it is assumed that instruction benefits. However, professional development and experience may substitute as a mechanism for maintaining qualifications.

5. **The burden of proof rests with the faculty member.** Since APT Committee members cannot be expected to be experts in the faculty member's area of expertise, the faculty member shall be responsible for supporting all claims concerning the importance, relevance, or quality of any publications. As noted below, copies of all publications are to be submitted to the APT Committee, not merely citations of those publications. Any claims made by the faculty member concerning the importance of his/her research must be supported. As examples, the faculty member might provide the number of and sources of citations of an article if she/he claims that the article is "seminal". If a faculty member claims that her/his article is in a "top journal", she/he must support the claim that the journal in question is indeed a top journal; that might be done by using some combination of (1) a ranking of journals from a published source, or (2) a ranking of journals from other colleges or universities or (3) multiple testimonials from prestigious institutions attesting that the journal would be considered a leading journal in that sub-field or (4) an assessment of journals from professional groups or (5) other relevant sources such as Cabell's measure of selectivity.

Reiterating the central points from 1, 2, and 5 above, the APT Committee is not able to provide the expertise to evaluate quality in all areas and thus it is the faculty member's responsibility to argue that she/he meets the scholarship requirements suggested by the tables above and to substantiate that claim. The APT Committee is expected to weigh evidence, not to collect it.

6. **Non-traditional forms of scholarship:** In satisfying the standards and requirements for scholarship described herein, a faculty member must make the case for including less traditional or emerging forms of scholarly and creative contributions in his/her scholarship portfolio.
7. **Impact of Teaching Load on Expectations for Scholarship:** Because standards may change over time, it is expected that these guidelines will be modified by the Department at some future time. The criteria above were established under the assumption that the "normal" teaching load is nine hours per semester. Should the "normal" teaching load be redefined, the suggested "Scholarly Achievement" requirements for promotion and tenure should also be redefined.
8. **'Grandfather Clause':** These scholarship guidelines apply to faculty hired subsequent to the adoption date of this document. If the guidelines are changed, faculty hired subsequent to the change will be subject to the new guidelines, while faculty who were formerly subject to older guidelines may choose either the criteria described in this document or the guidelines/criteria in place at the time when the person was appointed to his/her current position. For Fall 2005

applicants only, faculty hired before 11/15/99 have the option of going up for promotion under the rules they were hired under or the new rules.¹⁷

9. **Required Supporting Documentation:** In addition to a Curriculum Vita, all faculty member for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure are expected to provide the APT Committee with documentation of scholarship which includes, but is not limited to:

- A reflective statement discussing how the faculty member's scholarship meets the expectations implied by the tables in section III.2 and how the Candidate's scholarship is relevant to his/her teaching and/or service responsibilities;
- Reprints or photocopies of all published work;
- Complete copies of works in progress listed in the Vita;
- Documentation supporting claims of quality or importance of scholarship.

¹⁷ Modified 9/28/05

10. Definitions of Terms & Explanation of Concepts

- (1) The term "peer review" includes editorial review of articles in outlets of relevant academic/professional publications.
- (2) The term "publication" is defined to be either a work in print or a work accompanied by an editor's letter indicating an unconditional acceptance for publication. Furthermore, "publication" shall be restricted to topics relevant to business and economics. Publications may be books or articles in peer-reviewed journals or peer-reviewed edited books. The faculty member may make a case for inclusion of emerging and newer forms of publications, e.g., electronic publications.
- (3) A faculty member who suggests that his/her work is "seminal" must provide supporting evidence for such a claim. For example: the frequency of citation of the seminal work from a recognized and objective source.
- (4) A faculty member who suggests that his/her work is "top-tier" must provide supporting evidence of such a claim.
- (5) The applicant is free to supplement his/her scholarship portfolio with other evidence of quality and contributions, such as testimonials and/or letters from peers or outsiders. A further example of the kind of evidence which the Committee would find helpful and appropriate might include evidence of the number of adoptions, **across institutions**, of a text, monograph, study guide, etc. that is claimed to be a "significant instructional tool".
- (6) The examples in the tables are meant as guidelines. The faculty member is expected to provide substantiating evidence on questions of quality and "importance" of scholarly work. The Committee has a clear responsibility to detect and deny frivolous or exaggerated claims of "scholarly" achievement.
- (7) All applicants should demonstrate evidence of continued performance in the area of scholarly activity, e.g., working papers, papers in progress, conference presentations, grants received, articles under review, etc.
- (8) At least three of the "minimal acceptable publications" required for promotion or tenure must have been published in the five years preceding application. For example, for the faculty member applying for promotion to associate professor who claims 4 publications in peer-reviewed journals and 3 published book reviews, at least three of the publications or book reviews must have been published in the five years preceding the personnel action. (See footnote 10 on page F-2 for definition of "minimal acceptable publications.")

IV. Standards and Procedures for Evaluating Service

Service has an important role in the academic community. Contributions to the service needs of the Department, School, the College, the community, and one's profession are an ongoing expectation within the total professional obligation. Sections 1 through 6 below describe the expectations, reporting requirements, and evaluation of service contributions for the Department of Accounting, Economics, and Finance.

1. **Scope of Department Service Activities.** Department/School service activities, and the anticipated effort required to execute each activity, are detailed annually in the Department/School planning document. These obligations include not only the activities of the major Department/School Committees, but also those activities required to maintain competitive programs, including program development, program coordination, program assessment, program accreditation, advisement, student recruitment, employer relations, and retention.
2. **Standards For Contributions To Department/School Service:** All faculty are required to maintain a minimum of four hours per week of office hours and are expected to attend faculty and area meetings. All faculty are expected to shoulder a proportionate share of the Department's advisement and registration activities and to dispatch the same in a professional and competent manner. Minimum standards for competency in advisement include regular availability during scheduled hours, non-cursory review of student course schedules prior to providing approval, returning student phone calls, etc. Additionally, the following expectations must be met:
 - (1) **Minimum Acceptable Contribution to Department/School Service:** In addition to the service obligations described in the preceding paragraph, all faculty at the **rank of assistant professor and above** are expected to shoulder a proportionate share of the service obligations detailed annually in the Department/School planning document. The minimum acceptable contribution in the area of Department/School service is 60 hours per year, contributed to service activities detailed in the annual planning document, with the anticipated standard hours provided in the planning document used as the basis for calculating hours contributed. This contribution of 60 hours is in addition to the 1) advisement, 2) registration, 3) office hours¹⁸, and 4) faculty meeting obligations described above. In this context, the term *minimum* is meant only to convey the lower limit of a standard and is not meant to convey that a faculty member's contribution is immaterial or trifling. Rather, faculty meeting this minimum standard are judged to have made material and important contributions to the service needs of the Department/School. As such, the Department/School service contributions of the faculty member will be categorized as having "met expectations".
 - (2) **Additional Requirements for Promotion.** Faculty members for promotion to Associate Professor are expected to be able to demonstrate service contributions that reflect significant

¹⁸ For full-time faculty, a minimum office hour obligation of four hours per week (approximately 120 hours per year) is mandated by College policy.

growth in responsibility and leadership over time. Faculty member for Full Professor must demonstrate high quality and substantial contributions to the committees on which they serve. Faculty members for promotion to Full Professor should also be able to demonstrate on-going constructive and leadership roles in non-committee service contributions and a willingness and ability to undertake administrative duties of increased scope or complexity.

- (3) Faculty **at the rank of lecturer** are expected to meet the service obligations negotiated at the time the individual was hired or, alternatively, the obligations that have since been mutually agreed to by the Department Chair and the faculty member.
 - (4) With respect to service, the minimum service obligation of **tenure track faculty in their first year** at the College at Brockport is defined as participation in orientation training provided by the Department and the College, scheduled office hours, and attendance at Department/School, and area meetings. First semester tenure track faculty will receive advisement training from the Department Chair. Normal contributions to advisement and registration activities will begin in said faculty member's second semester at the College at Brockport. During this time, only 20 advisees will be assigned.¹⁹ The standards in 2.1 become effective in said faculty member's second year at the College at Brockport.
3. **Adjustments To Expectations For Department/School Service:** The expectations for Department/School service are based on a nine hour per semester teaching load and continued activity in the area of scholarship commensurate with AACSB standards. However, there may be circumstances where expectations for an individual faculty member's annual contribution, to supporting the service activities identified in the planning document, need to be adjusted to a level below that defined in section 2. These circumstances include increases in the number of sections taught and substantial participation in activities and initiatives sanctioned by the Department/School but not explicitly accounted for in the planning document. All faculty are expected to meet minimal expectations as defined in 2 unless a documented agreement is reached with the Department Chair as per 3.1 or 3.2 below.

Examples of sanctioned activities include substantial curriculum development (e.g., design of new degrees, curricula, and courses), unanticipated administrative assignments (e.g., Acting Associate Dean), major faculty development initiatives required by the Department/School, and approved leave for sabbatical or faculty exchange.

Except as noted in (1) and (2) below, the following activities generally **do not** qualify for adjustment in Department/School service expectations: routine faculty development, consulting or business activities of the faculty, on-going revision of existing courses, and College and professional service activities not explicitly required by the Department/School or assigned by the Department Chair. Faculty involved in these types of activities, who are having difficulty meeting their Department/School service obligations, may wish to reduce their levels of College and professional service, keeping in mind that College guidelines for various personnel actions require some activity in these areas. The assignment of three course preparations in a single semester is generally not sufficient to justify an adjustment in Department/School service

¹⁹Modified per minutes of 2/24/10.¹⁹

expectations. However, when combined with other non-standard obligations (e.g., developing a new course or program) consideration may be given.

- (1) **Adjustment For Increased Teaching Load:** In the event that a faculty member is assigned a teaching load in excess of three courses per semester, a commensurate reduction in service and/or scholarship contribution shall be granted as mutually agreed to between the faculty member, the Department Chair, and the Dean of School of Business Administration and Economics. All such agreements will be documented by the Department Chair in 1) a written memo to the faculty member, and 2) in the Chair's comments in the faculty member's annual report, which should explicitly indicate the magnitude and nature of the agreed upon adjustment.
 - (2) **Other Adjustments:** Any faculty member may make the case for a reduction in expectation for Department/School service on the basis of time demanded by competing obligations or temporary personal circumstances. In general, requests for reduction in expected Department/School service level should be related to the need to pursue other initiatives that benefit the Department/School or College, with priority given to initiatives that appear in Department/School and College planning documents. In consultation with the Chair, a commensurate reduction in the minimum service load defined in section 2 may be authorized. All such agreements will be documented by the Department Chair in 1) a written memo to the faculty member, and 2) in the Chair's comments in the faculty member's annual report, which should explicitly indicate the magnitude and nature of the agreed upon adjustment.
4. **Standards for College, Professional, and Community Service:** While all faculty are encouraged to participate in service to the College and Profession, determination of the annual scope and intensity of such service is largely left to individual faculty, given their specific interests and aspirations. However, faculty should consider the following:
- (1) Faculty are required to meet the requirements and standards for College and professional service as set forth in performance at rank documents sanctioned by the Academic Vice-President's office;
 - (2) Faculty seeking **continuing appointment and/or promotion to associate professor** should be able to demonstrate significant and on-going service contributions to the College, as well as to their profession or the community. With regard to Community and Professional service activities, activities must be relevant to the Candidate's teaching, scholarship, or specific initiatives of the School (e.g., recruiting, program marketing, etc.). Candidates seeking **promotion to full professor** must be able to demonstrate substantial leadership in the College and/or their profession.
 - (3) Outreach, i.e., community activities that enhance the college's reputation, support the school's efforts in advancement, admissions, or student success, and which relate to the faculty member's area(s) of professional expertise, are recognized as a legitimate contribution in the category of Service.²⁰

²⁰ added 3/2/05

5. **Reporting and Recording of Service Contributions:** The annual report will serve as the primary record of how each faculty member met the service component of his/her professional obligation. In specifying the annual report as the primary record of contributions to service, the intent is to reduce the burden, on both a Candidate and the APT Committee, associated with the compilation and review of a Candidate's record of service for purposes of personnel actions.

In completing their annual reports, faculty shall indicate how they met the standards detailed in section 2 for minimum acceptable contributions to Department/School service. Faculty should provide a *brief* indication of their specific activities and accomplishments in each service capacity, i.e., simply listing appointments to positions and memberships on Committees is generally not adequate documentation of service contribution for purposes of annual evaluation or future personnel actions. Specifically, faculty should indicate their individual responsibility, participation, and any product developed. However, in the case of the following activities, attendance alone is considered indicative of contribution, and faculty need not elaborate on activities: final registrations, transfer student registration events, and Saturday information sessions and similar recruiting events.

Faculty members should also detail contributions to Community and Professional service, including an assessment of how the activities are relevant to the faculty's teaching, scholarship, specific Department/School initiatives (e.g., recruiting, program marketing, etc.), or to the central mission of the College.

6. **Process: Evaluation of Service in Personnel Actions**

(1) **Documentation.** With respect to evaluating service contributions, the primary documentation to be considered by the APT Committee in personnel actions is the annual report. However, the application for reappointment, continuing appointment, or promotion should also include:

- A (required) reflective statement discussing how the faculty member's service activities meet the expectations implied by this document and how the degree to which the faculty member's service activities inform his/her teaching or scholarship.
- (Optionally) supporting detail for activities listed on the annual report²¹. The purpose of submitting additional documentation beyond the annual report should be to provide the APT Committee with evidence of the scope, level of responsibility, and quality of service contributions, particularly in the case of promotion.

(2) **Basis for Judgment.**

- i) In cases of contract renewal, the standards set forth in section 2 and 2.1 provide the primary basis for evaluation by the APT Committee. The APT Committee report

²¹ For example, a supportive letter from a Committee Chair citing specific contributions to the work of the Committee, letters submitted by colleagues, letters of recognition from community agencies or professional organizations that cite contributions and initiatives undertaken by the faculty member, etc.

must conclude that the faculty member has/has not consistently met Department/School service expectations as per section 2.1. The report should include reference as to whether the faculty member has shouldered a proportionate share of the Department's advisement activities and dispatched the same in a professional and competent manner. At the second contract renewal (and beyond) for tenure track lines, the APT Committee should also explicitly indicate whether there is evidence of growth in the scope and level of responsibility associated with service activities of the faculty member commensurate with promotion to Associate Professor as per section 6.2.iii below.

ii) **Continuing appointment:** See section 6.2.iii - *Promotion to Associate Professor* below.

iii) In the case of **Promotion to Associate Professor**, the standards set forth in section 2, 2.1, and 2.2 provide the primary basis for evaluation, by the APT Committee, of the faculty member's School service contribution. The APT Committee report must conclude that the faculty member has/has not consistently met Department/School service expectations as per section 2.1 and whether the faculty member has dispatched the same in a professional and competent manner

Additionally, the APT Committee report must indicate how the faculty member's service record does (or does not) demonstrate significant growth in responsibility and leadership in the Department/School or the College as per section 2.2 and 4. The APT Committee report should address how the faculty member's service record does (does not) meet the requirements for service to the College, Community, and Profession as specified in section 4. With regard to Community and Professional service activities, the APT Committee report should describe how the faculty member's contribution to the service needs of the Community and Profession are relevant to the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, or specific initiatives of the Department/School (e.g., recruiting, program marketing, etc.).

iv) In the case of **promotion to Full Professor**, the standards set forth in section 2, 2.1, and 2.2 provide the primary basis for evaluation, by the APT Committee, of a faculty member's Department/School service contributions. The APT Committee report must conclude that the faculty member has/has not consistently met Department/School service expectations as per section 2.1 and whether the faculty member has dispatched the same in a professional and competent manner.

Additionally, the APT Committee report must indicate how the faculty member's service record does (or does not) consistently demonstrate high quality and substantial contributions to the committees on which they serve. The APT Committee should indicate how the faculty member's record does (or does not) demonstrate on-going constructive and leadership roles in non-committee service contributions and a willingness and ability to undertake administrative duties of increased scope or complexity.

Finally, the APT Committee report should address how the faculty member's

service record does (does not) meet the requirements for service to the College, Community, and Profession as specified in section 4. Specifically, the APT Committee report should describe how the material submitted by the faculty member does (or does not) document that the faculty member is a leader in the College and/or their profession. Further, the APT Committee report should describe how the faculty member's contribution to the service needs of the Community and Profession are relevant to the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, or specific initiatives of the Department/School (e.g., recruiting, program marketing, etc.).

- v) In cases where a faculty member is applying prior service at another institution to meet the residency requirements for promotion or continuing appointment, the service record of the faculty member at the College at Brockport may be difficult to assess. In assessing the service contribution of the faculty member, the APT Committee may also consider the recent service record of the faculty member at another institution as being indicative of his/her potential service contributions at this institution.

V. Review and Revision of Standards and Procedures

Any member of the full-time faculty may make a motion to amend the guidelines, standards, and procedures contained herein. Faculty interested in introducing such a motion should seek to have the motion placed on the agenda of a regularly scheduled Department meeting, where the motion will be introduced, discussed, and adopted only by majority vote. All amendments, as passed by the Department, must specify the implementation date of the amendment and the party or (parties) to whom the amendment applies. ²²

Additionally, the guidelines, standards, and procedures contained herein will undergo a regular review as part of the Department's strategic planning process, with a goal of maintaining guidelines, standards, and procedures that are consistent with School and College strategic goals. Those members of the Department charged with recommending revisions to the Department's strategic plans shall introduce motions for change consistent with evolving strategic planning documents. All amendments, as passed by the Department, must specify the implementation date of the amendment and the party or (parties) to whom the amendment applies. ²³

²² modified 12/1/04

²³ modified 11/17/04

SUNY College at Brockport
Department of Accounting, Economics, and Finance
School of Business Administration and Economics
Classroom Visitation Appraisal Instrument

Person observed: _____

Observed by: _____

Course: _____

Date: _____

For each of the following questions, please circle the symbol that most closely reflects your observation. Explanatory notes are optional and may be included in the comments section for each question.

Symbols: Y = Yes N = No NA = Not Applicable

I. Organization: ways of organizing or summarizing subject matter of the course

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| 1. Was a preliminary overview of the lecture given at the beginning of the class?
Comments: | Y N NA |
| 2. Was linkage to previous subject matter provided?
Comments: | Y N NA |
| 3. Were explanations given on how the subject matter fits into the course as a whole?
Comments: | Y N NA |
| 4. Were clear transitions made from one topic to another?
Comments: | Y N NA |
| 5. Was the class presentation clearly and effectively organized?
Comments: | Y N NA |

II. Clarity: methods used to explain or clarify concepts and principles

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|----|
| 1. Were relevant examples of concepts provided?
Comments: | Y | N | NA |
| 2. Were new or unfamiliar terms defined?
Comments: | Y | N | NA |
| 3. Were difficult ideas explained?
Comments: | Y | N | NA |
| 4. Were important points and key terms addressed?
Comments: | Y | N | NA |
| 5. Were students' questions answered adequately?
Comments: | Y | N | NA |
| 6. Were ways of retaining complicated ideas suggested?
Comments: | Y | N | NA |
| 7. Was subject matter explained in familiar, clear language?
Comments: | Y | N | NA |

III. Enthusiasm: use of nonverbal behavior to solicit student interest and attention

- | | | | |
|--|---|---|----|
| 1. Did the instructor appear enthusiastic about the subject matter?
Comments: | Y | N | NA |
|--|---|---|----|

2 Did the instructor use gestures for emphasis? Y N NA
Comments:

3. Did the instructor avoid reading verbatim from prepared notes or text? Y N NA
Comments:

IV. Interaction: techniques used to foster student participation in class

1. Were students encouraged to ask questions or make comments? Y N NA
Comments:

2. Was constructive feedback provided to students? Y N NA
Comments:

3. Were students praised for their ideas or contributions? Y N NA
Comments:

4. Were attempts made to stimulate student involvement? Y N NA
Comments:

5. Did the instructor make frequent eye contact with students? Y N NA
Comments:

V. Pacing: rate of presentation of information/efficient use of class time

1. Was class time managed effectively? Y N NA
Comments:

2.	Were excessive tangential discussions avoided? Comments:	Y	N	NA
3.	Was time allowed for questions before moving on to the next topic? Comments:	Y	N	NA
VI.	Speech: characteristics of voice relevant to classroom teaching			
1.	Did the instructor speak at an appropriate volume? Comments:	Y	N	NA
2.	Did the instructor speak clearly? Comments:	Y	N	NA
3.	Did the instructor speak at an appropriate pace? Comments:	Y	N	NA
VII.	Rapport: quality of interpersonal relations between teacher and student			
1.	Was an effort made to address at least some students by name? Comments:	Y	N	NA
2.	Did the instructor permit other points of view to be expressed? Comments:	Y	N	NA
3.	Was a professional demeanor maintained while interacting with students? Comments:	Y	N	NA

4. Was the atmosphere in the classroom conducive for learning?
Comments:

Y N NA

Optional Additional Comments:

**Checklist/Inventory of Materials Submitted
For Reappointment, Continuing Appointment and Promotion
(Source: Appendix A of Governance Documents)²⁴**

**Binder # &
Page#/Tab Name**

Item

- | | |
|-------|---|
| _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Maximum 2 page summary of accomplishments |
| _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Letter of application, including criteria weights to be applied |
| _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Annual reports for the period under review, including Chair's comments and signature pages |
| _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum vita |

Supporting Documents Related Primarily To Teaching

- | | |
|-------|--|
| _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching portfolio |
| _____ | A written statement: |
| _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> on the Candidate's philosophy of education and educational goals as they relate to the mission of the School and the mission of the College |
| _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> reflecting how the materials compiled by the Candidate demonstrate teaching excellence and continued growth as an instructor |
| _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> on the Candidate's educational goals relative to specific courses the Candidate currently teaches or has taught during the review period and how those goals relate to the mission of the School and the College |
| _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> One copy of the Candidate's syllabus (from any semester during the review period) for each course taught during the review period |
| _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> One complete set of examinations (i.e., all semester exams and the final exam, if given) for one section of each course taught during the review period. The Candidate may, optionally, also include samples of student work, such as papers or term projects |
| _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade distributions for all courses taught during Fall and Spring semesters for the three most recent years prior to the application, or for applicants with fewer than three years of service, for all Fall and Spring semesters prior to the application submission |
| _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Computer printouts of the four global questions for all Instructional Assessment System (IAS) teaching evaluations given during the review period |

²⁴ Added 5/11/05

- Evidence of the Candidate’s involvement with course development and/or instructional innovation

- Evidence of interaction with the professional community during the review period, including interaction with business practitioners

Supporting Documents Related Primarily To Scholarship

- A reflective statement discussing how the Candidate’s scholarship meets the expectations implied by the tables in Section III.2 and how the Candidate’s scholarship is relevant to his/her teaching and/or service responsibilities

- Reprints or photocopies of all published work

- Complete copies of works in progress listed in the vita

- Documentation supporting claims of quality or importance of scholarship

Supporting Documents Related Primarily To Service

- A (required) reflective statement discussing how the Candidate’s service activities meet the expectations implied by Appendix A and how the degree to which the Candidate’s service activities inform his/her teaching or scholarship

- (optionally) Supporting detail for activities listed on the annual report. The purpose of submitting additional documentation beyond the annual report should be to provide the APT Committee with evidence of the scope, level of responsibility, and quality of service contributions, particularly in the case of promotion.

Other Items (optional)

- Other items, documents and appendices included by the Candidate that will assist the APT Committee in evaluating the Candidate’s accomplishments

School of Business Administration and Economics
Governance Documents

Appendix B

Hiring Procedures For Full-Time Faculty

Hiring Procedures For Full-Time Faculty
School of Business Administration and Economics
The College at Brockport

Revised: 1/9/97

Hiring Procedures For Full-Time Faculty
School of Business Administration and Economics
The College at Brockport

Revised: 1/9/97, 5/21/08²⁵

The make up of the Search Committees will be five members of the specialty area the position falls within. If there are not five members of the area, then additional members will be appointed by the School Chair from the members of the APT Committee. If there are more than five faculty members in a specialty area, a committee of five will be selected by from volunteers from the area first, followed by appointment of faculty within the specialty area by the School Chair, followed by appointment of members of the APT Committee by the School Chair. An area faculty who wishes not to be included must obtain an exclusion determined by the Chair.

Prior to elections at the first School meeting of the Fall semester, the School Chairperson will notify the School faculty of any searches that have been authorized by the College or searches that are pending authorization.

For each search authorized, the Hiring Coordinator will provide template drafts of required documents, including the Vacancy Announcement, Initial Screening Instrument, Interview Questions, Interview Response Rating Sheet, and Advertising Plan. The Search Committee will revise the documents according to their discretion depending on the nature of the specific search. Preparation should be in consultation with the School Chair and informed by the School's Faculty Resource Management Plan, the Authorization to Search form as approved by the College, and Affirmative Action policies currently in effect.

The Hiring Coordinator will forward required documents, including the Vacancy Announcement, Initial Screening Instrument, Interview Questions, Interview Response Rating Sheet, and Advertising Plan through appropriate administrative channels, ensuring that copies are maintained in School files.

After receiving affirmative action approval of the hiring documents, the Hiring Coordinator will implement the advertising plan with the assistance of the Administrative Assistant.

Upon receipt of applicant files, initial screening of applicants shall be done by the Search Committee, and School Chair. Completed screening forms will be returned to the Hiring Coordinator by the Chair of the Search Committee.

²⁵ Approved in Departmental meeting on 5/21/08

In consultation with the Search Committee, and School Chair, the Search Committee will compile an “A, B, C” list of candidates, based on the initial screening of candidates. The “A, B, C” list and applicant files will be forwarded through appropriate channels, with a copy maintained in the School.

After receiving affirmative action approval for the “A, B, C” ranking, the Hiring Coordinator or the Search Committee may arrange phone interviews with each “A” candidate, for the purpose of finalizing the decision concerning which candidates will be invited to campus. The Hiring Coordinator, School Chair, members of the Search Committee will be invited to participate in the phone interviews. A “short list” of candidates, to be invited for on-campus interviews, will be developed.

Priority for interviewing shall be as follows: the Dean, Chairperson, Hiring Coordinator, Search Committee, specialty area faculty, all other School members. Interview questions from the set of questions approved by the Affirmative Action Officer shall be used during the interview process. Members of the ~~APT~~ Search Committee rate the responses of each candidate on the response rating sheet that accompanies the interview questions.

After consultation with other faculty, the Search Committee will make its written recommendation to the School within a week after the last candidate for a position has been interviewed. Full consideration will be given to the recommendations of the Chairperson, the needs of the School, the Faculty Resource Management Plan, and the qualifications conveyed in the official Announcement of Professional Vacancy. Supporting documentation, including completed screening and rating sheets and application materials provided by the candidate, will be kept on file in the School Office for examination for a reasonable period of time prior to the vote. Materials removed for examination will be recorded on an inventory sheet.

The School will meet following the candidates' visits to discuss and vote on the recommendation(s) of the Search Committee. The vote will be by secret ballot. The record of the vote, together with the Committee's recommendation, will be forwarded to the Dean.

Should the Chairperson disagree with the School's decision of any candidate, he/she shall make it known to the School at the meeting discussed in 12. If, following the meeting, there is still disagreement, the School's recommendation and supporting material shall be forwarded as the major recommendation. The Chairperson, if he/she chooses, shall, at the same time, forward her/his recommendation with appropriate supporting materials. Any faculty member may submit an individual written opinion, which will be included in the candidate's file and forwarded to the Dean.

All full-time faculty recruitment efforts (except in unusual circumstances) will conform to the above.

A report to the Search Committee and the School will be given at the first meeting in the Fall semester, by the Chairperson, concerning full-time faculty who were hired for the current academic year.

School of Business Administration and Economics
Governance Documents

Appendix C

Procedures for Allocating Scholarship Support

Procedures for Allocating Scholarship Support

School of Business Administration and Economics
The College at Brockport

Revised: 1/9/01

In addition to the research support offered by the College, the School will allocate funds from its budget to support the following initiatives:

- I. **Supplementary Research Support Awards Program**
- II. **Supplemental Travel Support Program**
- III. **Research/Grading Assistance Program**
- IV. **Release Time Awards Program**

I. Supplementary Research Support Awards Program (\$3500 Per Year)

The \$3500 is intended to augment existing support, available through the College, for underwriting the cost of research projects. In particular, the College provides a number of scholarly incentive awards that are available annually and applied for as per administrative guidelines. The intent of the School's program is to fund projects not supported by the College or for which the support offered is inadequate.

Size of Awards: The \$3500 is divided into 4 units of \$500 and 5 units of \$300. Applicants can the apply for awards of \$300, \$500, \$600, \$800, or \$1000.

Application Process:

- A) To qualify for this money, faculty must first apply for a scholarly incentive award.
- B) The applications to the APT committee may not exceed two double-spaced pages and must include.
 - I. The name of the applicant(s).
 - II. A description of the project to be funded, including
 - project goals and research plan,
 - a statement of how the project supports the goals of their area as set forth in the planning document,
 - major milestones and tentative time frame for completion of major milestones,
 - the amount requested,
 - anticipated use of funds,
 - anticipated project deliverables, e.g. paper submitted to journal x, data set of size y, presentation at conference z.
 - If the application is for money to augment a scholarly incentive award, the applicant should explain the impact of the additional funds on the project.

- C) Applicants must attach the following to their application.
- I. The application submitted to the scholarly incentive program,
 - II. The reviews of the College committee that evaluated the proposal,
 - III. If the review by the College committee expressed criticisms or concerns, the application to the APT committee should include a narrative, not to exceed one page, describing how the criticisms of the college will be addressed.
- D) The applications cycle is intended to follow that of the scholarly incentives awards (SIA) program. Applications to the SIAI program are typically due by November 1 each year and applicants are notified of their award status by December 1. Applications for additional School support are due to the Chair by January 25 of each year. Applications are submitted to the School Secretary, who will mark the date of receipt on the proposal and forward the proposal to the School Chair. The School Chair will forward all applications to the APT committee chair no later than January 30. The APT committee will notify applicants of their award status by February 15.

Evaluation Process:

- A) Timely applications receive priority over late applications.
- B) If the sum of the requested funds is less than \$3500, all proposals will be funded, with the remainder of funds used to support faculty development and travel.
- C) If the sum of the funds exceeds \$3500, funds will be allocated based on the outcome of the review process described in IV-VII below.
- D) For each proposal, each member of the APT committee will assign a score 0-10 with 0 representing poor and 10 representing excellent for each of the following attributes:
 - Clarity of goals
 - Feasibility of research plan,
 - Appeal of deliverables relative to the other applications submitted.
- E) Each referee will assign a score of 0-30 to the proposal, which will be the sum of the points assign to each of the three attributes listed above.
- F) The final score assigned to an application is defined as the average of the total scores assigned by all referees.
- G) To facilitate a broad distribution of funds, the final scores of applicants who received an award in the previous year will be reduced by 3 points (10%).
- H) Committee members who have proposals pending may not evaluate proposals. In cases where there are fewer than three members of the APT committee evaluating the proposals,

the APT committee chair will solicit the assistance of other faculty in the School until three evaluations are obtained.

Funds Allocation Process:

- A) The three proposals with the highest scores will be fully funded. Remaining proposals will be funded in rank order of final score until funds are exhausted; the last proposal funded may be only partially funded.
- B) The APT committee will provide, in writing, the results of the allocation process to the applicants and to the School chair. In cases where all proposals are not funded evaluation scores will also be provided.

II. Supplemental Travel Support Program (five awards of \$300 per Year)

The \$300 awards are intended to support travel to a second conference during a given year or to augment existing support, available for the through the College, for the first conference attended in a given year. The intent is to fund travel to “important” conferences²⁶, i.e. the goal is to support quality rather than quantity. A publication in a published proceeding is required to be eligible.

Size of Awards: There are five awards of (up to) \$300 per year. Up to three will be allocated for travel between August 1 and December 31 with the remainder allocated for travel between January 1 and July 31.

Application Process:

- A) The application must include:
 - I. A (brief) cover page that includes the name of the applicant and the name and date of the conference for which travel support is requested. . The conference must appear on the School’s list of “top” conferences.
 - II. Some evidence that a paper has been accepted and will be included in a published proceedings.
- B) Applications will be collected during each calendar month by the School secretary and forwarded, as a batch, to the School Chair at the end of the month. The secretary will note the date of submission.

Because there are different notification of acceptance dates for various conferences, applications for support can be submitted any time during the year.

²⁶ The Department will maintain a list, supplied by the areas, of “top” conferences. The list will be available from the department secretary.

Evaluation Process:

- I. To be eligible for support, the conference must be included on the School's list of prestigious conferences and result in a published proceeding. (This list will be maintained on-file in the School office).
- II. All requests received at the beginning of a month (a batch) will be funded, if funds are available.
- III. In the event that availability of funds precludes funding all requests in a batch, priority will be given as follows:
 - a) Requests to support a second conference receive priority over requests for a first conference. (The first conference already receives some support from the College and School.)
 - b) Individuals who received funding in the previous 18 months will be given lower priority.
 - c) If conflicting requests are not resolved by a) and b) above, awards will be made on a first-come first served basis.

Other: The chair will notify the applicants of their funding status and answer any questions on how funds were allocated.

III. Research/Grading Assistance Program (maximum of eight \$400 awards/semester)

The intent of this award is to help people have more time to do their scholarship, either by 1) hiring (student) labor applied directly to a project or 2) leveraging faculty time by hiring students to release faculty from mundane grading activities.

Size of Awards: There are eight awards of \$400, per semester.

Application Process:

- A) To qualify for this money, faculty must first identify a (student) worker who is willing and able to complete required tasks.
- B) The applications to the APT committee may not exceed two double-spaced pages and must include.
 - I. The name of the applicant(s) and the (student) worker(s).
 - II. A description of the project to be funded, including
 - project goals and research plan,
 - goals and plan for current semester,
 - anticipated use of contracted labor,
 - anticipated project deliverables, e.g. paper submitted to journal x, data set of size y, presentation at conference z.
 - If the application is for money to augment a scholarly incentive award, the applicant should explain the impact of the additional funds on the project.

- C) If the applicant received an award within the last two calendar years, attach the following to the application.
- I. The nature of the award, i.e. was it for grading or for a research assistant,
 - II. A brief (paragraph) description of the project(s) previously supported,
 - III. An candid assessment of how successful the applicant was in utilizing prior research support.

The applications cycle is intended to correspond to the fall and spring semesters. Unused funds may be applied for use during the summer. Applications for work to be done in the spring semester are due by November 15 with awards announced by December 15. Applications for work to be done in the fall semester are due by August 28 with awards announced by September 10. Awards for work to be done in the summer are due by April 28 with awards announced by May 15. Applications are submitted to the School Secretary, who will mark the date of receipt on the proposal and forward the proposal to the School Chair. The School Chair will forward all applications to the APT committee no later than September 1, November 20, and May 1 respectively.

Evaluation Process:

- I. Timely applications receive priority over late applications.
- II. If the number of awards requested is less than the number of awards available, all proposals will be funded, with remaining funds used to support faculty development and travel.
- III. If the number of awards requested is less than the number of awards, funds will be allocated based on the outcome of the review process described in IV-VII below.
- IV. For each proposal, each member of the APT committee will assign a score 0-10 with 0 representing poor and 10 representing excellent for each of the following attributes:
 - Clarity of goals for utilizing the requested research support,
 - Time feasibility of research plan for time period in question,
 - Whether use of research assistants (or graders) is appropriate for the type of research (or grading) being done.
 - How well the applicant utilized their previous award. (If the applicant has never received an award, a score of 10 will be assigned to this criteria).
- V. Each referee will assign a score of 0-30 to the proposal, which will be the sum of the points assign to each of the four attributes listed above.
- VI. The final score assigned to an application is defined as the average of the total scores assigned by all referees.
- VII. The final scores of applicants who received an award in the previous semester will be reduced by 5 points; scores of applicants who did not receive an award in the previous semester, but did receive an award during the previous calendar year will be reduced by 3 points.

VIII. Committee members who have proposals pending may not evaluate proposals. In cases where there are fewer than three members of the APT committee evaluating the proposals, the APT committee chair will solicit the assistance of other faculty in the School until three evaluations are obtained.

Funds Allocation Process:

- I. The four research assistant and four grader proposals with the highest scores will be funded. If less than four requests were made for one category of award (e.g. only three graders are requested), the remaining rewards will be allocated to the other category and awarded in rank order of final score.
- II. The APT committee will provide, in writing, the results of the allocation process to the applicants and to the School Chair. In cases where all proposals are not funded evaluation scores will also be provided.

IV. **Release Time Awards Program** (2 awards per year)

These awards are intended to give faculty, with a demonstrated need, more time to complete a specific research project. The awards are not intended to support course development; faculty who are developing new courses should apply for the College's class room scholarship grant.

Size and Number of Awards:

There are two awards per year, allowing for a one-course release. One award will be made for the fall semester and one will be made for the spring.

Application Process:

A) The application may not exceed three double-spaced pages and must include:

- I. The name of the applicant.
- II. A description of the project to be funded, including
 - project goals and research plan,
 - a statement of how the project supports the goals of their area as set forth in the planning document,
 - major milestones and tentative time frame for completion of major milestones,
 - the anticipated use of release time, estimated to be approximately 80 hours.
 - an explanation of why a less expensive research assistance/or grader award (also estimated to free up approximately 80 hours, i.e. 80 hours @ \$5.00 per hour) is not appropriate for the work to be done.
 - anticipated project deliverables, e.g. paper submitted to journal x, data set of size y, presentation at conference z.

Course release applications for fall and spring of the next academic year must be submitted to the APT Committee no later than October 15 of the current academic year.²⁷ Applications are submitted to the School Secretary, who will mark the date of receipt on the proposal and forward the proposal to the School Chair. The School Chair will forward all applications to the APT committee within five days of the due date. The APT committee will notify all applicants and the School chair of the committee's final recommendations by April 15 and October 1 respectively.

Award recipients and the Chair are jointly responsible for the identification and orientation of adjunct faculty to be hired to staff courses from which award recipients are released. Release is subject to identification of a suitable replacement instructor. Release is also subject to the School meeting requirements for full-time faculty coverage. Awards recipients may have to alter their schedules to maintain coverage requirements.

²⁷ modified 3/3/04

Evaluation Process:

- I. Timely applications receive priority over late applications.
- II. If only one proposal for a given semester, it will be funded.
- III. If multiple proposals are received, funds will be allocated based on the outcome of the review process described in IV-VII below.
- IV. For each proposal, each member of the APT committee will assign a score 0-10 with 0 representing poor and 10 representing excellent for each of the following attributes:
 - Clarity of goals,
 - Feasibility of research plan,
 - The degree to which the applicant has justified the need for release time beyond that which might be provided by the \$400 research assistant/grader awards program.
 - Appeal of deliverables relative to the other applications submitted.
- V. Each referee will assign a score of 0-30 to the proposal, which will be the sum of the points assign to each of the four attributes listed above.
- VI. The final score assigned to an application is defined as the average of the total scores assigned by all referees.
- VII. The final scores of applicants who received an award in the previous 2 calendar years will be reduced by 3 points.
- VIII. Committee members who have proposals pending may not evaluate proposals. In cases where there are fewer that three members of the APT committee evaluating the proposals, the APT committee chair will solicit the assistance of other faculty in the School until three evaluations are obtained.

Funds Allocation Process:

- I. The proposal with the highest score will be funded
- II. The APT committee will provide, in writing, the results of the allocation process to the applicants and to the School chair. In cases where all proposals are not funded evaluation scores will also be provided.

School of Business Administration and Economics
Governance Documents

Appendix D

Faculty Resource Management Plan

Faculty Resource Management Plan
School of Business Administration and Economics
The College at Brockport

Revised: 1/9/01

- I. **Goals:** The School will manage faculty resources such that:
- Existing programs and areas of strength are maintained.
 - Areas of weakness are remedied.
 - Emerging trends in management education are addressed.
 - AACSB accreditation standards are maintained.
 - The faculty resource is continually improved.
 - The diversity profile of the faculty is enhanced.
 - Faculty size is sufficient to meet the School's teaching, scholarship, and service responsibilities.
- II. **Mechanisms:** The primary mechanisms for affecting changes in the faculty resource are 1) hiring and 2) faculty development. These mechanisms are supported by:
- The hiring process;
 - The faculty development processes;
 - The annual planning process;
 - The strategic planning process; and
 - The curriculum development and review process.
- III. **Faculty Position Planning and Authorization (full-time):** The hiring process for full-time faculty represents an important opportunity for the School to continuously improve the credentials and qualifications of its faculty. The hiring process takes place in the context of a College-wide faculty hiring model. The College solicits, annually, requests and justifications for hiring full-time faculty. The School Chair responds, by completing a *Faculty Position Request Form* as directed by the College. In completing the form, the Chair will pursue the goals specified in section I above.

The planning and authorization process is informed by 1) the annual planning process, 2) the strategic planning process, and 3) the curriculum development and review process, all of which consider the current faculty profile vis-à-vis curricular needs. Known resignations and retirements also inform the process, as do AACSB faculty size and composition standards.

The School Chair incorporates the findings of the aforementioned planning and review processes into an *Authorization To Search Plan*, which describes the profile, justification, and priorities for faculty lines to be requested from the College. The Chair presents the plan to the School faculty, typically at the beginning of the spring semester. Revisions are made in accordance with faculty comments and suggestions; the revised plan is then adopted by a majority vote of the faculty.

In accordance with the Authorization to Search Plan, the School Chair submits required documents to the College, which then reviews and prioritizes requests for new faculty lines. Lines approved by the College are then announced to the School, and faculty searches are conducted in accordance with the *Hiring Procedures for Full Time Faculty* (Governance Documents, Appendix B) adopted by the School and approved by the College. The hiring process, which takes place in an affirmative action and equal opportunity employment context, shall seek to generate a large and diversified applicant pool.

IV. **Hiring (Part-time):** Hiring of adjunct (part-time) faculty is done by the School Chair, as required to staff the schedules proposed by the School and approved by the College. Relative to hiring full-time faculty, the process of hiring adjunct faculty is, by nature, more ad hoc. The goals delineated in Section I above, however, are still germane. In order to achieve the goals specified in Section I, the following policies are pursued.

- Course schedules will be staffed such that at least 60% of the credit hours in evening and extension programs are staffed by full-time faculty.
- Except in unusual circumstances, adjunct faculty will have earned a masters degree, preferably in a discipline related to business.
- All adjunct faculty will be qualified, by academic preparation and/or professional experience, to teach the classes to which they are assigned.
- Administration of the IAS²⁸, in all classes taught, and submission of results to the School is required of adjunct faculty.
- Adjunct faculty employed (full time) by another organization will be limited to teaching at most two courses per semester.
- Adjunct faculty will receive course guides and representative syllabi for the courses to which they are assigned. Adjunct faculty will submit course syllabi to the School Secretary at least one week prior to the start of a semester. The School secretary will forward the syllabi to the appropriate course coordinator(s). Course coordinators will review syllabi to ensure that syllabi reflect the learning outcomes embodied in the course guides. Compliance with the course guide will be indicated on a standard review form. In cases where the course coordinator expresses concerns about a syllabus, the School Chair will work with the adjunct faculty to resolve the concerns.

²⁸ Or other instrument currently adopted by the College.

- V. **Faculty Development:** Faculty development needs and efforts are to be identified and documented as part of the annual reporting and planning process. Faculty should complete a *Faculty Development Plan and Report* (Governance Documents, Appendix E) each year coincident with their annual report. The goal is for a broad cross section of the faculty, normally exceeding 80%, to participate in intellectual development activities that support their teaching, scholarship, and service. This includes interaction with people in organizations, on subjects related to the phenomena about which they teach and research, and the observation of business practices in action.

The College supports faculty development through a number of mechanisms, including seminars and workshops, sabbatical leave, scholarly incentive grants, UUP grants, support for conference travel, the Center for Excellence in Teaching, and the Faculty Residency Program.

In the case of adjunct faculty, individuals are hired for their specific and current knowledge and expertise as it applies to the courses to which they are assigned. However, where adjunct faculty, particularly individuals on term contracts, maintain longer-term relationships with the School, they will be asked to report development needs and activities on an annual basis, in concert with the annual reporting process.

- VI. **Faculty Size:** In reflection of the teaching mission of the College, but in recognition of the expectations for active scholarship and service profiles among the faculty, the School will seek to maintain a full-time faculty complement sufficient to afford three course (per semester) teaching loads for assistant, associate, and full professors. Implied is a full-time faculty complement sufficiently large to meet full-time faculty standards as set forth by AACSB. A three course load is also consistent with the *Faculty Roles and Rewards* report adopted by the College.

School of Business Administration and Economics
Governance Documents

Appendix E

Faculty Development Plan And Report

Faculty Development Plan And Report
School of Business Administration and Economics
The College at Brockport

Revised: 1/9/01

The School of Business Administration and Economics has adopted a Faculty Resource Management Plan (Governance Documents, Appendix D) which relies on continuous faculty development to support continuous maintenance and improvement of faculty qualifications. As part of the annual reporting process, the attached form is to be completed each year by 1) full-time faculty and 2) adjunct faculty who routinely teach two or more sections per semester and who have been teaching in the School for more than five years.

The purpose of the form is twofold:

1. To document²⁹ faculty development activities undertaken during the previous years and to indicate the significance of the activity to the teaching, services, and scholarly obligations assigned to the faculty.
2. To plan for activities in the coming year such that budgets can be planned and allocated.

The form is to be completed and attached to the annual report submitted by the faculty.

²⁹ For stakeholder groups, such as AACSB and for purposes of documenting performance at rank.

Faculty Development: AY01-02 Budget Requests and Documentation of AY00-01 activities

Faculty Name: _____

Part I: Requests For Development Funds: AY01-02			Estimated Cost	Amount Funded
Requested Training or Activity	Training Source (if known)	Will Support		
1.		O Teaching O Scholarship O Service		
2.		O Teaching O Scholarship O Service		
3.		O Teaching O Scholarship O Service		
4.		O Teaching O Scholarship O Service		
5.		O Teaching O Scholarship O Service		
6.		O Teaching O Scholarship O Service		

Part II: Documentation: Development Activities Undertaken in AY00-01		
Development Activities Related to Teaching (continue on back if required)		
1.		O Interact w/ practitioners
2.		O Interact w/ practitioners
3.		O Interact w/ practitioners
4.		O Interact w/ practitioners
Development Activities Related to Scholarship (continue on back if required)		
1.		O Interact w/ practitioners
2.		O Interact w/ practitioners
3.		O Interact w/ practitioners
4.		O Interact w/ practitioners
Development Activities Related to Service (continue on back if required)		
1.		O Interact w/ practitioners
2.		O Interact w/ practitioners
3.		O Interact w/ practitioners
4.		O Interact w/ practitioners

Development Activities Undertaken in AY00-01 (continued)

Development Activities Related to Teaching (continued)		
5.		O Interact w/ practitioners
6.		O Interact w/ practitioners
7.		O Interact w/ practitioners
8.		O Interact w/ practitioners
9.		O Interact w/ practitioners
10.		O Interact w/ practitioners
11.		O Interact w/ practitioners
12.		O Interact w/ practitioners
Development Activities Related to Scholarship (continued)		
5.		O Interact w/ practitioners
6.		O Interact w/ practitioners
7.		O Interact w/ practitioners
8.		O Interact w/ practitioners
9.		O Interact w/ practitioners
10.		O Interact w/ practitioners
11.		O Interact w/ practitioners
12.		O Interact w/ practitioners
Development Activities Related to Service (continued)		
5.		O Interact w/ practitioners
6.		O Interact w/ practitioners
7.		O Interact w/ practitioners
8.		O Interact w/ practitioners
9.		O Interact w/ practitioners
10.		O Interact w/ practitioners
11.		O Interact w/ practitioners
12.		O Interact w/ practitioners

Appendix F

Performance at Rank: Minimum Performance Criteria for Tenured Faculty

Performance at Rank: Minimum Performance Criteria for Tenured faculty
School of Business Administration and Economics
The College at Brockport

Effective beginning in AY2000-2001

Revised: 1/9/01

This appendix describes the performance at rank criteria adopted by the faculty of the School of Business and Economics for *tenured faculty*. The criteria address performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and professional development. Scholarship expectations for graduate faculty are also specified.

These criteria were developed with an understanding that they are to be used to foster quality and continuous improvement. The School does not intend for these criteria to be used in a punitive fashion. Rather, the intent of these criteria is to provide guidelines so that tenured faculty have a clear understanding of when they are not meeting expectations and to ensure that appropriate remedial programs, as described within, are developed.

I. Minimum Performance at Rank for Tenured Faculty:

A. Teaching: All full-time faculty must report IAS scores, for all classes taught during the academic year, in their Annual Report. Tenured faculty will meet the minimum performance at rank expectations if, for each class taught during the academic year, they have either:

1. Achieved an average score of 2.25 or better on both Question 3 and Question 4 of the College IAS30 instrument, or
2. Achieved a rating of good, very good, or excellent on both Question 3 and Question 4 from 80% or more of the students completing the survey.

The IAS form is the mandated survey instrument until such time that an alternative document is developed and approved by the College. Faculty members wishing to use another form of student evaluation in place of the IAS instrument, to demonstrate teaching effectiveness, must get prior School approval of the alternative instrument.

³⁰ Or equivalent on instrument adopted by College.

B. Scholarship: Tenured faculty will have met minimum performance at rank expectations in scholarship if they have:

1. Three scholarship activities³¹, relevant to the School's area of instruction as reported in the five most recent annual reports.³² (effective 8/20/07)
2. At least one of the three scholarship activities in 1. above must be a peer-reviewed journal publication. (Note "peer review" and "publication" are defined in Appendix A, Section III., subsection 10 of the governance Document.³³ (effective 8/20/07)
3. Faculty members who have received their doctorate within the last three years have met performance at rank expectations.

C. Service: Tenured faculty will have met minimum performance at rank expectations in service if they have met the applicable guidelines in the School's *Guidelines, Standards, and Procedures For Re-Appointment, continuing Appointment, and Promotion*, Section IV, 1-5. (Governance Documents, Appendix A, pp 9-12).

D. Professional Development: Tenured faculty must demonstrate that they are remaining current in their professional and instructional field(s). Faculty will have met minimum professional development expectations if they have undertaken at least three professional development activities in the preceding five years. Development activities must be relevant to the area of instruction; examples of development activities include:

- Conference Attendance
- Meeting CPE Requirements For A License
- Journal Refereeing
- Maintaining Currency In Professional Publications
- Significant Attendance Of Professional Society Meetings
- Training Exercises Or Workshops
- Workplace Residency Experiences
- Sabbatical
- Consulting
- For-Credit Courses

II. **Reporting:** Reporting of Teaching, Scholarship, Service, and Professional Development activities will occur via the annual report.

III. **In the event that a faculty member does not meet performance at rank in any of the four categories above,** said faculty shall append a remedial plan to the Annual report, providing specific action plans and/or time-lines for meeting performance requirements.

³¹ Scholarship activities must be peer-reviewed and include publications in journals, conference proceedings and abstracts, published book reviews or article summaries, published textbook chapters, chapters of scholarly books, published textbook ancillaries, and published instructional materials.

³² Changed in 3/9/07 Departmental minutes

³³ Changed in 3/9/07 Departmental minutes

Said faculty will discuss the plan with the School Chair, who will assist the faculty member in identifying and procuring any resources required by the plan.

- If the School Chair is satisfied that the plan presented by the faculty is feasible and will remedy the situation, the School Chair will assert that the faculty is making satisfactory progress towards meeting performance expectations. If the Chair deems the remedial plan to be unsatisfactory with regard to remedying the situation, the Chair will ask the faculty to make specific modifications.
- Faculty who do not meet performance at rank expectations and who do not append a remedial plan that is satisfactory to the Chair will be deemed, in the Chair's comments on the annual report, as not meeting performance at rank expectations.
- Faculty who disagree with the Chair's evaluation of Performance at Rank and/or the Chair's assessment of the feasibility/appropriateness of the remedial plan, may request a meeting with the Chair and the Dean of Professions to seek a resolution to the disagreement.
- After all other procedures in this Appendix and any other relevant college processes have been exhausted, faculty deemed to not be performing at rank with respect to scholarship may be required to contribute more in teaching and/or service. That decision will be made by the Dean of Professions after appropriate consultation with the School Chair.³⁴

Note: Peer-reviewed journal articles include articles published in an academic or professional journal listed in a recognized source such as Cabell's.

³⁴ added 3/2/05

Appendix G

AQ/PQ Definitions

School of Business Administration and Economics

Adopted by AACSB Committee, November 1, 2006³⁵

³⁵ Accepted in Departmental Meeting, September 26, 2007

Standard No. 10 requires that the business unit meet the following standards for faculty qualifications:

- At least 90% of faculty resources must be academically-qualified or professionally-qualified.
- At least 50% of faculty resources must be academically-qualified.

A. SCHOOL STANDARD FOR INITIALLY ACHIEVING ACADEMICALLY-QUALIFIED (AQ) STATUS:

The School uses the following guidelines to determine whether faculty are AQ:

1. For those teaching courses other than business law or taxation, normally the minimum requirement will be a doctoral degree, defined as a Ph.D., a DBA, a DPS, or an Ed.D. The doctoral degree must have addressed or emphasized the discipline(s) in which the individual teaches. An exception may be made for faculty with a doctoral degree in a discipline other than that which they teach but with at least a master's degree in the field in which they teach, combined with substantial business experience (at least five years) in that field.
2. For those teaching taxation, normally a graduate degree in taxation or a combination of graduate degrees in law and accounting will be required.
3. For those teaching business law, normally a degree in law will be required.
4. Faculty who are doctoral students and who have achieved the status of "ABD" will be considered AQ for up to three years beyond their most recently completed graduate comprehensive exam or other milestone that puts them in the dissertation stage. They must also still be currently enrolled in the doctoral program.

B. SCHOOL STANDARDS FOR MAINTAINING AQ STATUS:

1. All faculty are required to engage in professional development activities to maintain their knowledge and expertise. This is to ensure that they bring current and relevant information to their classes and students.
2. The critical factor in determining whether faculty are maintaining their expertise is the impact of their activities on the School's mission.
3. New Ph.D.'s are normally considered to be AQ for five years from the date of the degree.³⁶
4. AQ faculty are normally expected to engage in the following activities:
 - a) Producing intellectual contributions. Faculty are required to meet or exceed School and College standards for intellectual contributions. This normally means written publication of at least three research activities relevant to the **School's**

³⁶ At page 11 of "Deploying Professionally Qualified Faculty: An Interpretation of AACSB Standards," published by AACSB International, February 1, 2006.

area(s) of instruction during every rolling five-year period. Examples of intellectual contributions are listed in the School Governance Document Appendix F.

- b) Professional development activities. Faculty are required to meet or exceed School and College standards for professional development activities. This normally means completion of three professional development activities relevant to the area(s) of instruction every rolling five-year period.
- c) Examples of professional development activities are listed in the School Governance Document Appendix F.
- d) The burden of proof of demonstrating compliance with this policy is on the faculty member.

C. SCHOOL STANDARD FOR INITIALLY ACHIEVING PROFESSIONALLY-QUALIFIED (PQ) STATUS:

The School uses the following guidelines to determine whether faculty are PQ:

1. For those teaching any School courses,- including CIS106 and ENL308, normally the minimum requirement will be an earned graduate degree, normally either a master's degree or a law degree. The degree must have addressed or emphasized the discipline(s) in which the individual teaches.
2. In addition to a master's degree, to qualify as PQ faculty must have professional experience relevant to the faculty member's teaching assignments and current at the time of hiring.
3. "Current at the time of hiring" normally means that the experience is no more than five years old at the time of initial the College at Brockport hire. For example, if a faculty member had qualifying experience when first hired after retiring in 2001, that faculty member will be considered PQ with respect to experience through 2006. An exception is made for faculty whose experience at the time of initial hire to teach at the college level but at a different institution meets this "five-year limitation," as long as that faculty member was PQ at the time of that initial hire and had *maintained* PQ status throughout the time period subsequent to hire. For example, an individual who was PQ by these standards when hired by another college or university to teach in 1995, and who then engaged in activities to maintain that PQ status until initial hire by the School in 2005, would still be considered PQ for School purposes.
4. The required professional experience must be "significant in duration and level of responsibility" and must provide the faculty member with intellectual capital equivalent to that of completion of a program of doctoral study. The School adopts the position that a minimum of four (4) years of professional business experience (or legal experience for those teaching law or taxation) with increasing responsibility is "significant in duration and level of responsibility."

D. SCHOOL STANDARDS FOR MAINTAINING PQ STATUS:

1. All faculty are required to engage in professional development activities to maintain their knowledge and expertise. This is to ensure that they bring current and relevant information to their classes and students.
2. The critical factor in determining whether faculty are maintaining their expertise is the impact of their activities on the School's mission.
3. Faculty are required to meet or exceed School and College standards for professional development activities. This normally means completion of three professional development activities relevant to the area(s) of instruction every rolling five-year period.
4. PQ faculty are normally expected to engage in a subset of the following activities to sustain status as PQ:
 - a) Continuing in an active role of significance in a business enterprise.
 - b) Conducting an active consulting practice of significance (i.e., more than one client).
 - c) Creating and/or delivering executive education programs.
 - d) Serving on one or more boards of directors.
 - e) Successfully publishing papers in academic, professional, or trade journals.
 - f) Publishing other intellectual contributions such as technical reports or textbooks and supporting materials.
 - g) Obtaining a new professional certification or license.
 - h) Maintaining a professional certification or license.
 - i) A significant workplace residency experience.
 - j) Other professional activities that demonstrably maintain the individual's expertise in the area(s) of instruction.
5. The burden of proof of demonstrating compliance with this policy is on the faculty member.

Appendix H

Modifications to Governance Document School of Business Administration and Economics

Modifications to this document are embedded in the document at the relevant location, and the date of change is noted. Changes are highlighted. Changes are only reflected in the document subsequent to motions adopted by vote in School meetings. Such motions and votes are documented in minutes to School meetings, maintained by the School secretary.

- a) Any section of the Governance Documents that are modified (including Appendix A) shall contain a header or footer that reads: “Last modified on (date)”**
- b) Changes are highlighted in text indicating dates and cross reference to School meeting minutes.³⁷**

Modifications to this document:

³⁷ last modified on 5/18/05

Date	Section	Description
Minutes 9/10/03	D – IV, 9	Add Department Archivist
Minutes 3/3/04	Apx A – I, 2.	The application contents should comply with the requirements of the College.
Minutes 3/3/04	Apx A – I, 3.	Grade distributions for all of their courses taught during Fall and Spring semesters...or for applicants with fewer than three years of service...
Minutes 3/3/04	Apx C – IV, A) II	Course release applications for fall and spring of the <u>next</u> academic year must be submitted to the APT Committee no later than October 15 of the <u>current</u> academic year.
Minutes 4/16/04	D – II, 2.	1. If a majority of full time faculty within the specialty area affected.....concur...
Minutes 4/16/04	D – II, 2.	2. If a majority of full time faculty within the specialty area affected..... <i>do not</i> concur...
4/21/04	Apx A – I, 6	Classroom evaluation...When conflicts arise due to teaching schedules, a minimum of 3 APT Committee Members must observe a candidate.
5/5/04	Apx A- I,3	Add: Any letters of recommendation received....after the application deadline will not be included.
5/14/04	Apx A- I,2	Letters of recommendation that are not marked “personal”...must be given to the candidate...
5/14/04	Apx-I,2	Letters of recommendation (solicited or unsolicited) obtained from students prior to their graduation shall not be included...
10/20/04	D-II-2-v	Modify: All Department Course Guides will be re-examined...at least every three years, beginning Fall 2004.
11/17/04	Appx A- V	All amendments, as passed by Department, must specify the implementation date...and the party ...to whom the amendment applies.
Minutes 12/1/04	D-I, 1.	Standing Department committees are permitted to elect Co-chairs...
3/2/05	Apx. A,I,4	Add: Implicit in the Department’s standards ... compliant with the 1998 standards set by the Faculty Senate Roles and Rewards Committee,
3/2/05	Apx A, IV, 4.3	Added: Outreach, i.e. community activities that enhance...
3/2/05	Apx F – D, II	Add: After all other procedures in this Appendix and any other relevant college process have been exhausted...
3/2/05	Apx A- III, 10.8	Modify: <i>At least three</i> of the "minimal acceptable publications" ... journals and 3 published book reviews, <i>at least three</i> of the publications or book reviews ... personnel action. (See footnote

		10 on page F-2 for definition of “minimal acceptable publications.”)
4/27/05	Apx A – I, 4	Added: Criteria to be Considered:...
Minutes 4/27/05	D – II, 3.	3a) Composition and Election of Committee: Five members of the Department faculty, to be elected annually by the Department.
Minutes 4/27/05	D – V, 1.	Hiring of QARs: Effective August 22, 2005, the hiring...
Minutes 5/11/05	Apx A – I, 3.	A “Checklist/Inventory of Materials Submitted” listed at the end of Appendix A.....
Minutes 5/11/05	Apx A – I, 3.	Candidates for reappointmentshall include an Executive Summary (maximum 2 – 3 pages) as part of their package.
5/18/05	Apx G, c	Add: Any section of the Governance Documents that are modified ... contain a header or footer that reads: “Last modified on (date)”
5/18/05	Apx G, d	Add: Changes are highlighted in text indicating dates and cross reference to Department meeting minutes.
Minutes 5/11/05	D –II, 1.	c.) The APT Committee shall publish to the Department faculty <u>all</u> APT submission deadlines...
Minutes 5/14/05	D-II, 12	Add: Technology Coordinator
Minutes 5/18/05	D – II, 1.	d) During their period of APT Committee service, the APT Committee members shall not write personal letters...
Minutes 5/18/05	Apx H	Add: a) Any section of the Governance Document that are modified... b) Changes are highlighted in text...
Minutes 9/28/05	Apx A	Add: The APT Committee will prepare a written response to the faculty member. The faculty member may...ask that his/her letter and APT Committee written response be included in package...
Minutes 10/5/05	Apx. A	Modify: a.) A written statement that explicitly addresses each of the following: i.) <i>The faculty member’s philosophy of education...</i>
Minutes 10/5/05	Apx A	Modified: If the faculty member believes that the report contains errors of fact or omission, the candidate will detail his/her concern, in a <i>written memo not to exceed three pages...</i>
Minutes 10/5/05	D.I.	Modify: The quarterly report deadline dates shall be October 31, December 31, March 31, and May 31
Minutes 9/28/05	Apx.A, III	Grandfather Clause:For Fall 2005 applicants only,

Minutes 9/20/06	D,II	AACSB Committee Appointment: change of term from 5 to 3 years
Minutes 10/4/06	D.III	Appointment: A member of the faculty, appointed by the
Minutes 10/4/06	Pre- Amble 3.1	Add: Exams, projects, papers, and other graded work will be graded and returned to students <u>or made available</u> ...
Minutes 10/18/06	Pre- Amble 3.	Add: To that end, <u>except for unusual circumstances</u>
Minutes 02/07/07	Pre- Amble	Added: Faculty Responsibilities and Obligations
Minutes 5/11/07	D.II.3.	Strategic Planning Committee: Modification of composition, general charge and duties and responsibilities
Minutes 3/9/07	Apx. A	Add: Additional procedures, criteria, or standards are used by the Department Chair, the Dean of School of Professions, the Department of Professions, and the College in evaluation of faculty for re-appointment, ...
Minutes 3/9/07	Apx. F	Change : 1. Three scholarship activities ³⁸ , relevant to the Department’s area of instruction as reported in the five most recent annual reports.
Minutes 3/9/07	Apx. F	Change: 2. At least one of the three scholarship activities in 1. above must be a peer-reviewed journal publication. (Note “peer review” and “publication” are defined in Appendix A, Section III., subsection 10 of the governance Document.
Minutes 9/26/07	Apx G	Add: AQ/PQ Definition appendix
Minutes 5/21/08	Apx B	Change: search committees created by members of specialty areas forming
Minutes 9/17/08	V.2.c.ii.2	Change: Assoc Chair responsibility for training new hires regarding advisement
Minutes 9/2/09	D.II.4.	Outstanding Student Scholarship Committee changed to Coordinator position and moved to D.III.5.
Minutes 2/24/10	Apx A	Change: First year tenure track faculty’s advisement load
Minutes 9/16/10	D.III.	Deleted: Hiring, Scheduling, and Dept. Events Coordinators

³⁸ Scholarship activities must be peer-reviewed and include publications in journals, conference proceedings and abstracts, published book reviews or article summaries, published textbook chapters, chapters of scholarly books, published textbook ancillaries, and published instructional materials.

As of 7/1/11	All	Change Department to School (of Business)
Campus Wide	All	Change State University of New York - College at Brockport to College at Brockport State University of New York