

Deconstructing AACSB Standards: Participants Standard 10

“The faculty has, and maintains, intellectual qualifications and current expertise to accomplish the mission and to assure that this occurs, the school has a clearly defined process to evaluate individual faculty member’s [sic] contributions to the school’s mission.”¹

A plethora of contradictions to Participants Standard 10 have been documented at www.usmpride.com. Among these are the following contradictory instances:

1. All results of the CoB evaluation system is labeled “confidential” by CoB administrators. If an individual faculty member seeks to place his or her annual evaluation and/or merit raise in context of his or her peers, he or she is informed that any such data is “confidential.” How, then, are faculty members ever sure that the evaluation processes have been followed? These issues are explored in depth at www.usmpride.com. Summary statistics are not provided to faculty by the administration (even after direct requests), so that individuals have no clear picture of their placement in the rank ordering. The result is a system that is far from “clearly defined.”
2. Based on the examinations of merit raises from 1996 – present (housed at www.usmpride.com) indicates administrative clustering at or near the top of the rankings on a consistent basis. Since there is no “fourth category” for administration under the CoB’s evaluation system, administrators must be receiving special, unwritten consideration under the CoB evaluation system. The result is a system that is far from “clearly defined.”
3. Documented at www.usmpride.com is the fact that for the 2005 annual evaluation process (conducted Spring 2006), the SEDONA System was implemented as the “only” source of information, irrespective of the fact that no discussion of the SEDONA System appears in the CoB faculty handbook, *Enhancing Faculty Productivity*, revised Spring 2005. The process outlined in *EFP* was abandoned in favor of the unwritten, undefined process based on the SEDONA System. The result is a system that is far from “clearly defined.”
4. Documents at www.usmpride.com show that under the Dean D. Harold Doty regime, there have been non tenure track instructors (with no research requirement) who have received larger merit raises than research active tenure track faculty who teach the same (or heavier) course load and who do the same (or greater) service. Questions about these anomalies are ignored, as CoB administrators consider such matters “confidential.” The result is a system that is far from “clearly defined.”
5. During the 2005 annual evaluation process (conducted Spring 2006), Doty announced his plan to withhold 10% of the merit raise pool so that he might give “market adjustments” and “equity adjustments.” Documents at www.usmpride.com illustrate that CoB females are no more underpaid, relative to their relevant AACSB median salaries, than their male counterparts are; the result indicates that “equity adjustments” are not needed. Other documents indicate that only one faculty member is paid less than 80% of his relevant AACSB median

salary (Doty's stated measuring stick): Doty himself. Was 10% captured by Doty? If so, where did it go? These questions remain unanswered. The result is a system that is far from "clearly defined."
Of course, other issues may be identified as well.

Comment

The preponderance of the evidence presented at www.usmpride.com indicates that the CoB's evaluation system is secretive and flawed and that the system definitely does not reward the type of activities that support the CoB's stated mission. In as much as is available, all data points to clear and direct violations of AACSB Participants Standard 10.

¹ "Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation," AACSB International – The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, revised January 1, 2006, p.17.