

Deconstructing AACSB Standards: Participants Standard 11

“The school has well-documented and communicated processes in place to manage and support faculty members over the progression of their careers consistent with the school’s mission. These include:

- Determining appropriate teaching assignments, intellectual expectations, and service workloads.
- Providing staff and other mechanisms to support faculty in meeting the expectations the school holds for them on all mission-related activities.
- Providing orientation, guidance and mentoring.
- Undertaking formal periodic review, promotion, and reward processes.
- Maintaining overall plans for faculty resources.”¹

There exists a number of issues with Participants Standard 11, including

1. Determination of teaching assignments, a task undertaken by the administration, is incongruent with application of other expectations. For example, see the reports at www.usmpride.com that relate to student credit hours generated for an overview of how SCH are assigned across rank, department, and area. While some departments with relatively large faculty sizes are allowed to employ instructors, other departments are not allowed the same opportunity. Lack of instructors means more SCH taught by full-time faculty (which is good), but it also means that this additional teaching time takes the place of valuable research time. The process used to assign teaching loads is neither “well-documented” nor “communicated” appropriately to faculty.
2. Determination of intellectual expectations is governed by a spinning compass. When current Dean D. Harold Doty arrived at the College of Business (CoB), he made bold statements to certain untenured faculty, stating that (in effect) his standard for tenure was premier level publications. However, as can be discerned by a crosscheck of the merit raise documents and the research productivity documents available at www.usmpride.com, many faculty are rewarded for consistent output of low quality papers and proceedings, while other faculty are rewarded with promotions and/or other special treatment for little or no research output. The current process of identifying appropriate scholarship requirements does not follow the CoB faculty handbook, *Enhancing Faculty Productivity*, revised 2005. The process used to determine research expectations is neither “well-documented” nor “communicated” appropriately to faculty.
3. A comparison of the service assignments for all faculty from 2004-2006 (available at www.usmpride.com) shows a disconnect between service performed and reward. In fact, the series of documents that outlines Ed Nissan’s shirking of Academic Council duties and the large raise he was later rewarded illustrates this point. Also prescient to this point is the assignment of service across departments; some junior faculty in one department have heavy loads while others have no service assignments, again creating an unequal playing field with respect to research time. The process used to determine service obligations is neither “well-documented” nor “communicated” appropriately to faculty.

4. With respect to provision of staff and other mechanisms to support faculty, one only has to ask why Ed Nissan consistently receives CoB-supplied typing and editorial services while other department faculty must perform all their own clerical work or why Rod Posey has been allowed to use CoB equipment and supplies to support his roles as lay preacher and Lion's Club official while Marc DePree went a decade without USM providing him with a computer that met his research needs. Provision of staff and support services seems to be a perquisite in the CoB rather than a necessity as indicated by AACSB. The process used to provide support services is neither "well-documented" nor "communicated" appropriately to faculty.
5. The CoB has neither a sufficient college orientation for faculty nor a structured mentoring program. Mentoring is undertaken by giving senior faculty who feel a personal responsibility to help junior faculty; however, not all junior faculty receive appropriate mentoring, causing many junior faculty to leave abruptly or receive negative performance reviews, deserved or not (see the list of recent departures from the CoB, available at www.usmpride.com). The process used to provide orientation, guidance, and mentoring is neither "well-documented" nor "communicated" appropriately to faculty and, for the most part, is nonexistent.
6. As has been documented at length at www.usmpride.com, the promotion, tenure, and raise systems deviate significantly from *EFP*, and application of the tenure, promotion, and raise standards varies widely among individuals and departments. There are documents that outline special treatment for some faculty with weak vitas, while other faculty with stronger vitas receive no such special treatment. The process used to evaluate faculty for tenure, promotion, and raises is neither "well-documented" nor "communicated" appropriately to faculty.
7. Maintenance of faculty resources seems to be an *ad hoc* process. Some faculty receive vast resources while others are denied complete funding for even one conference presentation. Allocation of soft monies further exacerbates the disparity across departments and ranks. As many documents at www.usmpride.com indicate, seniority trumps fairness, and administrative position trumps all. The process used to maintain faculty resources is neither "well-documented" nor "communicated" appropriately to faculty, if it even exists.

Comment

The preponderance of the evidence presented at www.usmpride.com indicates that the CoB's system of managing its faculty suffers greatly from its secretive and flawed evaluation system that does not reward the type of activities that support the CoB's stated mission. In as much as is available, all data points to numerous clear and direct violations of AACSB Participants Standard 11.

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.