

Special Report

George Carter's "Literature Presence"

An Investigation into *Ad Hoc* Policies & Procedures in the CoB

A previous post at usmpride.com, entitled "On the Folly of Believing that the Merit Raise Process is Clean," pointed out that economics and finance faculty were informing others that their chair, George Carter (Professor of Economics), had inserted a number of controversial items into their annual faculty evaluation form. At the center of these allegations is the so-called "Literature Presence" category," a line-item Carter is reportedly using, on a case-by-case basis, to assess the "name recognition" (or lack thereof) of EcoFinIB faculty in their respective fields. As usmpride.com readers now know, a copy of that evaluation form has since surfaced, validating the claim in "On the Folly of . . .". This report examines in more detail the use of this new category in EcoFinIB.

Once Again Down the *Ad Hoc* Road?

First and foremost among the potential problems with Carter's action in this case comes with what we are told is Carter's admission that he added the "Literature Presence" category on his own initiative. We can report having verified that the measurement is not explained in any way in the revised *Enhancing Faculty Productivity* handbook, nor is the term used in any formal way in other CoB guidelines or documents. We can also report that not a single faculty vote of any kind, departmental (EFIB) or college-wide, has occurred (to date) that authorizes Dean Doty or any of the departmental chairs to use this "new" category in procedures related to the merit raise process.

Aside from a number of potential procedural violations that may have occurred through the addition/use of the new "Literature Presence" appraisal category, this report also examines Carter's credentials with regard to making categorical determinations related to "literature presence" of various CoB faculty.

A Brief Look at Carter's Record

Under normal circumstances, an evaluator's credentials might not be scrutinized as heavily as is done below in this report. There are a number of cases in academia wherein evaluators perform effectively with a credentials package that is exceeded by those of the individuals who are being evaluated. However, the fact that Carter initiated use of the "Literature Presence" category — a category that is noticeably absent from official CoB documents, and one that was possibly not applied evenly throughout the CoB during the 2006 evaluation period — invites a significantly higher level of scrutiny than might otherwise occur.

A recent literature search (online) revealed that Carter's highest ranking publication (in terms of journal outlet quality) falls below the highest ranking publication of each of the

other eight senior professors in EcoFinIB. Other information posted to usmpride.com offers additional light on this issue, as Exhibit 1 below indicates.

Exhibit 1

	<u>GSC/YSTD</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Total GSC</u>	<u>Rank</u>
George H. Carter	0.414	31	12	25
Trellis G. Green	0.409	32	9	28
William D. Gunther	0.486	30	18	17
Ernest W. King	5.000	11	115	7
Mark A. Klinedinst	2.737	14	52	9
Franklin G. Mixon, Jr.	13.857	2	194	3
Edward Nissan	0.789	23	30	13
James T. Lindley	9.241	3	268	2
W. Charles Sawyer	5.217	10	120	5

Exhibit 1 above presents figures from the two Google Scholar Citations studies available at usmpride.com. As the exhibit indicates, Carter is in the penultimate position among the nine EFIB senior faculty using either “Google Scholar Cites/Years Since Terminal Degree” or “Total Google Scholar Cites.” Carter’s numbers place him in 31st and 25th position, respectively, among all CoB faculty represented in the original tables. What is not shown in Exhibit 1 above, but can be seen in other exhibits at usmpride.com, is that a large portion of EcoFinIB’s junior faculty place better than 31st in the “GSC/YSTD” category that is partially reproduced in Exhibit 1 above.

The investigation that is detailed in this report raises a number of concerns for faculty members in the CoB. Some of those concerns are certain to be the focus of future analyses at usmpride.com. In the interim, it would seem prudent to begin to consider some of the other details mentioned in “On the Folly of . . .”.