

# Accounting, Department of

## Mission-Driven Faculty

### Goal Description:

The faculty composition and characteristics will be consistent with the mission of the College of Business of Administration and the Department of Accounting.

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

### Expectations For Teaching, Research, And Service

#### Performance Objective Description:

The faculty will meet or exceed expectations in teaching, research, and service commensurate with the mission of the college and the department of accounting.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

### Effective Researcher

#### KPI Description:

In support of the College's accreditation by AACSB, International, the Department of Accounting expects sustained research output from the faculty. The department uses the Faculty Evaluation System (FES) Form 3 to document the publications and other intellectual contributions of the faculty. The percentage of effective researchers defined and measured using FES 3 will provide information about the quantity and quality of intellectual contributions provided by the department's faculty.

1. Of the academic faculty (those eligible for Scholarly Academics (SA), Practice Academics (PA), and Scholarly Practitioners (SP) designation based on the College's self-defined standard for AASCB, International accreditation purposes), ninety percent (90%) will meet or surpass the departmentally set minimum FES 3 score of 2.5.

#### Results Description:

During 2016, 77 percent (10 of 13) of all academic faculty (those eligible for SA, PA, and SP designation) in the Department of Accounting exceeded the minimum score of 2.5 for FES 3. This is below the 90 percent target. Note: These results do not include the Department Chair.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

### Maintain Expectations

#### Action Description:

The faculty in the Department of Accounting as a whole exceed the minimum standards for teaching and service, and are very close on research. Given the small size of the department, it is relatively easily for the department to slip from these standards if only one or two people failed to perform to expectations. That is what happened this year. Several faculty members did not have enough IC materials accepted during the year. We had one faculty member who started in Fall 2016. He was ABD coming in and had to complete his dissertation. Consequently, he had no publications for the year. Also, we had a faculty member that missed the end of the year due to family medical issues. This faculty member did not update her research activities, so I have counted her as not meeting the research expectations. The chair of the department will continue to review the FES forms each year. Faculty who are not performing at the expected level will be advised.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

### Effective Service Provider

#### KPI Description:

The Department of Accounting uses the Faculty Evaluation System (FES) Form 4 to document the service activites of the faculty. The percentage of effective service providers defined and measured using FES 4 will provided data concerning the service activities of the faculty.

1. Eighty percent (80%) of all Participating (as defined by AACSB, International standards) faculty in the department will meet or surpass the departmentally set minimum FES 4 score of 3.0.

#### Results Description:

During 2016, 87 percent (13 of 15) of all Participating faculty in the Department of Accounting exceeded the minimum score of 3.0 for FES 4. This exceeds the minimum criterion. Note: These results do not include the Department Chair.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

### Maintain Expectations

#### Action Description:

The faculty in the Department of Accounting as a whole exceed the minimum standards for teaching and service, and are very close on research. Given the small size of the department, it is relatively easily for the department to slip from these standards if only one or two people failed to perform to expectations. That is what happened this year. Several faculty members did not have enough IC materials accepted during the year. We had one faculty member who started in Fall 2016. He was ABD coming in and had to complete his dissertation. Consequently, he had no publications for the year. Also, we had a faculty member that missed the end of the year due to family medical issues. This faculty member did not update her research activities, so I have counted her as not meeting the research expectations. The chair of the department will continue to review the FES forms each year. Faculty who are not performing at the expected level will be advised.

#### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

##### Effective Teacher

##### KPI Description:

The department, college, and university utilizes the IDEA System as part of its evaluation of classroom performance. The IDEA System, developed by the IDEA Center at Kansas State University, is a nationally normed, validated and reliable measure of classroom performance based on up to 12 learning objectives. The IDEA scores are a major portion of the department's Faculty Evaluation System (FES) as it relates to classroom performance. The percentage of effective teachers as defined and measured using IDEA and FES will provide data as to the quality of instruction within the department of accounting.

1. Eighty percent (80%) of all faculty in the department will meet or surpass the departmentally set minimum IDEA score of 45 on the Discipline Weighted Average.
2. Eighty percent (80%) of all faculty in the department will meet or surpass the departmentally set minimum score for the average of FES 1 and 2. Consistent with the department's post-tenure review process this average score must be 2.5 or above.

##### Results Description:

##### Acceptable IDEA Score

During 2016, 88 percent (14.5 of 16.5) of all faculty in the Department of Accounting exceeded the minimum IDEA score of 45 on the Discipline Weighted Average. This exceeds the minimum criterion. Note: These results include the Department Chair.

##### Acceptable FES 1 and 2 Score

During 2016, 87 percent (13.5 of 15.5) of all faculty in the Department of Accounting exceeded the 2.5 minimum average score of FES 1 and FES 2. This exceeds the minimum criterion. Note: These results do not include the Department Chair.

#### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

##### Maintain Expectations

##### Action Description:

The faculty in the Department of Accounting as a whole exceed the minimum standards for teaching and service, and are very close on research. Given the small size of the department, it is relatively easily for the department to slip from these standards if only one or two people failed to perform to expectations. That is what happened this year. Several faculty members did not have enough IC materials accepted during the year. We had one faculty member who started in Fall 2016. He was ABD coming in and had to complete his dissertation. Consequently, he had no publications for the year. Also, we had a faculty member that missed the end of the year due to family medical issues. This faculty member did not update her research activities, so I have counted her as not meeting the research expectations. The chair of the department will continue to review the FES forms each year. Faculty who are not performing at the expected level will be advised.

#### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

##### Faculty Composition

##### Performance Objective Description:

The composition of the department's faculty will be adequate to support the mission of the department. As a department in a college accredited by AACSB, International, there are guidelines related to the percentage of Scholarly Academic (SA) faculty and by the combination Scholarly Academic (SA), Practice Academic (PA), and Scholarly Practitioner (SP) faculty. The department is committed to meeting the AACSB standards concerning faculty sustained engagement activities.

#### RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

##### Faculty Sustained Engagement Activities

##### KPI Description:

As a department in a college accredited by AACSB, International, there are guidelines related to the percentage of time devoted to mission by the combination of Scholarly Academic (SA), Practice Academic (PA), Instructional Practitioner (IP) and Scholarly Practitioner (SP) faculty as well as for the percentage of Scholarly Academic (SA) faculty alone.

1. Based on time devoted to mission, ninety percent of all faculty must be by the combination of Scholarly Academic (SA), Practice Academic (PA), Instructional Practitioner (IP), and Scholarly Practitioner (SP) faculty.
2. Based on time devoted to mission, forty percent of all faculty must be Scholarly Academic (SA) faculty.

## **Results Description:**

### **Percentage Of SA, PA, IP, And SP Faculty Based On Time Devoted To Mission**

During 2016, 88 percent (14.5 of 16.5) of all faculty in the Department of Accounting were classified as SA, PA, IP, and SP faculty. This is slightly below the stated criterion. This is one of the few areas where AACSB "mandates" a minimum-level of performance. Therefore, raising this percentage in this area is a high-priority. Note: These results include the Department Chair.

### **Percentage Of SA Faculty Based On Time Devoted To Mission**

During 2016, 67 percent (11 of 16.5) of all faculty in the Department of Accounting were classified as SA faculty. This is above the stated criterion. This is one of the few areas where AACSB "mandates" a minimum-level of performance. Therefore, maintaining this percentage in this area is a high-priority. Note: These results include the Department Chair.

## **RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3**

### **Faculty Qualifications**

#### **Action Description:**

While the SA numbers in the department exceed the minimum as required by AACSB, the combination of SA, SP, IP, and PA is slightly below the required amount. We made some progress in this area in the past few years and we had a new faculty member (who is SA qualified) start in the Fall 2016 semester. However, we had a SA faculty member resign in Summer 2016 and another SA faculty member leave in Summer 2017. The good news is that we have two (2) new SA faculty starting in Fall 2017. In addition, we will look for an additional faculty member (or perhaps two) for Fall 2018.

## **Update to Previous Cycle's Plan for Continuous Improvement**

### **Previous Cycle's Plan For Continuous Improvement (Do Not Modify) :**

For the recently completed assessment cycle, the results were mostly positive. Faculty members in the Department of Accounting have exceeded the expectations for Teaching and Service, and were very close on Research. The shortfall in Research appears to be the result of timing (submissions, acceptance, and publication). This will be monitored. We will continue to work towards improvement for the one or two faculty members in each area that are not meeting the expectations. Also, faculty members who are currently meeting the expectations will be encouraged to continue to meet those expectations and to seek to improve their performance when possible. With respect to the discipline related accrediting (AACSB, International) requirements for the faculty qualifications, the department has exceeded the requirement for Scholarly Academics (SA) faculty. However, the department is still slightly below the requirement for the combination of SA, SP, IP, and PA faculty. We have a new faculty member starting for Fall 2016 (SA qualified). In addition, we are currently seeking to add another new SA faculty member for Fall 2017. Their addition should further improve the percentages.

### **Update of Progress to the Previous Cycle's PCI:**

For the recently completed assessment cycle, the results were mostly positive. Faculty members in the Department of Accounting have exceeded the expectations for Teaching and Service, but are below expectations in Research. The shortfall in Research appears to be mostly the result of timing (submissions, acceptance, and publication). This will be monitored.

We will continue to work towards improvement for the one or two faculty members in each area that are not meeting the expectations. Also, faculty members who are currently meeting the expectations will be encouraged to continue to meet those expectations and to seek to improve their performance when possible.

With respect to the discipline related accrediting (AACSB, International) requirements for the faculty qualifications, the department has exceeded the requirement for Scholarly Academics (SA) faculty. However, the department is still slightly below the requirement for the combination of SA, SP, IP, and PA faculty. While we had a new SA faculty member start in Fall 2016, we had an unexpected resignation of a SA faculty member in Summer 2016. Consequently, our numbers for 2016 are very similar to 2015.

We are adding two new SA faculty members for Fall 2017. Their addition should further improve the percentages.

## **Plan for Continuous Improvement**

### **Closing Summary:**

For the recently completed assessment cycle, the results were mostly positive. Faculty members in the Department of Accounting have exceeded the expectations for Teaching and Service, but are below expectations in Research. The shortfall in Research appears to be mostly the result of timing (submissions, acceptance, and publication). This will be monitored. We will continue to work towards improvement for the one or two faculty members in each area that are not meeting the expectations. Also, faculty members who are currently meeting the expectations will be encouraged to continue to meet those expectations and to seek to improve their performance when possible. With respect to the discipline related accrediting (AACSB, International) requirements for the faculty qualifications, the department has exceeded the requirement for Scholarly Academics (SA) faculty. However, the department is still slightly below the requirement for the combination of SA, SP, IP, and PA faculty. While we had a new SA faculty member start in Fall 2016, we had an unexpected resignation of a SA faculty member in Summer 2016. Consequently, our numbers for 2016 are very similar to 2015. We are adding two new SA faculty members for Fall 2017. Their addition should further improve the percentages.