

1-2-2017

## Engagement, Innovation, and Impact: Tracking Faculty Activities Under the 2013 AACSB Standards

Amy Foshee Holmes  
*Trinity University*

Michael Wilkins  
*Trinity University*

Shage Zhang  
*Trinity University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/omj>



Part of the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#), and the [Organizational Communication Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Holmes, Amy Foshee; Wilkins, Michael; and Zhang, Shage (2017) "Engagement, Innovation, and Impact: Tracking Faculty Activities Under the 2013 AACSB Standards," *Organization Management Journal*: Vol. 14: Iss. 1, Article 4.

Available at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/omj/vol14/iss1/4>

## Engagement, Innovation, and Impact: Tracking Faculty Activities Under the 2013 AACSB Standards

Amy Foshee Holmes<sup>a</sup>, Michael Wilkins<sup>a</sup>, and Shage Zhang<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Accounting, Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas; <sup>b</sup>Department of Finance and Decision Sciences, Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas

### ABSTRACT

This article describes the process one university followed to develop an efficient way of collecting information related to faculty engagement, innovation, and impact. The purpose of the document (i.e., the tracking record) is to facilitate the production of effective Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) Self-Evaluation Reports and Continuous Improvement Review Reports. The experiences recorded and the sample tracking record provided will be of use to accreditation directors, associate deans, and deans across a wide range of universities as they prepare for initial accreditation or maintenance of accreditation under the 2013 AACSB Standards.

### KEYWORDS

AACSB accreditation; measuring impact; faculty motivation; faculty performance evaluation

The 2013 Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) Standards emphasize continuous quality improvement in business education across three primary dimensions: engagement, innovation, and impact. Broadly speaking, the concept of engagement refers to the existence and productive intersection of academic and professional engagement. Innovation is tied to the pursuit of continuous improvement in business education via strategic experimentation and entrepreneurial pursuits. Finally, impact encompasses the various outcomes typically associated with high-quality business education and research, as well as addressing the extent to which business schools “make a difference” in business, society, and the global community of business schools and educators (AACSB, 2016).

For business schools to present self-evaluation reports (SERs) and continuous improvement review reports (CIRRs) that effectively demonstrate the ways in which they are addressing issues related to engagement, innovation, and impact, directors of accreditation, associate deans, and deans must have a way of reliably gathering such information. While presentations, panel sessions, and informal discussions at AACSB conferences during the past few years have addressed the engagement, innovation, and impact activities themselves, an important issue that has not received as much attention relates to the manner in which faculty information related to these activities can be efficiently collected and utilized by parties

primarily responsible for managing the accreditation process. The purpose of this article is to present and explain a documentation process that was developed to collect this important data in a more efficient manner.

Given that all business schools must now file for initial accreditation or reaccreditation under the 2013 AACSB Standards, most schools are likely to have (and certainly should have) identified how their faculty and programs contribute in these three areas. The 2013 AACSB Standards note that all contributions and activities should be mission driven and that different types of business schools will conduct themselves in different ways. Schools with PhD programs and executive education programs will have missions that are different from schools that only have bachelor’s and master’s degree programs, and both of these types of schools are likely to have missions that are different from schools that only have bachelor’s degree programs. While different types of schools will vary with respect to the activities they view as being valuable indicators of engagement, innovation, and impact, all AACSB-accredited business schools must identify the activities they view as being important in these areas and must also establish a mechanism for capturing the information that facilitates the production of effective reports. This article should be of considerable use to business schools of all sizes and structures as they prepare for their upcoming peer review team (PRT) visits under the 2013 AACSB Standards.

## Literature review

This article contributes to existing research related to best practices in accreditation management. One prominent example of work in this area is Muuka and Ezumah (2013), which presents a practical assessment of learning (AoL) roadmap (in the spirit of Gardiner, Corbitt, & Adams, 2010) that is based on the traditional view that the purpose of assessment should be continuous improvement in learning and achievement (Palomba & Banta, 1999). Muuka and Ezumah (2013) initially describe how a vision and mission statement was used to establish appropriate learning goals. A 10-point checklist was subsequently developed to evaluate the efficacy of the assessment process and a discussion of the specific course and program-level improvements was provided as an example to demonstrate the loop-closing activities which are necessary to show continuous improvement. Finally, a flowchart representation of the complete AoL process was also provided. Muuka and Ezumah (2013) is an extremely valuable resource for any school interested in improving its AoL system, particularly schools that are pursuing initial AACSB accreditation.

Historically, most business schools have simply “counted” peer-reviewed journal articles (with perhaps an emphasis on journal quality) for purposes of both promotion and AACSB faculty qualification status. However, the demands on faculty are increasingly varied and continuing to embrace such a narrow focus would not seem to be advisable.

Ideally, the evaluation system used in schools to assess faculty performance would change to reflect the fact that research productivity is impeded by increased demands associated with teaching and other school-related needs . . . If citations are the only way we choose to measure ourselves, we are stabbing ourselves in the foot. (Shinn, 2014)

To aid business schools in their evaluation of one component of impact, Van Slyke, Yordy, and Wright (2015) describe how a school changed its view of faculty scholarship under the 2013 AACSB Standards. First, the school’s research group (in conjunction with other faculty members) broadened the definition of “quality” to recognize the fact that mission-consistent scholarship may be impactful in different ways both within and across business disciplines. Second, the school put in place a set of incentives and rewards aimed at encouraging faculty to target scholarship with high impact. Third, the school began basing faculty evaluations, in part, on AACSB considerations such as scholarship impact and faculty qualifications and engagement (Standard 15). In addition, faculty have been asked to construct narratives that describe

the specific impact of their intellectual contributions. The authors indicate that this process allows faculty to demonstrate how their work is contributing to the mission of the school and also enables them to prepare higher quality promotion and tenure packets.

The Van Slyke et al. (2015) research is an important step in terms of refining business school approaches to the concept of impact. However, the authors only discuss the revised treatment of intellectual contributions, which is a subset of overall impact. They also do not address issues related to engagement and innovation, which ultimately are the determinants of impact. To provide an example of a comprehensive solution, this article describes the process used by one business school to establish general guidelines and provide for the systematic documentation of activities across the 2013 AACSB Standards’ three pillars: engagement, innovation, and impact. A detailed example of the tracking record that faculty members use to document their activities across the 5-year CIR period is also provided.

## Implementation process

During the spring 2014 semester, the director of accreditation (DA) conducted a 90-minute AACSB workshop to communicate to all faculty the primary differences between the 2003 and the 2013 AACSB Standards. The DA then assembled a committee, comprised of both senior and junior faculty, to spearhead the transition to the new standards. Committee members were charged with submitting examples of engagement, innovation, and impact that were deemed appropriate to the school’s mission. Committee members also provided input for the school’s new faculty qualifications and engagement (Standard 15) criteria. The DA gathered and assimilated the information and distributed a comprehensive set of criteria for further review by all committee members.

After additional refinements had been made, the DA developed the first draft of a document that would be used by individual faculty to maintain a cumulative record of their efforts related to engagement, innovation, and impact. The DA presented this document to the committee members, incorporated additional suggestions and edits as appropriate, and developed a revised version that was circulated to all faculty members for further feedback. The final round of edits was very minor and resulted in a formal AACSB tracking record that was approved unanimously by school faculty. Individual faculty members completed this document for the first time during the summer of 2014.

## The tracking record

### **Section 1—Teaching effectiveness (standard 12)**

The tracking record presented (see [Appendix](#)) covers the three pillars of engagement, innovation, and impact, while also addressing related issues that are important for accreditation management. For example, a portion of AACSB Standard 12—Teaching Effectiveness requires documentation of innovative and effective practices that are employed by teaching faculty. Section 1 of the tracking record provides faculty members with an opportunity to highlight important teaching contributions. Evidence of teaching effectiveness includes items such as comments from peer classroom evaluations, outstanding performance by students on standardized exams (e.g., CPA, CFA, Lean Bronze Certification), participation in teaching workshops, and high teaching evaluations in the presence of appropriate rigor. The tracking record adopts a free-form approach that allows faculty members to expand on issues that they feel to be particularly indicative of teaching effectiveness. Again, the primary goal of the tracking record is to provide department chairs and the DA with a number of rich, detailed examples that can be used to efficiently construct a comprehensive narrative for the CIRR.

### **Section 2—Student academic and professional engagement (Standard 13)**

Section 2 addresses issues related to Standard 13 by providing faculty members with a place to easily record evidence that their courses facilitate student professional and academic engagement. This section is limited to documentation of faculty activities that are student related (Standard 13). Engagement activities related to scholarship (Standard 15) or other professional involvement are documented elsewhere in the tracking record, as are activities that have teaching-related impact without specific student engagement (e.g., publication of textbooks, cases, instructional software, receipt of grants or teaching awards). As with all sections, the document provides a sample list of activities and maintains a free-form emphasis to allow faculty members to provide as much detail as they would like. Examples of student professional and academic engagement activities that are noted in Section 2 include, but are not limited to, utilization of business professionals in the classroom, involvement with internship programs and consulting projects, and involvement with study-abroad experiences.

### **Section 3—Faculty qualifications and engagement (Standard 15)**

Section 3 relates to Standard 15—Faculty Qualifications and Engagement. In this section, faculty list their

intellectual contributions and other activities that relate to academic and/or professional engagement. A table is provided for peer-reviewed journal article details for faculty members who are engaged in research, and an additional area is provided for a bullet point listing of the other scholarly and professional activities that feed into the school's Standard 15 qualification criteria. The tracking record includes an appendix with detailed explanations of the criteria for Scholarly Academics (SA), Practice Academics (PA), Scholarly Practitioners (SP), and Instructional Practitioners (IP) (not included in [Appendix](#)) so faculty members are able to easily determine which items should be included in this section of the document. As with Section 2, this section collects lists of academic and professional engagement activities, with little specific emphasis on impact. For example, journal articles are listed but discussions related to the impact of these intellectual contributions (e.g., citations, download counts, research grants, use of papers in PhD seminars at other universities) are deferred to a later section, Section 5. Activities such as journal editorships, editorial board memberships, and conference presentations are listed in both areas because these items “count” toward the intellectual contribution requirement under Standard 15; however, elaboration is not included in Section 3. For example, a faculty member with three conference presentations would list these presentations in Section 3 to ensure their inclusion as part of the Standard 15 qualification requirements but could discuss specifics related to the quality of the conferences in the subsequent section related to academic impact.

### **Section 4—Innovation**

Section 4 covers issues related to innovation. As with engagement, innovation may take many forms (e.g., teaching, alumni development, research) that influence scholarship, software or other innovations that influence practice, and so on. However, because there is not a specific AACSB Standard related to innovation, all activities related to innovation are captured in a single section. For example, innovations that include development of new courses, new degree programs, and/or curricular initiatives certainly would be expected to have a positive influence on teaching effectiveness and impact.

### **Section 5—Impact: Academic**

The final four sections all relate to impact, with separate pages encompassing academic (i.e., research), professional, teaching, and other impact. For Impact—Academic (Section 5), faculty are reminded that this section should not simply be a cut-and-paste from their curricula vitae or from Section 3. Rather, faculty should discuss the specific

indicators of impact as related to the activities listed in Section 3—for example, citation counts, downloads, and views for research papers; journal quality for editorial board memberships and ad hoc reviews; conference quality for presentations; and so on. Faculty are also encouraged to use this section to highlight important indicators of impact beyond the 5-year CIR period, consistent with Table 2-1 in the 2013 Standards.

### **Section 6—Impact: Practice**

Section 6 provides an opportunity for faculty to report activities that show evidence of impact related to practice. This section is particularly useful for faculty classified as PA, SP, or IP to demonstrate their contribution to the school's mission through involvement in practice. Examples include such things as media citations, consulting projects, practitioner publications, participation in policy or practitioner panels, and board of director membership.

### **Section 7—Impact: Teaching**

Impact related to teaching (Section 7) is distinguished from Teaching Effectiveness (Section 1) in that impact should demonstrate a contribution to the broader academic community rather than an individual classroom or course. Examples include, but are not limited to, case studies, textbooks, student mentorship, teaching awards, use of materials at other universities, or involvement with study-abroad programs.

### **Section 8—Impact: Other**

Section 8 (Impact: Other) is particularly important as it allows faculty to discuss their individual contributions and also elaborate on other contributions that demonstrate impact. Capturing data related to departments, the school, student groups, or external stakeholders, for example, enhances the CIR by ensuring to the greatest extent possible that all activities that “make a difference” ultimately will be documented. Where individual contributions are concerned, this final section serves as a catch-all for any activities that do not cleanly fit within previous sections. For example, leadership positions and service on key committees obviously are forms of engagement, but these activities would not be included in the sections covering Standard 13 or Standard 15 because they do not have to do with student or scholarship-based engagement, respectively. Again, the overriding goal across all of these sections is to facilitate the efficient production of a high-quality SER or CIR narrative.

## **Effectiveness**

During the first year that the school began documenting activities, all but three faculty members submitted their tracking records. In the second year, the school required faculty to update their tracking records as part of the annual review process. As such, compliance at this point was both encouraged and required. Once the tracking records were submitted, the DA made a broad assessment of each faculty member's engagement, innovation, and impact during the CIR period to date and also noted whether each person met the school's standard for faculty qualification (SA/PA/SP/IP) for the current 5-year review period. This information was forwarded to the department chairs and the dean (and ultimately the vice-president for academic affairs), who were then able to include AACSB-related performance evaluations as part of the annual merit review process. Having faculty activities framed within the context of the AACSB standards provides a very useful structure for these parties, whose roles are critical in parsing out the rewards associated with performance evaluation.

The results of a faculty survey used to collect perceptions of general AACSB and tracking record-related issues were distributed via e-mail to the 19 full-time faculty members who had completed the tracking record at least once (see Table 1). Eighteen responses were anonymously collected. The first three survey questions gauged perceptions of the university administration's view of the importance of AACSB accreditation and the extent to which the tracking record has increased faculty awareness of the AACSB's emphasis on engagement, innovation, and impact (see panel A in Table 1). The mean response for the university administration's view regarding the importance of AACSB accreditation was 1.44, which lies between “extremely important” and “very important.” The mean response for faculty familiarity with the 2013 AACSB Standards prior to completing the tracking record for the first time was 3.44, which lies between “moderately familiar” and “slightly familiar.” However, eight of the 18 respondents said that they were “not familiar at all” with the AACSB Standards before completing the tracking record. Completing the tracking record increased the awareness of the AACSB Standards by an average of 1.94, which ranks between “a lot” and “a great deal.” Half of the faculty members scored this question at the top end of the range. Overall, the data suggest that requiring faculty members to document their activities in terms of engagement, innovation, and impact does have a positive impact on faculty understanding of the 2013 Standards.

The survey also included nine questions that relate to various aspects of the tracking record itself (see panel B in Table 1). All responses range from *strongly agree* (1) to *strongly disagree* (7). The scores indicate that the tracking

**Table 1.** Faculty responses to AACSB tracking record survey.

Panel A Question	Average response
How important do you believe AACSB accreditation is to the university administration? (1 = <i>extremely important</i> ; 5 = <i>not at all important</i> )	1.44
How familiar were you with the AACSB's emphasis on engagement, innovation, and impact before completing your AACSB Tracking Record for the first time? (1 = <i>extremely familiar</i> ; 5 = <i>not at all familiar</i> )	3.44
To what extent has completing the AACSB Tracking Record each year increased your awareness of the AACSB's emphasis on engagement, innovation, and impact? (1 = <i>a great deal</i> ; 5 = <i>none at all</i> )	1.94
Panel B The AACSB Tracking Record ... (1 = <i>strongly agree</i> , 7 = <i>strongly disagree</i> )	Average response
Provides a well-defined structure for documenting my contribution to the school's mission with respect to teaching, research, and service	1.72
Helps me better understand my contribution to the school's mission	1.94
Requires too much of my time for the benefit it provides to the school	5.06
Provides useful information for my Chair, the Dean, and the VPAA regarding my contribution to the school's mission	2.00
Creates anxiety if I believe my contribution to the school's mission in a particular area is low	4.83
Encourages me to think about ways I can increase my contribution to the school's mission	2.28
Helps me substantiate my case for merit reviews, tenure, and/or promotion	2.50
Decreases my motivation to contribute to the school's mission	5.94
Helps me better understand what the AACSB is trying to accomplish through the accreditation process	2.50

record provides a well-defined structure (1.72), helps faculty members better understand their contribution to the school's mission (1.94), provides useful information to administrators regarding faculty contributions (2.00), encourages faculty members to think about ways they can increase their contribution to the school's mission (2.28), and helps faculty members substantiate their case for merit evaluation and promotion (2.50). Faculty members also believe that the tracking record helps them to better understand what AACSB is trying to accomplish through the accreditation process (2.50). Most faculty members do not believe that the tracking record requires too much of their time for the benefit it provides to the school (5.06). In a separate question, 10 said that updating the document takes less than 2 hours, seven said that updating the document takes between 2 and 5 hours, and one said that updating the document takes between 6 and 10 hours. Faculty members also said that completing the tracking record doesn't create anxiety if they believe they are not contributing in certain areas (4.83), nor does it decrease their motivation to contribute to the school's mission (5.94). Overall, faculty seem to view the tracking record as being valuable across a number of important dimensions.

### Implementation challenges

There may be a number of challenges in implementing the tracking record, including faculty completion of the tracking record, faculty contribution distribution across activities, and integration into a faculty database management system.

One concern raised is that not all faculty members are interested in AACSB-related issues and not all faculty

members would be expected to voluntarily comply with a request to complete a document highlighting their activities. The tracking record is an opportunity for faculty members to document how they contribute to the school's mission. Although there are exceptions, most faculty members seem to appreciate the opportunity to write about their activities and accomplishments, and are encouraged by seeing exactly how much most of their colleagues are doing to improve business education at the school. Furthermore, when faculty members see that their many activities do, in fact, contribute substantially on the dimensions of engagement, innovation, and impact (as well as teaching effectiveness), many of them appear to view AACSB issues less as merely box-checking exercises and more as genuine attempts to provide business education that is continuously improving.

Another important point concerns the distribution of faculty contributions across activities. It is vital for department chairs, directors of accreditation, associate deans, and/or deans to collect this data in a positive fashion. It should be made very clear to faculty that all contributions to the school's mission are valuable and that not all individuals are likely to contribute in every area. Individuals classified as PA or SP, for example, will not have as many entries in the Impact—Academic section as those classified as SA, while individuals classified as SA are likely to have fewer entries in the Impact—Practice section than those classified as PA, SP, and IP. The tracking record's purpose is to highlight the many positive contributions faculty make and to streamline the reporting process.

Finally, many universities use faculty database management systems (e.g., Sedona or Digital Measures) to

collect accreditation data. Although some universities may have expanded the use of the faculty database management system to capture the broad range of data described in this article, it is more likely that most universities use these systems primarily to track data related to faculty sufficiency and qualification, intellectual contributions, and other scholarly activities (i.e., a small subset of the data gathered across Sections 1 through 8 of the tracking record). Universities *without* access to the faculty database management systems would find the concept of a comprehensive tracking record extremely useful. However, universities that do use faculty database management systems will also benefit from the experiences described in this paper, as they think about developing custom reports to collect critical data related to engagement, innovation, and impact.

### Implementation suggestions

A five-point strategy to encourage compliance with the AoL process and achieve program success, including top-level support, a faculty champion, continuous development, a well-defined structure, and continuous communication (DeMoranville, 2010), can assist with successful implementation of the tracking record. Although the context differs slightly, these factors can be equally important to develop and maintain positive faculty attitudes about documenting their activities with the tracking record. First, support from the top in discussions of AACSB accreditation at faculty meetings and workshops can provide encouragement and support of faculty activities. Second, the DA should champion the process and involve a core group of faculty in the initial development of the tracking record. The tracking record itself has a well-defined structure and also contributes to a well-defined structure of faculty evaluation. Finally, faculty members should be reminded frequently about the importance of documenting their activities.

Motivating faculty members to complete the tracking record might follow Purinton and Alexander (2013)'s recommendations for motivating faculty involvement in program assessment. The items most applicable for motivating faculty members to complete the tracking record include (a) reward participation; (b) convince faculty members that they can succeed; (c) show them how to do it; (d) be supportive in the face of tedious tasks; (e) enhance understanding of the values and processes; and (f) institutionalize the process within the organization. Once the tracking record itself becomes an institutionalized process, a school will have been successful in motivating faculty to complete the tracking record.

### Conclusion

This article outlines one university's experience in developing and implementing an approach to the task of tracking faculty activities in accordance with the 2013 AACSB Standards. The AACSB tracking record used to gather information related to engagement, innovation, and impact facilitates the efficient production of high-quality accreditation reports and provides a structure for directors of accreditation, associate deans, and deans to evaluate faculty contributions on AACSB-related issues.

### About the authors

**Amy Foshee Holmes** holds a PhD in Accounting from the University of Texas at Arlington and is currently an Assistant Professor of Accounting in the School of Business at Trinity University. Her research interests include financial reporting, governmental, and managerial accounting issues. She can be reached at [aholmes3@trinity.edu](mailto:aholmes3@trinity.edu).

**Michael Wilkins** is the Jesse H. Jones Professor, Chair of Accounting, and Director of Accreditation at Trinity University. His research typically addresses issues related to auditing and capital markets. He can be reached at [mike.wilkins@trinity.edu](mailto:mike.wilkins@trinity.edu).

**Shage Zhang** holds a PhD degree in Finance. She is currently an Assistant Professor in the School of Business, Department of Finance and Decision Sciences at Trinity University. Dr. Zhang's research interests include corporate finance, corporate governance, and international finance. She can be reached at [szhang@trinity.edu](mailto:szhang@trinity.edu).

### References

- Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business. (2016). *2013 Business standards (2016 Update)*. Retrieved from <http://www.aacsb.edu/~media/AACSB/Docs/Accreditation/Standards/2013-bus-standards-update-tracked-changed.ashx>
- DeMoranville, C. W. (2010, March/April). Making sense of assessment. *BizEd Magazine*, pp. 22–38. Retrieved from <http://www.e-digitaleditions.com/i/56065-marchapril2010>
- Gardiner, L. R., Corbitt, G., & Adams, S. J. (2010). Program assessment: Getting to a practical how-to model. *Journal of Education for Business*, 85(3), 139–144. doi:10.1080/08832320903258576
- Muuka, G. N., & Ezumah, B. A. (2013). AACSB accreditation: Towards assurance of learning best practices for the 5th year maintenance report. *Academy of Business Research Journal*, III, 92–108.
- Palomba, C. A., & Banta, T. W. (1999). *Assessment essentials: Planning, implementing, and improving assessment in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Purinton, E. F., & Alexander, E. R. (2013). Obtaining faculty motivation and “buy in” to a major program change: A case study in assessment. *Business Education Innovation Journal*, 5(1), 53–57.

- Shinn, S. (2014, September/October). Measuring faculty impact. *BizEd Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.bizedmagazine.com/archives/2014/5/features/measuring-faculty-impact>
- Van Slyke, C., Yordy, E., & Wright, S. (2015, November/December). Solving for X: Preparing for impact. *BizEd Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.bizedmagazine.com/archives/2015/6/features/solving-for-x-preparing-for-impact>

## Appendix

AACSB tracking record: Teaching effectiveness, student engagement, faculty qualifications, innovation, impact, and engagement

Name	Time period
John Doe	Fall 2012 through Fall 2016

\*\*This document will provide a cumulative record of all relevant AACSB involvement between Fall 2012 and Spring 2017. It should be updated and submitted along with annual review materials in January of each year.

## Section 1

### Standard 12—Teaching effectiveness

In this section, please provide evidence of teaching effectiveness.

#### Examples of Teaching Effectiveness

- Comments from voluntary peer classroom evaluations
- Outstanding performance by students on standardized exams (e.g., CPA, CFA)
- Activities and outcomes consistent with learning goals
- Course innovations with notable outcomes
- Evidence that courses and teaching methods are innovative/dynamic/current
- Participation in teaching workshops
- Other teaching-oriented developmental activities
- High teaching evaluations in the presence of appropriate course rigor (NOTE: providing information regarding teaching evaluations on this form is optional; it may be assessed independently by your department chair)

### A. Student standardized exam performance/course innovations

The section of the CPA exam that is most applicable to my area of teaching in the Master's program is FAR. I have organized the Accounting Theory course so that it is at least partially aimed at preparing students for this

section of the CPA exam. Over the past three years, our graduates' FAR pass rate has increased by ten percentage points over the historical average. As such, the approach seems to be working.

### B. CPA Exam content mapping

During 2012–2013, the ACCT Department undertook a CPA exam content-mapping exercise to ensure that all exam topics are being covered across the curriculum. The mapping project increased the effectiveness of the Accounting Theory course with respect to CPA material coverage. Given that Graduate Learning Goal #1 is directly related to CPA exam performance, I believe this was a very useful exercise. The content mapping program is ongoing, with updates as necessary.

### C. Innovative/dynamic/current course content

When I taught Introduction to Financial Accounting, I included continuing discussions related to information asymmetry (i.e., why accounting/auditors are important), corporate governance, agency theory, earnings management (e.g., inventory manipulations, cookie-jar reserves), ethics, financial statement analysis, basic ideas related to equity valuation, and a number of in-the-news items that invariably surfaced throughout the semester (e.g., fraud, initial public offerings, insider trading, etc.). I typically received far more questions in these areas than on standard accounting issues. I believe that these dynamic discussions keep students more interested than they otherwise would be and also add a lot of real-world business value to the course.

### D. Learning goal assessments

Students in my graduate courses have been assessed annually during the report period and have exceeded the relevant learning goal standards in all instances. Students in my undergraduate course were assessed in spring 2015 (critical thinking and writing) and performance exceeded the standard.

### E. Course Rigor/numerical student ratings

#### Undergraduate:

Six sections of Intro Financial Accounting between fall 2012 and spring 2015

Average Course GPA—list specifics

Average Median Student Rating (Question 2.8, “effective teacher”)—list specifics

Average Mean Student Rating (Question 2.8, “effective teacher”)—list specifics

On average, 60% of students have rated the course difficulty as “substantial” or “extreme.”

Graduate:

Four sections of Graduate Business Ethics between Fall 2012 and Fall 2015

Three sections of Graduate Accounting Theory between Fall 2012 and Fall 2015

Average Course GPA—list specifics

Average Median Student Rating (Question 2.8, “effective teacher”)—list specifics

Average Mean Student Rating (Question 2.8, “effective teacher”)—list specifics

For the ethics class, 15% of students have rated the course difficulty as “substantial” or “extreme.” Given the nature of the ethics class, this number is not surprising.

For the theory class, 82% of students have rated the course difficulty as “substantial” or “extreme.”

**F. Workshops and teaching development activities**

I co-led a teaching workshop during 2014 as part of the School of Business’ Teaching Workshop series.

**Section 2**

**Standard 13—Student academic and professional engagement**

In this section, please provide evidence that your courses facilitate student academic and professional engagement. There may be overlap here with your sections related to innovations and/or impact. Please think seriously about this area and list the specifics associated with each item. For example, if you had three guest lecturers during the time period covered by this form, list the associated course numbers (and semesters), the names and affiliations of the guest lecturers, and the nature of their presentations.

**Examples of Student Academic and Professional Engagement**

- Utilization of business professionals in the classroom (e.g., guest lecturers)
- Involvement with student internship programs
- Sponsorship of student consulting projects
- Involvement with School of Business study-abroad experiences
- Interaction with companies that employ our graduates
- Engagement with campus organizations in a professional setting

**A. Use of business professionals in class**

Date	Circumstance
11/30/ 2016	Executives in charge of Corporate Social Responsibility or Sustainability Reporting at three companies conducted a session in my undergraduate class.
10/10/ 2016	I initiated a seven-person Accounting Careers panel where prominent alumni discussed the value of their Accounting degree across a variety of different professional careers. Engagement was strong, with over 100 students in attendance.
11/23/ 2015	A Big 4 partner gave a presentation in my graduate Ethics course.
3/25/ 2015	A prominent corporate ethics team presented at our annual ethics symposium.
11/24/ 2014	A Big 4 partner gave a presentation in my graduate Ethics course.
9/26/ 2013	A prominent accountant associated with fraud spoke to 100+ ACCT and FNCE students on the topic of business ethics.
10/17/ 2012	A prominent accountant associated with fraud discussed fraud and business ethics in my graduate ethics class
10/22/ 2012	A Big 4 partner gave a presentation in my graduate Ethics course.

**C. Interaction with companies that employ our graduates**

Across the report period, I have taken part in dozens of executive meetings, business lunches, and mixers with the public accounting firms that hire our graduates. I also have met with recruiters and executives from many prominent corporations.

When I took over as chair in 2015, I began the process of significantly increasing alumni relationship efforts. Insert details as necessary.

**Section 3**

**Standard 15—Faculty qualifications and engagement**

In this section, please list your activities related to academic and/or professional engagement. For peer-reviewed journal publications, provide the name of the article, the name and issue number of the journal, and relevant indicators of journal quality (e.g., the rating from the ABDC survey in Harzing 2014, other journal quality metrics, journal acceptance rates, etc.).

For our current Standard 15 guidance, including the list of acceptable “Other Activities,” please refer to the **Proposed Faculty Qualification Criteria** located at the end of this document.

**A. Initial Academic Preparation**

Insert highest degree obtained

**B. Ongoing/Sustained Scholarly Engagement**

*Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles (Fall 2012–Present)*

*Other Activities (Fall 2012–Present)*

Name of Article	Journal (issue)	ABDC ranking or acceptance rate
Insert article names	<i>Insert Journal details</i>	Insert rankings and acceptance rates

Insert editorial board memberships, presentations, reviews, and other examples of activities that are included in Standard 15 faculty qualification criteria.

## Section 4

### *Innovation*

In this section, please provide evidence of innovation. There may well be overlap here with items cited in one or more of your “impact” sections.

#### **Examples of Innovation**

- Development of new courses
- Development of majors and minors
- Significant changes to existing courses
- Innovative course content or content delivery
- Involvement with curricular initiatives
- Innovations related to scholarship, professional activities, or alumni engagement.
- Other

#### *A. Development of new courses*

Graduate Ethics—Fall 2012

My approach uses a well-regarded Accounting Ethics text for students’ primary readings but also incorporates numerous outside articles, a comprehensive Oxford University DVD series that provides an excellent overview of the major ethical theories and theorists, and a dozen or so short videos dealing with high profile ethical business failures (e.g., Enron, Galleon, ZZZZ Best, HealthSouth, Bernie Madoff, etc.). In addition to discussing these issues on a daily basis, students are required to make individual 30-minute current ethical events presentations and complete 2–3 business case analyses dealing with things like fraud, insider trading, Ponzi schemes, and earnings management.

Graduate Accounting Theory—Spring 2013

Accounting Theory is taught in dozens of ways in graduate programs across the country. Some faculty choose to make it very FASB-intensive, others tie it more closely to research, while others use it to cover things that interest them. I have chosen to structure the course as a mix of

theory and associated application. The first third of the course focuses on seminal readings in economics and capital markets that are used to frame the importance of accounting and, more specifically, accounting information. Following this development, we talk about a number of financial accounting issues, discuss how the accounting treatment of these issues has varied over time, and work through applied exercises that emphasize current accounting treatments. The feedback I receive from graduates is that the course is useful for them as they prepare for the CPA exam. The evidence supports this idea (see section related to Teaching Effectiveness).

#### *B. Alumni engagement*

Insert details as appropriate.

#### *C. Innovative course content*

The standard approach to teaching Introductory Financial Accounting for most faculty members at most universities is very cookbook-ish—standard material, endless journal entries, very little in the way of insights or real-world application. While I do a fair amount of nuts and bolts work when I teach this class, I supplement this material with continuing discussions related to information asymmetry (i.e., why accounting/auditors are important), corporate governance, agency theory, earnings management (e.g., inventory manipulations, cookie-jar reserves), ethics, financial statement analysis, basic ideas related to equity valuation, and a number of in-the-news items that invariably surface throughout the semester (e.g., fraud, initial public offerings, insider trading, etc.). I get far more questions in these areas than on standard accounting issues. I believe that dynamic discussions such as these keep students more interested than they otherwise would be and also add a lot of real-world business value to the course.

#### *D. Workshop series*

In 2014 I initiated our AACSB, teaching, and research workshop series. We have one AACSB workshop and one teaching workshop each academic year and one research workshop each month. Faculty who attend the workshops have found that they add considerable value.

## Section 5

### *Impact: Academic*

Please provide evidence of academic impact. Please list activities and provide details related to each activity. Please do not simply provide a list of PRJs, books, presentations, etc. Rather, provide indicators of impact **as they relate to your activities**. For example, suppose you

published three papers, had two conference presentations, and were on the editorial board of a journal during the time period covered by this form. Your response below should not be a cut-and-paste from your CV. Instead, you should indicate the total number of papers and presentations you had during the time period covered by the form, discuss whatever indicators of impact apply to these activities (see above for examples), and then provide details regarding the impact of your editorial board position (journal prominence/duties).

#### **Examples of Academic Impact**

- PRJ journal quality
- Widespread adoption of scholarly books
- Citation and SSRN download/view counts
- Editorships and editorial board memberships (emphasis on journal quality)
- Journal and conference reviews (emphasis on journal and conference quality)
- Key appointments in professional associations
- Conference paper awards or similar recognitions
- Academic conference presentations or panel discussions (emphasis on conference quality)
- Use of papers in courses taught by faculty at other schools
- Grants received
- Appointment as a visiting professor or scholar

#### **A. Publications—Quality**

During the period covered by this report, I had five articles appear in print or accepted for publication. List specifics with a focus on impact and quality.

#### **B. Downloads/Views**

List specifics for current time period and also in the aggregate.

#### **C. Citations**

List specifics for current time period and also in the aggregate.

#### **D. Published author rankings**

List specifics if available (depends on discipline)

#### **E. Case study impact/conference paper award**

List specifics.

#### **F. Editorship and editorial board membership**

List specifics.

#### **G. Ad Hoc reviews**

List specifics.

#### **H. Key appointments in professional associations**

List specifics (e.g., national committees, section involvement, etc.).

#### **I. Invited presentations**

List specifics.

#### **J. Impact beyond the five-year window (Before Fall 2012)**

Provide details related to publications that appeared in print before the beginning of the review period. Citation counts should be included and there should also be an emphasis on journal quality and impact.

### **Section 6**

#### **Impact: Practice**

In this section, please provide evidence of practice impact. Please list activities and provide details related to each activity.

#### **Examples of Practice Impact**

- Media citations (emphasis on readership)
- Consulting projects based on expertise (emphasis on project quality/scope)
- Practitioner publications (emphasis on readership)
- Case studies of research leading to business solutions
- Participation in policy or practitioner panels (emphasis on conference quality)
- Expert witness experience (emphasis on scope)
- Membership on boards of directors (with demonstration of activity)
- PRJ publications with documented application to practice
- Research projects undertaken with companies

List specifics.

## Section 7

### **Impact: Teaching**

Please provide evidence of teaching impact. Please list activities and provide details related to each activity.

#### **Examples of Teaching Impact**

- Grants for research influencing teaching practice
- Case studies (emphasis on adoption/market)
- Textbooks and instruction manuals (emphasis on adoption/market)
- Pedagogical publications (emphasis on journal quality)
- Instructional software (emphasis on adoption/market)
- Mentorship of undergraduate research or independent studies
- Teaching awards or other teaching-related recognition
- Use of teaching materials at other universities
- Involvement with School of Business study abroad programs

#### **A. Case studies/teaching awards**

List specifics.

#### **B. Use of teaching materials at other Universities**

List specifics.

## Section 8

### **Impact: Other**

In this section, please provide evidence of other types of impact. Please list activities and provide details related to each activity. For these activities, focus primarily on your own impact but please also include information that is department- or school-wide to the extent that you know details, as this information will help us evaluate school-wide impact.

#### **A. Leadership positions**

List specifics.

#### **B. Service on key committees**

List specifics.

### **C. Development of school of business events**

List specifics.

#### **Examples of Other Impact—Individual**

- Involvement with student organizations
- Leadership positions in significant academic programs
- Development of/attendance at School of Business events
- Service on key University or School of Business committees
- Reputation leading to media exposure
- Involvement with joint degree programs
- Responsibility for international partnerships

#### **Examples of Other Impact—Department or School**

- Hiring/placement/internship success of graduates (provide specifics)
- Standardized exam pass rates (benchmarked to other schools)
- Partnerships between Department/School of Business and other organizations
- Involvement of key business executives on advisory boards
- Significant fundraising (endowments, scholarships, assistantships, etc.)
- Student recognition (e.g., significant School of Business representation in Phi Beta Kappa)
- Selection of School of Business or Departments to host events

#### **D. School of business marketing**

List specifics.

#### **E. Department or school impact**

CPA Exam pass rates for our graduates have averaged approximately 70% (first-time sections) during this reporting period. Furthermore, 82% of sections taken by Master's students within one year of graduation were passed in 2015 (the first year of data availability for this statistic).

NASBA overall performance relative to 13 AACSB peers for 2015 ... rank = 4.

\*Custom data purchased from NASBA in spring 2014 show that pass rates of our Master's Program graduates tend to exceed those that are published in the NASBA book.

Placement of Spring 2016 Master's in Accounting graduates = 100%.

Placement of Spring 2015 Master's in Accounting graduates = 100%.

Placement of Spring 2014 Master's in Accounting graduates = 100%.

Placement of Spring 2013 Master's in Accounting graduates = 100%.

Public Accounting internship rate for 2015 undergraduate Accounting majors = 90%.

Public Accounting internship rate for 2014 undergraduate Accounting majors = 97%.

Public Accounting internship rate for 2013 undergraduate Accounting majors = 73%.

List other specifics.