

WSB Faculty Qualifications Handbook

Utah Valley University

Last updated 4/28/21

Table of Contents

Faculty Qualification Classification	3
Minimum Intellectual Contributions To Meet WSB Standard	3
WSB Acceptable Journals for Peer-Reviewed Journals and Peer-Reviewed Cases Studies	4
Faculty Request to Accept a Journal Not Listed in the WSB Acceptable Journals Publication/List	4
Faculty Qualification Status Impact on Annual Reviews for Faculty for Tenured and Non-Tenure Track Faculty	5
Frequently Asked Questions	5
Appendix A - WSB Faculty Qualification Classifications	6
Appendix B – Faculty Qualification Classification Change Request	7
Appendix C – WSB Faculty Qualification Rubric – 2019-2024	8
Appendix D – Faculty Request For Acceptance of a Peer Reviewed Journal	9
Appendix E – Department and WSB Faculty Qualifications Committee Approved Journal List	10

Faculty Qualifications

Faculty Qualification Classification

[AACSB Accreditation Standard 3](#) states: Faculty are qualified in initial academic or professional preparation and sustain currency and relevance appropriate to their classification, as follows:

- Scholarly Academic (SA),
- Practice Academic (PA),
- Scholarly Practitioner (SP), or
- Instructional Practitioner (IP).

Each faculty member is assigned by the dean or dean's designee to one of the four faculty qualification classifications: SA, PA, SP, or IP. Appendix A-WSB Faculty Qualification Classifications presents WSB faculty members with their assigned faculty qualification classification.

If a faculty member desires to change faculty qualification classification, the faculty member may make the request using Form B-Faculty Qualification Classification Change Request and submit it to the dean or dean's designee, who shall approve or disapprove the requested change. The faculty qualification classification shall not be changed without the written approval of the dean or dean's designee.

Appendix C - WSB Faculty Qualification Rubric presents WSB standards for each of the above four faculty qualification classifications in the areas of academic and instructional qualifications, minimum intellectual contributions to meet WSB standard, and recommended activities outside of peer-reviewed journals that strengthen WSB's mission.

Minimum Intellectual Contributions To Meet WSB Standard

Excellence in academia requires an emphasis on excellence in scholarly activities. Scholarship complements teaching, advancing and strengthening teaching skills. A contribution to scholarship is expected of faculty members annually. Faculty members are encouraged to publish in their respective academic discipline. However, interdisciplinary work is also encouraged. Faculty members are encouraged to consider journal quality as they select the journals to which they submit research.

Scholarly Academic (SA) status is granted to faculty members who earned either their research doctorates or other appropriate terminal degrees in the area of expertise (e.g. LLM in Tax or relevant JD) within the last five years.

Except for faculty members who earned their terminal degrees within the last five years as stated above, tenured, tenure track, and non-tenure track faculty are granted SA status by publishing a minimum of two peer-reviewed journal articles (PRJ) or one PRJ and one peer reviewed case study within the last five-year rolling period. We encourage all faculty, including deans, chairs, and program directors, to maintain a research stream so they can continue publishing 2 in 5 years and remain Scholarly Qualified.

Faculty are granted SP status by publishing one PRJ and one peer-reviewed case study or one PRJ and one scholarly book within the last five-year rolling period.

The peer-reviewed journal articles and peer-reviewed case studies stated above must meet the acceptable journal criteria in the following section in order to meet the WSB minimum standard for intellectual contributions.

WSB Acceptable Journals for Peer-Reviewed Journals and Peer-Reviewed Cases Studies

SA qualifying publications come from a list of publications vetted by 3rd party experts. A peer-reviewed journal article or peer-reviewed case study meets the minimum WSB intellectual contribution standard if it is included in one of the following publications or lists:

Organization	List/Database	Link
Cabell's	Business Journalytics List	Access through UVU library website Click Databases, search for Cabells
Cabell's	Education Journalytics List	
Australian Business Deans Council	ABDC Journal Quality List	http://www.abdc.edu.au/
Journal List Approved by Department and WSB Faculty Qualifications Committee	See Appendix E.	

While faculty are encouraged to publish in the discipline in which they teach, publishing in business interdisciplinary areas is allowed. For non-business peer-reviewed publications, the faculty member must demonstrate the relevance of the article to the faculty members area of expertise. As an aspiring T1 institution, faculty are also allowed to publish in education centric journals.

Requirements for Journal Lists Approved by Department and WSB Faculty Qualifications Committee

Department approved publication lists should have the following elements:

- Title of the peer-reviewed journal
- Publisher of the journal
- Link to the journal's peer-review process

Developers and reviewers of the department lists should consider the following:

- Is the journal peer-reviewed? (Required)
- Is the journal listed on Cabell's predatory reports? (If the journal is on this list, it is not acceptable).
- Is the journal already listed in Cabell's Journalytics or the Australian Business Dean's Council (ABDC) approved lists? If yes, don't include in the department list, we don't need to duplicate the work.
- From a practical perspective, the department journal list should be limited (normally no more than 20) to the journals where the faculty are likely to publish in the next five years. (We don't want to waste reviewer's time analyzing numerous journals that will never be used).

Faculty Request to Accept a Journal Not Listed in the WSB Acceptable Journals Publication/List

For articles submitted after June 1, 2021, BEFORE SUBMITTING FOR PUBLICATION, faculty members may request acceptance of a peer reviewed journal that is not in Cabells' Journalytics Lists, the Australian Deans Council ABDC Journal Quality List, or the journal list approved by the department and WSB Faculty Qualifications Committee. The request is made by completing and submitting Appendix D – Faculty Request For Acceptance of a Peer Reviewed Journal, and submitting it to the WSB Faculty Qualifications Committee.

Before submitting this request, the faculty member is required to do the following:

1. Check to see if the journal is already listed in Cabells' Journalytics Lists or Australian Deans Council ABDC Journal Quality List, or Journal List Approved by Department and WSB Faculty Qualifications Committee. If it is already listed in these publications, Appendix D does not need to be submitted.
2. Check to see if the journal is listed as a predatory journal in the following publications:
 - a. Cabell's Predatory List - UVU Library Database - <https://www.uvu.edu/library/>
 - a. List of Predatory Journals - <https://predatoryjournals.com/journals/#1>

If the publication is in either of these Unapproved Lists, it will not be approved, so Appendix D should not be submitted.

3. Check to see that the publication is not a conference proceedings. If the publication is a conference proceedings, it will not be approved, even if it is peer reviewed.
 4. Make a case for why this journal is superior for this article to journals on approved lists. We strongly encourage faculty to publish in one of the many thousands of journals in the Approved Lists. If a compelling argument cannot be made for why the requested journal is not superior, it will not be approved. Information like impact factor scores, Scotus, or other reputable ranking organizations can be used in this argument.
 5. Provide a link to the journal's peer review process. If a link does not exist, provide the email address of the editor so the peer review process can be verified.
 6. Provide a copy of the peer review process as an attachment.
 7. Provide an attachment justifying the quality of the publication. Justification may include such items as journal quality ratings, citation indexes, and circulation size of the journal
- The following is a list of groups that evaluate journal quality:
- Impact Factor - <https://clarivate.com/>
 - Google Scholar Metrics - https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=top_venues
 - AltMetric - <https://www.altmetric.com/>
 - Scimago - <https://www.scimagojr.com/>
 - Scopus - <https://www.scopus.com/home.uri>

Faculty Qualification Status Impact on Annual Reviews for Faculty for Tenured and Non-Tenure Track Faculty

This annual review section applies only to tenured and non-tenure track faculty. Tenure-track scholarship expectations for “Does not meet expectations,” “meets expectations,” and “exceeds expectations” are established by the WSB Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) committee.

[Policy 633-Annual Faculty Reviews](#) establishes mandatory annual reviews to evaluate faculty teaching, scholarship/creative works, service, and compliance with university policies. Section 5.1.4.1 states: “Faculty members’ annual evaluations shall be classified as “exceeds expectations,” “meets expectations,” or “does not meet expectations” based on RTP criteria for teaching, scholarship/creative works, and service established in their previous years’ annual plan for the current evaluation period.

Normally, SA and SP tenured and non-tenure track faculty in their annual reviews shall receive scholarship classifications in accordance with the guidelines in Appendix E -SA and SP Faculty Annual Review Classification for Tenured and Non-Tenure Track Faculty.

Frequently Asked Questions

Why is maintenance of scholarly academic status so important for AACSB?

The main objective of AACSB's requirements for faculty is intended to keep them current in their fields. Professionally qualified faculty are expected to continue doing significant work in their fields, so as to keep current with industry trends. In a similar manner, academically qualified faculty are expected to keep current with the research in their fields. The intent is for the university to be a place where the most cutting-edge knowledge is disseminated. As a comparison, a community college business professor upon reviewing an updated textbook might learn about new theories that a professor at an AACSB-accredited business school not only already knows, but has been teaching for years.

Why is it important for WSB tenure-track faculty members to publish in quality journals on a regular basis?

Every few years the WSB is evaluated by the AACSB to see if we get to keep our accreditation. Accreditation is valuable because, among other reasons, it improves the brand of the degree our students graduate with and makes it easier for them to compete in their graduate school applications and careers (while many employers may not be clear on the distinction, it can help our students to be able to say we have the same accreditation as BYU and Harvard.) In addition, accreditation determines if our degree is accepted internationally. Our accreditation is also what allows us to have 3/3 teaching loads with a larger research and service load instead of a 5/5 teaching load like many other parts of UVU.

The point of accreditation is to certify to the world that we meet some level of quality. However, the margin by which we have passed our past few accreditation reviews has been thin. There are a couple of reasons why this is true, but the FQ committee was created to address one reason in particular: Too many faculty are not researching enough and the quality of research for too many faculty is suspect. That is not the evaluation from anyone in the WSB, that is the evaluation from the people who decide whether or not we get to keep our accreditation.

What is the Faculty Qualification Committee's charge at WSB?

- Establish minimum criteria for AACSB classifications
- Evaluate whether or not faculty meet those criteria

The FQ committee's goal is to identify faculty at risk early on so faculty and Chairs can work to meet requirements

What is the purpose of the Faculty Qualifications (FQ) Committee?

The purpose of the FQ committee is to establish the MINIMUM STANDARD for what counts towards being Scholarly Academic qualified (SA). The committee also addresses other qualification categories, but its primary focus has been on SA qualification. In the past, being SA qualified has been loosely defined as "2 publications every 5 years". Previously, little guidance was offered regarding parameters or attributes (e.g. quality) of those publications. AACSB accreditation reviews have encouraged us to make a change in this area. Specifically, we need to have a clear standard and a rationale for that standard.

Who is on the Faculty Qualifications Committee?

The FQ committee has representation from every department.

What criteria does the committee use to approve a journal?

The instinct of the committee has been to look to 3rd party experts for what the minimum standard for quality should be. You can imagine that as we have gained experience over the past 2 years, our understanding of what that minimum standard looks like has been clarified. You may be surprised to learn that each month the committee reviews 2-5 fellow faculty that are struggling to meet the "2 in 5" rule. We try to identify them early so they have time to rectify their situation.

In addition, early on we determined that the minimum standard for quality would be that manuscripts had to undergo an appropriate peer review process and could not be published in journals that are not on publicly available Unapproved lists. You might be surprised to learn that each month we are called upon to grant exceptions to this rule so people can stay SA. More and more we have found ourselves denying these requests because qualifying faculty based on suspect research publications jeopardizes our AACSB accreditation (we have another review coming up).

Also, we are learning that the world of predatory journals is crafty. We were discovering journals on unapproved lists were shutting down and new journals were started by the same people with different titles. They were also suing to be removed from unapproved lists. This made unapproved lists less useful. Some journals were adopting names that were nearly identical to well regarded journals. Predatory journals are big business. You might be surprised to learn that some WSB faculty were paying as much as \$1800 to publish in some of these journals. Obviously, this does not look good for AACSB accreditation. Each month, we found ourselves being amateur sleuths trying to figure out whether a journal was predatory or not and I personally felt over time that we needed a better way. It didn't seem right to sift through the muck to decide whether a very poor journal was not quite poor enough to

disqualify it. The committee felt like we could do better as a college. Keep in mind, these decisions only impacted a relatively small number of our peers, but the consequences of failing an AACSB accreditation would impact us all.

How does the committee decide which journals are approved?

We do NOT want to be in the business of controlling WHERE people publish. We believe in academic freedom. So, our objective was to find a solution that did not involve us saying which publications are good (our goal is only to set the floor of where it is bad). So, to bring clarity to FUTURE publications, we have turned to 3rd party experts for clarification about which journals are acceptable. Starting in 2021, we will propose that newly submitted SA qualifying publications come from a list of publications vetted by 3rd party experts.

Do cases count? How do I get a case published?

A case may count toward SA status but can only be one of two publications that qualify a faculty member for SA status (the other being a peer-reviewed academic article).

Will it be hard to find journals that fit our article on the approved lists?

There are literally thousands of journals to choose from on these lists, at all levels of reputation from the best journals to, honestly speaking, pretty mediocre journals. These lists include the ABDC list, Cabell's list of Business journals, and Cabell's list of Education journals. These lists should provide many options for most of us.

What if my article is best suited for a high quality journal that is not on the approved lists?

The committee recognizes that there may occasionally be a journal that is not on the list, but which has such a stellar reputation that we should accept it. Note here though that these journals will not be at the floor of quality, faculty will need to make the case why the brand or position of a non-list journal is so great, that it should be approved. This will not be a trivial hurdle to clear. Our goal is to make the tent as big as possible while at the same time being able to make a reasonable argument to the AACSB reviewers that we have standards and that we hold ourselves accountable to them.

Do all of my publications need to be on approved lists?

The committee's minimum standards do not apply to ALL of your publications, it only applies for the "2 in 5" rule. Two of your publications every five years will need to come from these lists. As older publications fall outside of the 5-year window, you will need to be sure to replace them with publications that meet the minimum qualification. Other manuscripts beyond the "2 in 5" standard can be published in journals outside the approved lists. However, it is critical to understand that this standard is only for maintaining SA status as determined by the FQ committee. The RTP committee determines its own standard, which may be much higher, for tenure and promotion decisions.

What about disciplines that are not well represented in the approved lists?

The committee is aware that some disciplines (e.g. Law, PFP) may not be well represented in the 3rd party lists we have identified (i.e. Cabell's, ABDC). The committee will work together with these disciplines and subdisciplines to ensure that appropriate journals are identified for publication. Thus, the committee is asking, a priori, for a list of journals from each department that meet quality criteria but may not be on Cabell's or ABDC lists so that we can add them to our internal approved lists. These lists will be used to evaluate publications starting in 2021. Preferably, these lists would come from some kind of 3rd party experts that the entire department could agree upon.

Can the Faculty Qualifications Committee sanction me?

It is important to note that the FQ committee does not establish the CONSEQUENCES of not being SA qualified. The committee sets reasonable minimum qualifications and evaluates whether or not someone meets those qualifications. It is up to the Dean's office and Chairs to decide if there are mitigating circumstances and what the consequences will be.

Why should I publish in a Cabell's-listed journal?

Cabell's Directory is the most comprehensive directory of academic journals in both business and education. There are thousands of journals that are included in the Cabell's directory which are regularly monitored and validated as quality journals. Cabell's is also well recognized by AACSB and peer reviewers as a directory which ferrets out predatory and less than worthy scholarly journals and publishers.

What are predatory journals and why are they discouraged? Predatory journals accept cash payments and large Open Access fees in lieu of high-quality editorial review and quality controls. The turnaround time to receive editorial approval/acceptance is often weeks rather than months for most predatory journals. Many of these journals are set up to look like the highest quality academic journals in your field or even have similar names to famous and highly selective academic journals to "dub" the submitter.

What is the process if my article is published in an academic journal that is not listed in Cabell's or ABDC? Please submit an exception form to the Faculty Qualifications Committee at facultyqual@uvu.edu. The usual processing time to have an exception reviewed is 30 days, but sometimes it's slightly longer. The results of a review go directly to Department chairs and the leadership team, so expect to hear back from them or make a direct inquiry to the representative from your department on faculty qualifications.

Why does my SA status operate on a five-year time clock?

The rolling five-year review period is commonly used at AACSB-accredited institutions.

Who communicates with me if I have a question or issue with faculty qualification policy or decisions, whom can I contact?

Contact the chair of the FQ committee.

What if my manuscript or submission is outside of my discipline or interdisciplinary in nature? Will it still count towards my SA status?

Yes if it is found in one of the approved lists.

Do book chapters or business publications count towards SA status?

In order to keep the standard for SA status simple and fair to all faculty members book chapters and business publications do not count towards SA status. As a committee we rely heavily on external measures of quality (e.g. Cabell's list, peer-review process) and there is too much variance in the way book chapters and business publications are evaluated and accepted. While these types of publications do not count towards SA status they are worthy pursuits and could be in many other ways (e.g. thought leadership, RTP).

Are conference presentations or inclusion in a conference proceedings valuable or worthwhile?

Conference presentations and conference proceedings are extremely valuable to the research community and to individual authors in terms of making connections and receiving feedback. However, in most cases they do not represent the same level of effort as peer-reviewed journal publications and are not considered for SA status.

Does the committee evaluate QA status by year or month of publication? (E.g., Does a Jan 2016 publication fall off in Jan 2021 or at the end of 2021?)

The FQ committee evaluates by month and year.

Does an "accepted" article count for QA or does it have to be published?

The FQ committee counts accepted articles but they must be converted to published within a year or they do not count.

Appendix A - WSB Faculty Qualification Classifications

Faculty Name	Discipline	Qualification Classification			
		SA	PA	SP	IP

Appendix B – Faculty Qualification Classification Change Request

Faculty Name _____

Date of Request _____

Current Faculty Qualification Classification (Circle one) SA PA SP IP

Requested Faculty Qualification Classification (Circle one) SA PA SP IP

Faculty Justification for Requesting Change in Faculty Qualification Classification

_____ Faculty Qualification Classification Change Approved

_____ Faculty Qualification Classification Change Disapproved

_____ Dean or Dean's Designee's Signature _____ Date

_____ Date Data Based Updated for Approved Change

_____ Individual Updating Database

Appendix C – WSB Faculty Qualification Rubric – 2019-2024

WSB Faculty Qualification Rubric 2019-2024	SA-Scholarly Academics (40+% per department)	PA-Practice Academics (10-30%)	SP- Scholarly Practitioners (10-30%)	IP-Institutional Practitioners (10-30%)
Academic & Instructional Qualifications	Doctoral credential or JD from an accredited graduate school in a related discipline or successful completion of five graduate level courses in the area of assigned instruction	Doctoral credential or JD from an accredited school in a related discipline. Substantial thought leadership portfolio or body of evidence related to industry practice in their area of instruction	Master's Degree earned in an area related to assigned instruction. Research capabilities or a history of thought leadership/ intellectual contributions	Master's Degree earned in an area related to assigned instruction
Minimum intellectual contributions to meet WSB standard	Two PRJs or one PRJ and one peer-reviewed case study published in approved journals every five years	Ongoing and formal collaboration with company, consulting practice, or industry association verified every five years	One PRJ and one peer-reviewed case study published or publication of a scholarly book every five years	Industry or discipline specific collaboration or association to maintain relevancy
Recommended activities outside of PRJs that strengthen WSB's mission	Current and relevant intellectual pursuits that benefit students. Invited participation in academic conferences, active participation in thought leadership activities on LinkedIn and discipline specific business publications. Close affiliation with companies or industry groups that could elevate the perception and reputation of WSB	Involving WSB students in a formal collaboration with a company, consulting practice, or industry association. Demonstrated thought leadership activities on LinkedIn or business periodicals	Two peer-reviewed case studies or publication of a scholarly book. Close affiliation with companies or industry groups that could elevate WSB perception and reputation	Close affiliation with companies or industry groups that could elevate the perception and reputation of WSB

Appendix D – Faculty Request For Acceptance of a Peer Reviewed Journal

Note: Form must be complete before the Faculty Qualifications Committee will review the request.

Faculty Name _____

Faculty Department _____

Date Submitted _____

Journal Title _____

Journal Website Link _____

Journal Peer-Review Process - Provide one of the following:

- A. Link to the journal peer-review process on the journal's website
- B. Email address of the journal contact person who provided the peer-review process

Link or email address _____

Attach a copy of the peer-review process to this request.

Attach justification for quality of publication to this request.

By submitting this application, I certify that the following is true:

- 2. The journal is not already listed in the publications/lists considered acceptable to meet minimum WSB intellectual contributions
 - a. Cabells' Journalytics list - UVU Library Database - <https://www.uvu.edu/library/>; or
 - b. Australian Deans Council ABDC List - <http://www.abdc.edu.au/>
- 3. The journal title above is not listed as a predatory journal by either of the following sources:
 - a. Cabell's Predatory List - - UVU Library Database - <https://www.uvu.edu/library/>
 - b. List of Predatory Journals - <https://predatoryjournals.com/journals/#1>
- 4. This publication is not a conference proceedings.
- 5. The attached peer review process is for the above journal title.
- 6. The attached justification for quality of the publication is true and accurate.

Faculty Signature

Date

The journal title above is on one of the predatory journal lists.

Yes ____ No ____ Reviewer 1 Name _____
Yes ____ No ____ Reviewer 2 Name _____

Journal Approved ____ Journal Disapproved ____ Date _____

Appendix E – Department and WSB Faculty Qualifications Committee Approved Journal List