



Culverhouse  
College of Business

Faculty Executive Board Meeting

March 20, 2019

8:30-10:30 am

Dean's Conference Room

**Members Present:** Dr. Tom Baker, Dr. Steve Buchheit, Dr. Jose Dula, Dr. Peter Magnusson, Prof. Joyce Meyer, Dr. Shawn Mobbs, Dr. Paul Pecorino, Dr. Ed Schnee, Dr. Marilyn Whitman, Dr. Eric Williams, Dr. Mesut Yavuz.

Non-Voting Members Present: Dr. James Cochran, Dr. David Mothersbaugh, Ms. Lauren Bennett, Dr. Dave Heggem, Mrs. Kati Hardemon (serving as recorder)

Dr. Schnee opened the meeting at 8:35 am.

1. **Approval of FEB Meeting minutes from 02/20/2019** - A motion was made by Dr. Baker to approve the minutes as written. **The motion was seconded by Prof. Meyer and passed unanimously.**
2. **New Course Proposal MGT 633-** This course was approved several years ago but did not get into the official catalog. A motion was made by Dr. Williams to send this item to the PhD Committee. **The motion was seconded by Dr. Baker and passed unanimously.**
3. **Time line for Faculty Forum Items** – Normally documents are sent out two weeks before the forum to the faculty for review. Given the date of the forum and the last FEB meeting there will only be 10 days instead of 14 for distribution. A motion was made to suspend this rule for this year by Prof. Meyer. **The motion was seconded by Dr. Buchheit and passed unanimously.**
4. **College Research Committee Document** – The committee has been working on this document as a guideline. FEB noted various issues and concerns with the document including the degree to which it might cause more rather than less confusion, whether or not much of the document's materials are not already subsumed under UA and Culverhouse P & T policies, the intended versus actual use of the document in P & T, etc. The Associate Dean for Research will visit with the departments and continue to work toward an acceptable document.

***Addendum NOTE: The motion and vote on number 3 turned out to be unnecessary as an examination of the FEB by-laws after the meeting revealed that the rule already was that documents must be sent a week in advance.***

**Meeting was adjourned at 9:25 am.**



Culverhouse  
College of Business

Faculty Executive Board Meeting

February 20, 2019

8:30-10:30 am

Dean's Conference Room

**Members Present:** Dr. Anup Agarwal, Dr. Tom Baker, Dr. Steve Buchheit, Dr. Brad Casselman, Dr. Peter Magnusson, Prof. Joyce Meyer, Dr. Paul Pecorino, Dr. Uzma Raja, Dr. Eric Williams, Dr. Marilyn Whitman

Non-Voting Members Present: Ms. Lauren Bennett, Mrs. Kati Hardemon (serving as recorder)

Prof. Joyce Meyer opened the meeting at 8:32 am.

- 1. Approval of FEB Meeting minutes from 01/16/2019** - A motion was made by Dr. Buchheit to approve the minutes as written. **The motion was seconded by Dr. Baker and passed unanimously.**
- 2. Economics PhD Program Changes** -The Economics field has become more weighted to empirical work, so we would like to have more metrics courses for the students. We would like to give them more econometrics content and add some supplemental courses to give more content for possible dissertation topics. This Economics faculty did vote and approve this proposal 13 to 1. A motion was made by Dr. Baker to send this item to the PhD Programs Committee. **The motion was seconded by Dr. Buchheit and passed unanimously.**
- 3. Finance PhD Program Changes** -This proposal address to comprehensive exam format, where written comprehensive exams. The changes have been compiled in a manual that will be streamlined by Dr. Mortal from the EFLS Department. This item was approved unanimously by the Finance Faculty. The course will be offered on a rotating basis so the content og the exam can be adjusted to meet the needs of students based on where they are in their coursework. A motion was made to send the item to the PhD Programs Committee by Dr. Baker. **The motion was seconded by Dr. Pecorino and passed unanimously.**

**The meeting was concluded at 8:43 am.**

## **New Course Proposal for MGT 633 Foundations of Entrepreneurship Research**

Submitted by Lou Marino

The Department of Management plans to renew offering an Entrepreneurship focus area in the Management Doctoral Program. Accordingly, we need to offer a doctoral seminar in Entrepreneurship. This course has been previously approved by FEB several years ago when we previously had doctoral students in Entrepreneurship, but the course never seems to have made it to the official catalog. Therefore we are proposing it again as a new course. There is consistent demand for doctoral students with a focus in Entrepreneurship and we have several faculty members who are willing and able to teach this course as part of their normal load.



# PROPOSAL TO OFFER A NEW COURSE

## COLLEGE OF COMMERCE AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

Department: Management Date: 3/6/2019

Course Number: MGT 633 Course Title: Foundations of Entrepreneurship Research

Effective Date: 9/1/2019

### PART ONE

(To be completed by the individual proposing the course.)

#### I. GENERAL INFORMATION

##### A. Description (25 words or less):

This course offers a systematic overview of the research literature on entre



B. 1. Prerequisite(s): \_\_\_\_\_

2. Corequisite(s): \_\_\_\_\_

3. Other: \_\_\_\_\_

C. Course Level: Graduate I  
(Lower Division Undergraduate, Upper Division Undergraduate, Graduate I or Graduate II)

D. Format: 3 Hours of lecture per week

\_\_\_\_\_ Hours of discussion (recitation per week)

\_\_\_\_\_ Hours of laboratory (or field work) per week

Other instructional methods and modes: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

E. Credit Hours: 3

## II. ACADEMIC INFORMATION

### A. Course Objectives:

One objective is to survey some of the major theoretical perspectives and issues



B. What course or courses, if any, will this course replace? Implementation of this course, if it does not replace an existing course, may cause enrollment reductions in other courses. Please list all courses in which such enrollment declines may be expected.

None

C. What is the justification for proposing the course at this time?

We are reinstating our doctoral focus in entrepreneurship and this is a core course



D. Name the current faculty who are qualified to teach this course. What specific qualifications and capabilities must an individual have in order to teach this course?

Craig Armstrong, Vishal Gupta, Louis Marino, Theresa Wellbourne

E. This course is designed for the following curricula (programs):

Management Doctoral Program

F. This course will be required for the following majors and minors:

Management Doctoral Students

G. Attach an outline of the course of at least one page in length and name any textbooks or principal readings that will be used. (This request is not intended to bind future instructors to a detailed program, but only to establish the general scope, nature and level of the course.)

PART TWO

(To be completed by the department head, alone or in consultation with the proposer.)

## I. BUDGETARY INFORMATION

## A. Anticipated frequency of offering:

\_\_\_\_\_ section(s) each fall semester      \_\_\_\_\_ section(s) each spring semester  
 \_\_\_\_\_ section(s) during summer school      X \_\_\_\_\_ according to demand

## B. Estimated total enrollment:

First Year: 10  
 Second Year: 10  
 Third Year: 10

## C. Estimated capacity per section:

Lecture: 10  
 Discussion: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Laboratory: \_\_\_\_\_

## D. How does this course impact on the mission of the College and department?

This furthers the mission of the College and Department by strengthening

E. What resources will be needed to teach this course and where will they come from? +

The course will require on faculty member every other year. The c

F. Is there agreement within the department that the course is needed and that resources will be available to teach this course? +

Yes

G. Is there any indication that this course duplicates course work offered elsewhere in the College or University?

No

## II. EVALUATION

Describe the system of evaluation that will be used to determine whether this course should be continued in the departmental program. (It would be helpful to relate this system of evaluation to the kinds of information, requested in PART ONE, Section II-Academic Information and PART TWO, Section I-Budgetary Information).

Proposed by:	<i>Lou Marino</i>	3/6/2019
	Name	Date
Approved by:	<i>Lou Marino</i>	3/6/2019
	Department Head/Director	Date
	Dean	Date

Conditions of approval, if any:

Upon final approval, a course inventory form must be completed and forwarded to the Office for Academic Affairs.

*(Revised 6/07)*



## II. Evaluation

MGT 633, Foundations of Entrepreneurship Research will be evaluated with the entirety of the program to determine whether this course should be continued in the departmental program. The determination will be made on four factors:

1. Enrollment
2. Number of Entrepreneurship focused doctoral students
3. Placement of Entrepreneurship focused doctoral students
4. The cost of teaching the class will be evaluated against departmental demands and the benefits received by the students and the department.

## MGT 633 FOUNDATIONS OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP RESEARCH

**Instructor: Vishal K. Gupta**

**Proposed: Fall 2019**

This course offers a systematic overview of the research literature on entrepreneurship. As is the case with the academic field of entrepreneurship, the course takes an interdisciplinary approach, building on research in economics, sociology, psychology, history, and other academic disciplines. We will cover both the classic contributions and more recent work from the leading journals. The course is intended for PhD students in management and related disciplines, though Master's students may also participate with the consent of the instructor. It is a research-oriented course designed to help students understand the research literature, formulate their own research questions, and begin their own independent analysis. As a result, participants who are pursuing (or want to pursue) research-based careers and wish to interpret and contribute to research on entrepreneurship will find this course useful.

One objective is to survey *some* of the major theoretical perspectives and issues studied in entrepreneurship research, including both classic and contemporary scholarship and both theoretical and empirical contributions. Another objective is to support students in drafting a paper that incorporates one or more of the topics covered in class with their own research interests and to help students learn in a hands-on manner about review and revision processes. Please note that we will eschew casual recreations of the stark distinction between “theoretically interesting” and “practically interesting” that plagues much of organizational scholarship and indeed much of social science. We will take the perspective that theoretically and practically interesting insights can cohere in the same research products. Nonetheless, much of what is presented as practical insights in entrepreneurship has a limited basis in research, and much of the presentation of research – especially in journals with high “technical” standards – seem to do very little to help readers make judgments about practical implications. We can treat the ‘theoretical-practical’ divide intellectually by, for example, considering some popular treatments of entrepreneurship and assessing their claims in the scholarly literature and by wondering what might happen if we took the ‘practical’ advice in some scholarly papers seriously.

### **FORMAT**

Class will meet once a week. Students will read and discuss assigned materials and will take turns leading discussions. Each student will write a research paper that will be ‘reviewed’ and then revised in response to the reviews. Guidelines for the paper will be provided by second week of class, and students will need to get their paper topics approved by the professor (in writing after submission of one-page research proposal).

### **ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

All acts of dishonesty in any work constitute academic misconduct. The Academic Misconduct Disciplinary Policy will be followed in the event of academic misconduct. **If academic misconduct occurs, it will be my recommendation to the Academic Misconduct Monitor**

**that the student receive an ‘F’ in the course and, if the misconduct impacts other students in the class, the student receive an additional punishment of a one-year suspension from The University.** Plagiarism is a serious violation of academic integrity.

## **DISABILITY STATEMENT**

If you are registered with the Office of Disability Services, please make an appointment with me as soon as possible to discuss any course accommodations that may be necessary. If you have a disability, but have not contacted the Office of Disability Services, please call (205) 348-4285 (Voice) or (205) 348-3081 (TTY) or visit Suite 1000 Houser Hall to register for services. Students who may need course adaptations because of a disability are welcome to make an appointment to see me during office hours. Students with disabilities must be registered with the Office of Disability Services before receiving academic adjustments.

## **REQUIREMENTS and GRADING**

An important part of this course will be your (in some cases continued) socialization into the journal review process. Therefore, about two-thirds of the way through the semester, your research paper for this class will be submitted for (not really) peer review, and you will serve as a reviewer for a classmate’s paper. The review you write, along with your revised manuscript and your response letter to the review you receive will form three-quarters of your grade. The remainder of your grade will be based on class contribution.

Each participant is required to come prepared to class. Since class discussion is an integral part of the course, absences and lack of preparedness are unacceptable. Preparation will always involve reading and working with all the weekly assignments. In addition, each article will be assigned to a class member who will prepare a short (preferably a single page) written synopsis / critique of the article that they will email to all class members by noon the day prior to our class meeting. While I will provide some introductory lecture materials, much of the course will involve engaging in discussions about seminar topics. Specific students will be tasked with leading our discussion of each article.

### **Week 1**

Gartner, W.B. 1990. What are We Talking about When We Talk about Entrepreneurship? *Journal of Business Venturing* 5: 15–28.

Shane, Scott, and Sankaran Venkataraman. 2000. The Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research. *Academy of Management Review* 25: 217–26.

Busenitz, L. W., West, P., Shepherd, D., Nelson, T., Zacharakis, A. & Chandler, G. (2003). Entrepreneurship in emergence: Past trends and future directions. *Journal of Management*, 29 (3): 285-308.

Landstrom, H. 2014. Entrepreneurship research and its historical background. Pp. 21-40 in T. Baker and F. Welter (eds.). *The Routledge Companion to Entrepreneurship*.

## Week 2

Hayek, F.A. 1968. Competition as a Discovery Procedure. New translation, *Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics* 6, no. 3 (2002): 9–23.

Hoselitz, Bert F. 1951. The Early History of Entrepreneurial Theory. *Explorations in Entrepreneurial History* 3: 193–220. Reprinted Joseph J. Spengler and William R. Allen, eds., *Essays in Economic Thought: Aristotle to Marshall*. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1960, pp. 234-57.

Schumpeter, J. 1942. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row, pp. 81-86. (Chapter VII: The Process of Creative Destruction).

Baumol, W.J. 1968. Entrepreneurship in Economic Theory, *American Economic Review*, Vol. LLVII, No. 2, pp. 64-71.

## Week 3

Short et al. 2009. The Concept of "Opportunity" in Entrepreneurship Research: Past Accomplishments and Future Challenges. *Journal of Management*, 36(1): 1-28.

Eckhardt, J. & Shane, S. 2003. Opportunities and Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management*, 29(3): 333-349.

Davidsson, P. 2015. Entrepreneurial Opportunities and the Entrepreneurship Nexus: A Re-conceptualization. *Journal of Business Venturing* 10, no. 5: 674–95.

Stratos Ramoglou and Eric W. K. Tsang, 2016. A Realist Perspective of Entrepreneurship: Opportunities as Propensities," *Academy of Management Review* 41, no. 3: 410–34.

## Week 4

Alvarez, Sharon A., and Jay B. Barney. 2007. Discovery and Creation: Alternative Theories of Entrepreneurial Action. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 1, nos. 1–2: 11–26.

Foss, Nicolai J., and Peter G. Klein. 2017. Entrepreneurial Discovery or Creation? In Search of the Middle Ground. *Academy of Management Review*.

Chiles, T. H., Bluedorn, A. B., & Gupta, V. K. 2007. Beyond creative destruction and entrepreneurial discovery: A radical Austrian approach to entrepreneurship. *Organization Studies*, 28(4), 467-493.

Shane, S. 2000. Prior knowledge and the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Organization Science*, 11: 448-469.

## Week 5

Aldrich, H., and Fiol, M. 1994. Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation. *Academy of Management Review* 19(4): 645-670.

Baker, T., Miner, A.S. & Eesley, D.T. 2003. Improvising firms: Bricolage, account giving and improvisational competencies in the founding process. *Research Policy*: 32: 255

Bhave, M. P. 1994. A process model of entrepreneurial venture creation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 9(3): 223-246.

Mitchell, R. K., Smith, B., Seawright, K. W., & Morse, E. A. 2000. Cross-cultural cognitions and the venture creation decision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(5): 974-993.

#### Week 6

Cardon, M. S., Wincent, J., Singh, J., & Drnovsek, M. 2009. The Nature and Experience of Entrepreneurial Passion. *Academy of Management Review*, 34 (3), 511-532.

Fauchart, E., & Gruber, M. 2011. Darwinians, Communitarians, and Missionaries: The Role of Founder Identity in Entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54 (5), 935-957.

Powell, E.E & Baker, T. 2014. It's what you make of it: Founder identity and enacting strategic responses to adversity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57, 5: 1406-1433.

Sarasvathy, Saras. 2001. Causation and Effectuation: Toward a Theoretical Shift from Economic Inevitability to Entrepreneurial Contingency. *Academy of Management Re-view* 26, no. 2: 243-63.

#### Week 7

George, G. 2005. Slack resources and the performance of privately held firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(4): 661-676.

Katila, R. & Shane, S. 2005. When does lack of resources make new firms innovative? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48: 814-829.

Gimeno, Folta, Cooper & Woo. 1997. Survival of the fittest? Entrepreneurial human capital and the persistence of underperforming firms. *ASQ*, 42: 750- 783.

Hmieleski, K., & Corbett, A. 2008. The contrasting interaction effects of improvisational behavior with entrepreneurial self-efficacy on new venture performance and entrepreneur work satisfaction. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 23: 482 – 496.

#### Week 8

Mair, J., & Marti, I. 2006. Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41: 36-44.

Miller, T. L., Grimes, M. G., McMullen, J. S., & Vogus, T. J. (2012). Venturing for others with heart and head: How compassion encourages social entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(4), 616-640.

Short, J.C., Moss, T.W., & Lumpkin, G.T. 2009. Research in social entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 3: 161-194.

Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. 2009. A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5): 519-532.

### **Week 9**

Busenitz, L. & Barney, J. 1997. Differences between entrepreneurs and managers in large organizations: Biases and heuristics in strategic decision-making. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 12(1), 9-30.

Stewart, Jr., W. & Roth, P. 2001. Risk propensity differences between entrepreneurs and managers: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86: 145-153. (optional: see rebuttal by Miner and Raju (2004) and response).

Baron, R. 2004. The cognitive perspective: A valuable tool for answering entrepreneurship's basic "why" questions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19: 221-239.

Hmieleski, K. & Baron, R. 2009. Entrepreneurs' optimism and new venture performance: A social cognitive perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(3): 473-488.

### **Week 10**

Fairchild, Gregory B. 2008. The influence of residential segregation and its correlates on ethnic enterprise in urban areas. *Journal of Business Venturing* 23: 513-527.

Sriram, V., Mersha, T. & Herron, L., 2007. Drivers of urban entrepreneurship: An integrative model. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, 13 (4): 235-251.

Robinson, J. & Hayes, R., 2012. Opportunity recognition in inner-city markets: An exploratory study. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 17 (2).

Porter, M.E., 1995. The competitive advantage of the inner city. *Harvard Business Review*, (May-June), pg. 55-71.

### **Week 11**

Shahriar, A. 2018. Gender differences in entrepreneurial propensities: Evidence from matrilineal and patriarchal societies. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 33: 762-779.

Gupta, V. K., Turban, D. B., & Bhawe, N. M. 2008. The effect of gender stereotype assimilation and reactance on entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 1053-61.

Baron, R. A., Markman, G. D., & Hirska, A. (2001). Perceptions of women and men as entrepreneurs: evidence for differential effects of attributional augmenting. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 923.

Gupta, V. K., Turban, D., Wasti, S. A., & Sikdar, A. 2009. The role of gender stereotypes in perceptions of entrepreneurs and intentions to become an entrepreneur. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 33(2), 397-417.

## **Week 12**

Baumol, W.J. 1990. Entrepreneurship: Productive, unproductive and destructive. *Journal of Political Economy*, 98,5: 893- 921.

Azoulay, P. & Shane, S. 2001. Entrepreneurs, contracts and the failure of young firms. *Management Science*, 47(3): 337-358.

McGrath, R. 1999. Falling forward: Real options reasoning and entrepreneurial failure. *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 13 - 30.

Shepherd, D.A., Wiklund, J., & Haynie, J.M. 2009. Moving forward: Balancing the financial and emotional costs of business failure. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(2): 134-148.

## **Week 13**

Covin, J. G., & Slevin, D. P. (1989). Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10(1), 75-87.

Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of management Review*, 21(1), 135-172.

Stam, W., & Elfring, T. (2008). Entrepreneurial orientation and new venture performance: The moderating role of intra-and extraindustry social capital. *Academy of management journal*, 51(1), 97-111.

Hansen, J. D., Deitz, G. D., Tokman, M., Marino, L. D., & Weaver, K. M. (2011). Cross-national invariance of the entrepreneurial orientation scale. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(1), 61-78.

## **Week 14**

Bradley, Steven W., and Peter G. Klein. 2016. Institutions, Economic Freedom, and Entrepreneurship: The Contribution of Management Scholarship. *Academy of Management Perspectives*

Sobel, Russell S. 2008. Testing Baumol: Institutional Quality and the Productivity of Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing* 23, no. 6: 641–55.

Bjørnskov, Christian, and Nicolai Foss, 2008. Economic Freedom and Entrepreneurial Activity: Some Cross-Country Evidence. *Public Choice* 134, no. 3: 307–28.

Levie, J., Autio, E., Acs, Zolatin, and Hart, M. 2014. Global Entrepreneurship and Institutions: An Introduction. *Small Business Economics* 42, no. 3: 437–44.

### **Week 15**

Baumol, William J. 1990. Entrepreneurship: Productive, Unproductive, and Destructive. *Journal of Political Economy* 98: 893–919.

Schneider, Marc, and Paul Teske. 1992. Toward a Theory of the Political Entrepreneur: Evidence from Local Government. *American Political Science Review* 86: 737–47.

Holcombe, Randall. 1992. Political Entrepreneurship and the Democratic Allocation of Economic Resources. *Review of Austrian Economics* 15: 143–59.

Klein, Peter G., Anita M. McGahan, Christos N. Pitelis, and Joseph T. Mahoney. 2010. Toward a Theory of Public Entrepreneurship. *European Management Review* 7: 1–15.



## **Culverhouse College of Business Proposed Statement on Research Scholarship**

Research scholarship is an essential part of University life and development, and it encompasses the many pursuits that broaden and expand the learning communities in which faculty function and the University is situated.

The University of Alabama's strategic plan states Goal #2 as: "Increase the University's productivity and innovation in research, scholarship and creative activities that impact economic and societal development." Consistent with this goal, the Culverhouse College of Business also strives to increase its productivity and innovation in research scholarship. Specifically, the long-range vision of the College is to be recognized internationally as a leading business school shaping the future of business based on its reputation, in part, of "research contributions by internationally acclaimed scholars" (2018 AACSB self-report). Further, the College's strategic plan Goal #2 states that the college will "Develop thought leaders who enhance our research profile through continuous collaboration with faculty, staff, students, and external stakeholders."

Enhancing the College's research profile and reputation rests on three major goals:

- Inclusion in internationally-recognized lists of top research business schools, e.g., the UT Dallas 100 list;
- Increasing the total amount of externally funded research expenditures; and through these efforts:
- Producing scholarly research that demonstrably impacts business, industry, and society.

While these research goals are central to the mission of the College, we also acknowledge that not all faculty must publish in top tier journals nor do all faculty have to seek external funding. What all faculty must do, however, is demonstrate impact in their research scholarship. Accordingly, business colleges must continually adapt to meet the needs of their stakeholders, and they must provide a wide range of opportunities in order for faculty, who by design have a variety of interests and skills, to contribute to efforts intended to meet these needs. As a result, this requires business colleges to be flexible in the ways in which they review the scholarly contributions of their faculty.

Forms of scholarly activity at the Culverhouse College of Business are:

- Discovery of new knowledge
- Development of new technologies, methods, materials, or uses
- Integration of knowledge leading to new understanding

The Culverhouse College of Business values traditional scholarly contributions (i.e., publications in top academic journals). However, it also acknowledges that other contributions meet the definition of scholarly activity (**assessment of faculty scholarly**

**activity cannot be feasible solely through a categorization and count of articles published in academic journals).** There is a broad range of scholarly activity outside of journal publications, including (but not limited to):

- Funded research (federal, state or local funding agencies, foundations, industry)
- Scholarly books and monographs
- Research reports
- Interdisciplinary collaborations
- Consulting/collaboration with industry to resolve important business problems
- Creation of software
- Creation of new databases used in research, business decision making, and/or policy making
- Patents or copyrights
- Efforts that influence or inform public policy

In considering the impact of scholarly activity on business, industry, science, and society when assessing the value of scholarly activity, a portfolio perspective must be taken. In short, 'quantity of output' or 'number of citations' does not necessarily capture the overall impact of a faculty member's scholarly activity. The Culverhouse College of Business recognizes that the following issues, among others, must be considered when assessing the scholarly contributions of a faculty member with regard to annual evaluations, merit pay disposition, tenure decisions, and promotions:

- Scholarly contributions may be made through theoretical and methodological developments as well as the application of theory and methods to solve problems in a variety of settings.
- The purpose of the journal lists is to help departments evaluate research that is being conducted by faculty members. Therefore, while it should be reasonably comprehensive, it does NOT need to be exhaustive (i.e., publications in journals other than those on the Culverhouse College list, including journals focused on disciplines outside of the college's disciplines, also constitute scholarly contributions).
- Interdisciplinary efforts are an increasingly important means for addressing complex problems, and faculty who engage in such research face unique challenges and these efforts may result in alternative, non-traditional outputs or results that are disseminated through nontraditional outlets.
- The impact of a scholarly contribution may become more apparent over time.
- The impact of a scholarly contribution may increase or diminish over time.
- Different disciplines present different opportunities for scholarly contributions (for instance, some disciplines may be more likely to pursue and win large research grants, while others may be more likely to produce patents or software).
- Different disciplines have different opportunities to influence policy or business practice and to pursue funded research.

- High level academic presentations (e.g., keynote or plenary talks) or presentations at major international conferences represent scholarly contributions.
- Faculty who engage students in scholarly activities in meaningful ways face unique challenges and make important contributions by mentoring future scholars.
- Pedagogical research may also be a scholarly contribution.

By using a broad perspective for examining and evaluating scholarly engagement, we are encouraging an environment in which Culverhouse faculty can actively affect the communities in which they directly engage.

Regardless of its diversity, however, scholarship:

- Is rigorous
- Extends the frontiers of knowledge/creative expression
- Can be documented
- Is validated by and shared with other professionals
- Contributes substantively to one's discipline or the larger academic community and/or has impact on business, industry, and/or society

Scholars should develop a national (and ultimately, international) reputation for the research in her or his discipline or sub-discipline.

Each year, Culverhouse faculty should work with their department head to develop scholarly activity objectives for the upcoming year (and beyond, if possible) as part of the annual faculty evaluation process. This conversation should include a discussion of the potential impact of ongoing and proposed scholarly activities. This will allow the faculty member and department head to specify the faculty's scholarly activity objectives so they support the objectives of the department, college, and/or university and are consistent with available resources.

When submitting materials for assessment of her or his scholarly activity, the faculty member should provide evidence (internal or external) of how she or he has addressed each objective for scholarly activity. The faculty member should also provide evidence (internal or external) of the impact or potential impact of her or his scholarly activity.

The guidelines presented in this statement allow Culverhouse faculty the opportunity to demonstrate impact through a variety of paths (such as research intensive, sponsored research intensive, teaching and pedagogical research, etc.). Specifically, a faculty member can demonstrate research impact solely through traditional research publications. Another faculty member might demonstrate research impact almost entirely through funded research activity that may or may not be published in top tier journals. The key is that the research activity has impact on its intended audience. Faculty members conducting research in niche areas may demonstrate scholarly impact through publications in top niche journals. We acknowledge and respect that there are

multiple paths for faculty to take to demonstrate sustainable and impactful research scholarship.

The Culverhouse College aspires to increasingly be recognized for the quality, quantity, and impact of its faculty's scholarly activity. However, pursuit of this objective should not be done at the expense of providing a quality education to its students. Although this statement focuses on research impact, assessment of faculty must also give appropriate consideration to the impact the faculty member has had through teaching and service (and activities at the intersection of research, teaching, and/or service). The Culverhouse College of Business expects each faculty member's overall impact (in some combination of research, teaching, and service that may evolve) to grow as the faculty member progresses through her or his career. And the Culverhouse College of Business will work to support its faculty in these endeavors.