

**SOULES COLLEGE OF BUSINESS**  
**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

**Preamble**

The Soules College of Business (SCOB) faculty believe that a fair and systematic performance evaluation system is a necessary condition for guiding an individual faculty member's professional development and is a critical element of efforts to implement the mission and improve the quality and reputation of the SCOB. Based on the policies defined in the university *Handbook of Operating Procedures* (HOP), the performance evaluation system specified in this document describes shared beliefs about the activities, behaviors, and outcomes that will help the SCOB remain competitive.

The philosophy guiding the performance evaluation system incorporates the following six basic beliefs:

- The ongoing review and improvement of the performance evaluation system will help continually examine the activities, behaviors, and outcomes necessary to achieve the mission and goals of the departments and the SCOB.
- A well-defined performance evaluation system will serve as a guide for new and existing faculty to improve job performance and professional development. This document helps specify the activities, behaviors, and outcomes that are valued.
- The performance evaluation system explicitly recognizes that individual faculty members can make a significant contribution to the SCOB in many different ways. Thus, it is recognized that different weightings of the evaluation criteria are appropriate for different faculty members and that alternative sets of activities, behaviors, and outcomes may result in the same level of overall performance.
- There are many different forms of scholarly activities that are important to the profession and to various stakeholders. Each of these diverse forms of scholarship is valued. Consequently, one or more scholarly activities must be explicitly incorporated in each dimension of performance.
- The annual performance evaluation process should provide consistent and accurate feedback about job performance. The job performance and formative feedback history documented in the annual review process constitute only one piece of information that will be incorporated in promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review decisions. **Receiving a “meets or exceeds expectations” does not guarantee promotion or tenure.**

- We recognize that professional performance is very complex and cannot be accurately and reliably measured on simple interval scales. Thus, great confidence is placed in the professional judgment and integrity of the Department Chairs/Coordinator, and the Dean. These individuals are charged with insuring that the performance evaluation process is conducted in a fair and impartial manner.

## **Purpose**

The performance review is designed to provide both summative and formative information. The summative information will provide input into decisions about annual merit pay increases, contract renewals, and faculty workloads. In most cases, these summative decisions will be based on the performance review conducted by the Department Chair/Coordinator. The formative information generated during the performance review process is expected to play an important role in the ongoing career development of each faculty member. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair/Coordinator to provide each faculty member with ongoing professional development feedback and guidance.

The annual performance evaluation does not replace the role of the cumulative review processes in the department. Thus, in addition to the annual performance reviews, untenured faculty members will receive a 3<sup>rd</sup> year review prior to being reviewed for tenure, and post-tenure reviews following tenure. Faculty members are expected to include copies of each annual review in the materials submitted for cumulative reviews.

## **Process and Timetable**

1. The Performance Evaluation Guidelines can be found on the SCOB shared computer drive.
2. All faculty members will receive an annual performance review each year. The *approximate* timeline follows:
  - a. March 20 (one week after return from Spring Break). **Faculty information must be complete in FAC 180.**
  - b. April 15 completed faculty evaluations due to the Dean for review.
  - c. April 20 – May 7 Chair/Coordinator meets with faculty individually to discuss evaluation. Chairs/Coordinator provide each faculty member a copy of their evaluation and a copy is provided to the Dean's Office.
  - d. May 31 all evaluations complete and certified to Provost's Office.
3. The results of the Annual Performance Review by the Chairs/Coordinators will be summarized on the Performance Evaluation form. Each faculty member will be rated on the dimensions of Teaching, Research, Service, and Collegiality.

On each dimension, a faculty member will be evaluated on a four-point scale:

- 1 – Unsatisfactory
- 2 – Does not meet expectations
- 3 – Meets expectations
- 4 – Exceeds expectations

An individual faculty member need not demonstrate each of the activities in a category to achieve the corresponding level of performance, and exhibiting a single activity, behavior or outcome in a category does not automatically place the faculty member's performance in that category. The professional judgment of the Department Chair/Coordinator and Dean are relied upon to fairly and accurately evaluate the performance of each faculty member.

- 4. The score on the Teaching, Research, and Service dimensions will be weighted by the appropriate percentage of effort for the faculty member on that dimension. For example, if a faculty member is to spend 50% of his/her effort on research, the score for research is weighted by 50%. See Workload policy for appropriate distribution of effort scenarios.

The weighted scores plus the Collegiality score will be averaged into a single number that is used for summative purposes.

The Chair/Coordinator must also provide an overall rating. This is a holistic evaluation and not merely a function of the summary score. However, large differences between the weighted average of the individual dimensions and the overall evaluation requires justification.

- 5. At the discretion of the Chair/Coordinator and the Dean, a rating of unsatisfactory on any performance dimension may trigger a professional development process for the faculty member. This plan is developed in consultation with the Department Chair/Coordinator and provides specific actions that the faculty member will take to improve his or her performance on the appropriate dimension(s). The initial draft of the professional development plan will be submitted to the Department Chair/Coordinator by May 15, and the final version approved by the Chair/Coordinator will be submitted to the Dean by May 31. Failure to submit and implement a professional development plan may be cause for termination.
- 6. Repeated performance evaluations of unsatisfactory on any single dimension or as the overall performance rating may be cause for termination.

## TEACHING DIMENSION OF PERFORMANCE

Teaching is a core activity for all members of the faculty and the primary revenue generating activity for the Soules College of Business. As such, it is imperative that all members of the faculty contribute to the continuing improvement and integration of the curriculum, instructional delivery, and collective learning environment. Despite the importance of teaching, mechanisms for evaluating teaching effectiveness are underdeveloped. No single instrument, method, or data source has been demonstrated to provide a valid and reliable approach to evaluate teaching performance. Thus, teaching performance in the SCOB will draw on multiple sources of information including those provided by the faculty member, students, peers, and administrators.

The *minimum* documentation required for evaluating teaching performance includes copies of the student teaching evaluations for each class, a syllabus for each class, and a clear statement of learning objectives for each class. Faculty members will submit via FAC 180. Materials that cannot be submitted on FAC 180 may be submitted directly to the Chair/Coordinator.

### Performance Criteria for Teaching

#### 1 – Unsatisfactory

Below are the activities expected of each faculty. **Failure** to meet these expectations will result in the score of “1” – Unsatisfactory.

- Regularly meets classes as scheduled and holds appropriate office hours
- Ensures that course content is consistent with the SCOB curriculum
- Ensures that course materials are current and relevant
- Provides students with a current course syllabus
- Maintains a current and relevant Blackboard page for each course
- Cooperates with activities to support both the SCOB Assurance of Learning program and SACS assessment.
- Typically receives student teaching evaluations above 3.5 on a scale of 5.0

#### 2 – Below Expectations

A faculty member who **only meets the expected activities** noted below will be evaluated as “2” - Below Expectations.

- Regularly meets classes as scheduled and holds appropriate office hours
- Ensures that course content is consistent with the SCOB curriculum
- Ensures that course materials are current and relevant
- Provides students with a current course syllabus

- Maintains a current and relevant Blackboard page for each course
- Cooperates with activities to support both the SCOB Assurance of Learning program and SACS assessment.
- Typically receives student teaching evaluations above 3.5 on a scale of 5.0

### **3 – Meets Expectations**

In addition to performing the activities necessary to earn a “2” or “Below Expectations” rating, a faculty member evaluated as “Meets Expectations” will *provide evidence that they have achieved several of the following outcomes* during the previous year:

- Creates updated course materials on a yearly basis
- Integrates his or hers current research with the course content when appropriate
- Creates an active learning environment through the appropriate use of exercises and assignments, lectures, and other instructional strategies and techniques
- Participates in or coordinates multiple section courses in the core
- Remains competent in and instructs multiple different courses
- Typically receives student teaching evaluations above 4.0 on a scale of 5.0

### **4 – Exceeds Expectations**

In addition to performing the activities necessary to earn a “3” or “Meets Expectations” performance rating, a faculty member evaluated as “Exceeds Expectations: will *provide evidence that they have achieved several of the following outcomes* during the previous year:

- Engages in new course development or significant revisions to existing courses
- Engages in significant efforts to initiate program revisions within the SCOB
- Publishes a case in widely used text book
- Publishes pedagogical materials in refereed outlets
- Publishes multiple pedagogical articles in refereed outlets
- Publishes a textbook or casebook that is widely used
- Receives a teaching award from the College, the University, or a professional association
- Typically receives teaching evaluations above 4.25 on a scale of 5.0

## RESEARCH DIMENSION OF PERFORMANCE

(Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty)

Research activities are the primary mechanism through which faculty members make intellectual contributions to the Soules College of Business and to their respective professions. Typically, the evaluation of research will focus on the creation of new knowledge (basic scholarship) and the application, transfer, and interpretation of knowledge to advance the practice of management (applied scholarship) that is disseminated through refereed scholarly journals, scholarly books, and high quality practitioner journals. Other types of scholarly activities, such as instructional development, business cases, consulting activities, and publications in trade journals are explicitly incorporated in other areas of the annual performance review document and thus do not contribute to the research dimension of performance.

The research dimension only will incorporate a 3-year moving evaluation period to allow for uneven publication cycles. Special consideration will be given to faculty with less than 3 years of service. Research for the performance evaluation will only be considered **when published** not when accepted and, thus, should be presented with full citation. **Documentation required to evaluate research performance will be submitted via FAC 180.**

An ongoing pattern of unsatisfactory ratings on the research dimension may constitute unsatisfactory cumulative performance.

### Performance Criteria for Research

#### 1 – Unsatisfactory

Faculty members will earn this performance rating when their annual evaluation materials clearly provide evidence that they have achieved **only** the following during the previous 3-year period:

- Created a substantial draft of a new paper for submission to an academic conference or journal
- Created a substantial draft of a new scholarly book chapter
- Gathered new data for an ongoing research project
- Made significant revisions that demonstrate progress on existing working paper(s)
- Renewed IRB approval to continue research on prior research study
- Submitted at least one scholarly paper to an academic conference
- Presented at least one intellectual contribution at a regional academic conference

- Submitted at least one scholarly paper to an academic journal for blind peer review
- Responded to at least one “revise and resubmit” editor letter by revising and resubmitting a scholarly paper to an academic journal
- Presented research at a department, college, professional, or academic seminar
- Published research or a position paper in practitioner outlets

## **2 – Below Expectations**

Faculty members will earn this performance rating when their annual evaluation materials clearly provide evidence that they have achieved several of the following outcomes during the previous 3-years:

- Engaged in significant ongoing research activities
- Submitted manuscript(s) or manuscript revisions to academic journal(s)
- Presented at national or regional conference appropriate for discipline
- Provided evidence of work under review at journals on the SCOB journal list
- Published chapters in scholarly or professional books
- Completed technical reports to funding sources
- Applied for research or grant funding

## **3 – Meets Expectations**

Faculty members will earn this performance rating when their annual evaluation materials clearly provide evidence that they have achieved several of the following outcomes during the previous 3-years:

- Published one or more manuscripts in a journal on the SCOB journal list
- Obtained internal (college or university) research funding
- Applied for significant external research funding
- Received external research funding
- Supervised doctoral students in ongoing research activities
- Received a best paper or best track award
- Received a research award from a department, the SCOB, or UT Tyler or a professional/academic association
- Published/Presented multiple papers at national conferences

#### **4 – Exceeds Expectations**

Faculty members will earn this performance rating when their annual evaluation materials clearly provide evidence that they have achieved several of the following outcomes during the previous 3-years:

- Published multiple blind peer review articles in journals that are ranked as “A” or “B” on one of the SCOB departmental journal lists
- Published a paper in a journal that is ranked “A+” on one of the SCOB departmental journal lists
- Received significant external research funding
- Received a research award from a regional or national professional organization
- Published or edits scholarly book or textbook
- Received a patent for intellectual property
- Served as Editor or Associate Editor for a journal on the SCOB journal list



## **RESEARCH DIMENSION OF PERFORMANCE (Lecturers and Senior Lecturers)**

Generally, Lecturers/Senior Lecturers with the faculty status of IP are not considered to have any research expectations (workload would be 0% for research). However, the requirements to obtain/maintain the faculty status of SP *may* include a research component. The workload distribution for research may be greater than 0% with concurrence of the Chair/Coordinator and the faculty member. When that is the case, the performance criteria shown below will be used for the research dimension.

Research activities are one mechanism through which lecturers and senior lecturers maintain appropriate SP faculty status. Typically, the evaluation of research will focus on activities that demonstrate currency and relevancy in the field of teaching. The set of activities encompass peer reviewed journal articles, publications and presentations at professional meetings, among others.

**Documentation required to evaluate scholarship and professional activities will be submitted via FAC 180.**

It should be noted that an ongoing pattern of unsatisfactory scholarship and professional activities is not sufficient for a given faculty member to maintain his or her status as being considered AACSB Qualified. An ongoing pattern of unsatisfactory ratings on the scholarship and professional activities dimension constitutes unsatisfactory cumulative performance.

### **Performance Criteria for Research**

#### **1 – Unsatisfactory**

Faculty members will earn this performance rating when their annual evaluation materials clearly provide evidence that they have achieved **none** of the following outcomes during the previous year:

- Attended regional professional meeting in discipline
- Submitted at least one manuscript to a regional conference
- Presented research at a “brown bag” seminar
- Participated in select AACSB seminars and workshops

## **2 – Below Expectations**

Faculty members will earn this performance rating when their annual evaluation materials clearly provide evidence that they have achieved several of the following outcomes during the previous year:

- Attended regional professional meeting in discipline
- Submitted at least one manuscript to a regional conference
- Presented research at a “brown bag” seminar
- Participated in select AACSB seminars and workshops

## **3 – Meets Expectations**

Faculty members will earn this performance rating when their annual evaluation materials clearly provide evidence that they have achieved several of the following outcomes during the previous year:

- Submitted manuscript(s) to journal(s)
- Presented at national or regional conference appropriate for discipline
- Applied for research funding
- Published materials in academic or professional outlet

## **4 – Exceeds Expectations**

Faculty members will earn this performance rating when their annual evaluation materials clearly provide evidence that they have achieved several of the following outcomes during the previous year:

- Published in peer reviewed journals
- Submitted manuscripts to national conferences appropriate for discipline
- Obtained internal or external research funding
- Presented paper at regional or national conference
- Received a research award from a regional or national professional organization
- Published scholarly book(s) (as author or editor)

## **SERVICE DIMENSION OF PERFORMANCE**

Service is an important and valued activity that is a key responsibility for each faculty member. Each member of the faculty is expected to provide significant service to the department, college, and university. In addition, faculty members are expected to engage in other service activities to the broader community including service to professional organizations, business organizations, government organizations, and/or community organizations.

Given the large assortment of service options, a large variation in the service of individual faculty members is expected. No single type of service is preferred, and many different types of service are valued. It is also expected that the amount and type of service contributions to vary with an individual's career stage. Junior faculty members often have lower service requirements and are likely to focus more on internal service activities. More senior faculty members are expected to make greater overall service contributions and are likely to focus on more external service activities. Thus, the Department Chair/Coordinator and the Dean may shift the behavioral descriptions somewhat to adjust for the career position of the individual faculty member.

**Documentation required to evaluate service performance will be submitted via FAC 180.**

### **Performance Criteria for Service**

#### **1 – Unsatisfactory**

Faculty members will earn this performance rating when their annual evaluation materials clearly provide evidence that they have achieved **none** of the following outcomes during the previous year:

- Regularly attended department and SCOB faculty meetings
- Provided service to department
- Conducted consulting activities that benefit the department or college
- Provided oversight to student groups when asked
- Was regularly present in office and meetings
- Attended graduation convocations when possible

## **2 – Below Expectations**

In addition to performing the activities noted above, a person will earn this rating when their evaluation materials clearly provide evidence that they have achieved multiple outcomes from the following during the previous year:

- Regularly attended department and SCOB faculty meetings
- Provided service to department
- Conducted consulting activities that benefit the department or college
- Provided oversight to student groups when asked
- Was regularly present in office and meetings
- Attended graduation convocations when possible

## **3 – Meets Expectations**

In addition to performing the activities noted above, a person evaluated as “Meets Expectations” will provide evidence that they have also achieved several of the following outcomes during the previous year:

- Actively served on at least one SCOB committee or taskforce
- Served as faculty sponsor of a student organization
- Served on Faculty Senate
- Actively participated in departmental efforts
- Supervised doctoral students if applicable
- Conducted significant consulting activities that benefit the SCOB, department, University, community or national professional organization
- Conducted significant review for scholarly journals in their discipline
- Actively participated in professional associations
- Served as coordinator for one or more of the multiple section core or interdisciplinary courses
- Edited and/or reviewed papers for colleagues
- Reviewed papers for proceedings and journals
- Served on major University and SCOB and department committees
- Provided support to colleagues by attending their presentations
- Served on an editorial board for a major journal
- Directed SCOB Center
- Represented SCOB at University and Community events\*

#### 4 – Exceeds Expectations

In addition to performing the activities noted in the above categories, a person evaluated as “Exceeds Expectations” will provide evidence that they have also achieved several of the following outcomes during the previous year:

- Actively participated on multiple SCOB of University committees
- Chaired a Faculty Senate Committee
- Was an active reviewer for two or more journals on the SCOB journal list
- Chaired (or co-chaired) a major SCOB committee or taskforce
- Helped with Development and Alumni Relations
- Served as an active mentor for junior faculty members
- Provided economic development activities
- Served as an officer or program chair in a professional association
- Held an officer position in a regional or national professional organization
- Demonstrated significant Center activities
- Delivered significant executive education activities

\*Examples of these events include:

<b>University</b>	<b>College/Departmental</b>	<b>Community</b>
Distinguished Alumni	Business Expo booth	Better Business Bureau Awards
Dedication/Open Houses	Meetings sponsored by SCOB	Chamber of Commerce activities
Patriots Day		

## COLLEGIALITY DIMENSION OF PERFORMANCE

FROM: The University of Texas at Tyler Handbook of Operating Procedures,  
SECTION: 3.3.4 – **TENURE**

(<http://www.uttyler.edu/ohr/hop/documents/3.3.4Tenure.pdf>)

Item 4 – Performance Standards for the Granting of Tenure – paragraph b. **iv.**  
**Collegiality.**

UT Tyler defends the concept of academic freedom, which assures each faculty member the freedom to criticize and advocate changes in existing theories, beliefs, programs, and policies, and guarantees faculty the right to support any colleague whose academic freedom is threatened. Collegiality is a professional, not personal, criterion relating to the performance of duties within a department. Collegiality should not be confused with sociability, likability or conformity to certain views. Instead collegiality addresses such issues as the faculty member's compatibility with department missions and goals, an ability and willingness to work cooperatively within the department and college, a willingness to engage in shared governance, and a high standard of professional integrity in dealing with colleagues and students on a professional and personal level.

The University subscribes to the following description of collegiality from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) statement on professional ethics:

*As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas, professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.*

## SOULES COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

### Collegial Activities

- Demonstrate an ability and willingness to work cooperatively within the department and college
- Engages in shared governance
- Demonstrates high standards of professional civility and integrity in dealing with colleagues and students
- Contributes to a collegial department environment

### **Non Collegial Activities**

- Willingly violates important department or SCOB policies
- Does not participate in a positive fashion
- Intentionally creates a hostile work environment
- Engages in workplace violence, i.e., behaviors ranging from harassment, verbal abuse, aggressive behavior, physical contact, and violence
- Does not contribute to a collegial environment