

DEPARTMENT OF MARKETING

MPPS

Faculty Evaluation, Performance, and Merit Policy

PURPOSE

This policy explains the annual faculty evaluation process, including expectations of faculty, evaluation criteria, the role of the personnel committee and department chair, and procedures for determining performance and merit raises. This policy is designed to promote a collegial environment that encourages excellence and emphasizes academic professionalism.

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES

CBAPPS 5.01 Faculty Evaluation
CBAPPS 5.04 Merit/Performance Policy
CBAPPS 5.06 Workload Policy

AAPPS 7.10 Procedures for Awarding Merit and Performance Raises
AAPPS 8.09 Performance Evaluation of Faculty and Post-Tenure Review

FACULTY EXPECTATIONS

Faculty members in the Department of Marketing are expected to be contributing members of an academic team that seeks to fulfill and support the goals of the department, college, and University involving teaching, scholarly activity, and service. They are expected to carry out their responsibilities with integrity, professionalism, and a spirit of collegiality.

Performance evaluation in the research, teaching, and service areas is the primary basis for decisions concerning salary, promotion, tenure, merit, and other rewards. In order to be eligible for tenure and/or promotion, the faculty member must meet the minimum requirements as set forth in relevant tenure and promotion policies.

Faculty members in the McCoy College of Business Administration are expected to remain Academically Qualified (AQ) or Professionally Qualified (PQ). Normally, full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty should be AQ and full-time lecturers and instructors should be PQ. The performance standards associated with AQ and PQ are described in CBAPPS 5.06. Faculty members who fail to remain qualified are not eligible for merit raises, summer teaching, reduced course load, or graduate faculty status.

ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS

1. Faculty members are expected to submit their Annual Activity Report and Plan to the chair, along with supporting documentation. Documentation and description should address the minimum areas as noted in CBAPPS 5.01.
2. The chair will review the Annual Activity Report and any additional information submitted by the faculty member, to rate the faculty member from 1 (lowest rating) to 4 (highest rating) on the teaching, scholarly activity, and service criteria specified in this policy. An overall score for each faculty member will also be developed. The overall score is calculated using the chair's ratings along with the appropriate weights for teaching (.40), scholarly activity (.40), and service (.20) under the McCoy CBA Workload Policy. Table 1 provides an example of how the weights will be applied to the teaching, scholarly activity, and service ratings to create an overall score.
3. The chair will review Annual Activity Plan for purposes of future faculty development and not to make performance or merit decisions.
4. The chair will meet with each faculty member to discuss the Annual Activity Report and Plan. A copy of the chair's evaluation and comments will be provided to the faculty member. Faculty members may make written comments on the annual evaluation before it is placed officially in departmental personnel files.

PERFORMANCE AND MERIT PROCESS

1. Unless otherwise mandated by the Texas Legislature or the Texas State Board of Regents, faculty salary raises at Texas State will be based on performance and merit and will not be based on an "across-the-board" or "cost-of-living" basis.
2. A performance raise is defined as a prescribed number of salary steps awarded to all faculty members whose performance in teaching, scholarly activity, and service meet the expected criteria of the Department of Marketing. A merit raise is defined as salary steps awarded to faculty members who exceed expected criteria in teaching, scholarly activity, and service as specified by the Department of Marketing.
3. In determining performance and merit raises, the personnel committee, chair, and the dean will consider faculty performance over the years determined by the University. Faculty who wish to be excluded from merit considerations should notify their chair in writing.
4. Within a week of the university determining the availability of performance and merit raises, the chair will convene the personnel committee and distribute a matrix showing the overall scores of each faculty member for the relevant time period (see Table 2). Members of the personnel committee will have access to the documentation from which the scores were derived. Personnel committee members will have an opportunity to review the documentation, individually or collectively, prior to making recommendations to the chair.
5. An average score of at least 2.0 on a 4.0 scale earned over the relevant time period makes a faculty member eligible for a performance increase.
6. An average score of at least 3.0 on a 4.0 scale earned over the relevant time period makes a faculty member eligible for a merit increase. Merit increases may be determined using natural breaks/cutoffs in the average scores earned during the relevant time period.

Faculty must be Academically Qualified or Professionally Qualified in order to be considered for merit.

7. The chair will evaluate the materials submitted by each faculty member for performance and merit raises independent of the recommendations of the personnel committee.
8. The chair will meet with faculty members to discuss the approximate level of merit determined for that faculty member. Faculty members who believe their accomplishments have been overlooked or undervalued may, within five working days, request a meeting with the chair to ask for reconsideration. After reconsideration, the chair will make final recommendations to the dean.
9. Faculty who are dissatisfied with the chair's final recommendation may appeal to the dean. The decision of the dean is final and not subject to grievance.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

When rating an individual in each category, the department chair will rely upon documentation gathered by the department or college and that provided by the faculty member in the Faculty Activity Report. The documentation will be compared to the guidelines below to rate faculty members.

Teaching

For purposes of faculty evaluation both numerical scores and open-ended comments in student evaluations will be considered. Consideration may be given to items such as size of classes, required versus elective courses, time course is taught, level of course (graduate versus undergraduate), nature of course (writing intensive, quantitative, online, etc.), where taught (on-campus, off-campus), and grade distribution. Additional considerations may include new course development and/or revision of existing courses, honors or recognition for teaching effectiveness, and efforts toward professional improvement and development. The following four categories will be used to evaluate teaching activities.

Category 4. A faculty member whose teaching performance is outstanding.

Is rated significantly above average on teaching evaluations (with equal weights on all 16 items). Additional consideration will be given to the faculty member's score on item 17.

A faculty member in this category does the following:

- Strives for continuous improvement of courses taught.
- Prepares thorough and challenging course syllabi, course material and examinations.
- Integrates current examples and materials into classroom instruction.
- Is available to students outside of class.
- Interacts effectively with students.

Category 3. A faculty member whose teaching performance is very good.

Is rated above average on teaching evaluations (with equal weights on all 16 items). Additional consideration will be given to the faculty member's score on item 17.

A faculty member in this category does the following:

- Strives for continuous improvement of courses taught.
- Prepares thorough and challenging course syllabi, course material and examinations.
- Integrates current examples and materials into classroom instruction.
- Is available to students outside of class.
- Interacts effectively with students.

Category 2. A faculty member whose teaching performance is good.

Is rated around average on teaching evaluations (with equal weights on all 16 items).
Additional consideration will be given to the faculty member's score on item 17.

A faculty member in this category does the following:

- Strives for continuous improvement of courses taught.
- Prepares thorough and challenging course syllabi, course material and examinations.
- Integrates current examples and materials into classroom instruction.
- Is available to students outside of class.
- Interacts effectively with students.

Category 1. A faculty member whose teaching performance is not acceptable, often leading to student concerns and complaints. This faculty member would benefit from development of characteristics and activities such as those described in the above categories.

Is rated below average on teaching evaluations (with equal weight on all 16 items).
Additional consideration will be given to the faculty member's score on item 17.

Student evaluations indicate the following performance problems:

- Does not seem prepared for classroom activities.
- Does not manage the classroom well.
- Is not available to students.
- Does not seem current with the subject matter.
- Shows little enthusiasm for the subject matter or classroom interaction.
- Provides limited or no feedback regarding classroom performance.

Scholarly Activity

The faculty member's scholarly activities will be based on quantity and quality of contributions to the discipline, with an emphasis on peer reviewed journal publications. Indicators of quality may include acceptance rates, editorial review boards, reputation in discipline or area, citations, number of authors, and other factors.

Performance at the category 2 level is required to maintain AQ or PQ status. Even after a faculty member has achieved AQ or PQ, he or she is expected to present evidence of continuous

scholarly activity on an annual basis. The following four categories will be used to evaluate scholarly activities.

Category 4. A faculty member whose scholarly activity is outstanding.

AQ: The minimum requirement includes three peer reviewed academic journal publications within the previous five-year period (not all may be in the area of instructional development).

PQ: The minimum requirement includes two intellectual contributions within the previous five-year period.

Continuous scholarly activities may include refereed proceedings or presentations from respected international and national scholarly meetings, textbooks, grants, and other scholarly contributions at the international and national level. Evidence may also include honors or recognition for scholarly activity.

Category 3. A faculty member whose scholarly activity is very good.

AQ: The minimum requirement includes two peer reviewed academic journal publications within the previous five-year period (not all may be in the area of instructional development).

PQ: The minimum requirement includes four development activities, including at least one intellectual contribution, within the previous five-year period.

Continuous scholarly activities may include refereed proceedings or presentations from respected scholarly meetings, textbooks, grants, and other scholarly contributions.

Category 2. A faculty member whose scholarly activity is good.

AQ: The minimum requirement includes five or more intellectual contributions, including at least one peer reviewed journal article, within the last five years (not all may be in the area of instructional development).

PQ: The minimum requirement includes three or more developmental activities, including at least one intellectual contribution, within the previous five-year period.

Continuous scholarly activities may include material published as part of a textbook, papers published in trade/professional journals or non-refereed journals, non-refereed proceedings, presentations at professional refereed meetings, grants, published book reviews, case studies with teaching notes, the creation of generally available instructional software, papers sent out for review, and other scholarly contributions.

Category 1. A faculty member who presents little or no evidence of continuous scholarly activity. The faculty member is encouraged to develop habits and activities that will result in scholarly activity such as that described in the above categories.

Service and Leadership

Quantity, quality and time commitment associated with service and leadership activities will be considered in determining performance in the service category.

Examples of internal service include but are not limited to the following, and are in no particular order: helps students secure jobs, participates in on-campus workshops, teaches in professional development programs (within the university), student advising and/or sponsorship of student organizations, committee work, student or faculty mentoring, non-credit teaching, represents the department at college and university events, and serves on these committees.

Examples of external service include but are not limited to the following, and are in no particular order: active participation in professional or academic organizations, reviewer for conferences and journals, track chair, program chair, discussant, session chair for professional conferences, leadership and committee activities in academic or professional organizations, teaching in professional development programs (outside of university), invited lecturer related to the faculty member's area of teaching/research, consulting projects related to the faculty member's area of teaching/research, and volunteer community activities related to the faculty member's area of teaching/research. The following four categories will be used to evaluate service activities.

Category 4. A faculty member whose service is outstanding.

A faculty member in this category does the following:

- Seeks out service opportunities.
- Contributes significantly in terms of service to the department, college, university, professional associations, and/or community relative to the faculty member's area of expertise.
- Receives honors or recognition for service.

Category 3. A faculty member whose service is very good.

A faculty member in this category does the following:

- Contributes in terms of service to the department, college, university, professional associations, and/or community relative to the faculty member's area of expertise.
- Is willing and available when called upon to perform service at the department, college, or university level.

Category 2. A faculty member whose service is good.

A faculty member in this category does the following:

- Demonstrates some initiative.
- Participates in projects occasionally.
- Attends meetings and department, college, or university events, which he or she has been asked to attend.

Category 1. A faculty member who provides little or no evidence of service. There may be frequent complaints about this faculty member's lack of involvement and availability. This faculty member would benefit from activities such as those described in the above categories.

APPENDIX

Table 1: Example of Rating System and Overall Score

	Teaching Rating	Weight	Scholarly Rating	Weight	Service Rating	Weight	Overall Score
Faculty Member 1	4	.4	4	.4	3	.2	3.8
Faculty Member 2	4	.4	3	.4	2	.2	3.2
Faculty Member 3	3	.4	2	.4	3	.2	2.6

Table 2: Example of Faculty Matrix

	Overall Score Year 1	Overall Score Year 2	Overall Score Year 3	3 Year Average
Faculty Member 1	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.67
Faculty Member 2	4.0	3.0	3.6	3.53
Faculty Member 3	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.53
Faculty Member 4	3.3	3.1	3.3	3.23
Faculty Member 5	3.0	3.0	2.6	2.87
Faculty Member 6	2.3	2.8	2.8	2.63
Faculty Member 7	1.8	1.8	2.1	1.90

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

This PPS has been approved and represents the Department of Marketing policy and procedure from the date of the document until superseded.

Review Cycle: Every three years

Review Date: Sept. 1, 2008

Last Update: March 2005