

Updated by the personnel committee of the department of accounting, May 1, 2007.

**DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING
Annual Performance Review/Merit Criteria**

When rating an individual in each category, a chair will rely upon documentation gathered by the Department/College and that provided by the faculty member in the Faculty Activity Report. The documentation will be compared with the guidelines below to rate the individual. Faculty members are encouraged to self-evaluate themselves in writing in all three categories.

The Dean and the chair will confer on faculty performance evaluations in the Spring semester. The evaluations will be discussed between the Chair and faculty as part of the feedback process. The weights given to each area are 40% teaching, 40% scholarly/creative and 20% service.

Teaching Designations

Category 1 (3 points). A faculty member who is clearly excellent in the classroom compared with his or her peers. This person exhibits most of the following traits: is rated “significantly above average” or “above average” by students in a preponderance of evaluations of classroom performance; demonstrated enthusiasm for the subject matter; stimulates students of varying abilities; attends seminars or colloquia for improvement; tries new pedagogical methods and technologies in the classroom; shares successful techniques with colleagues; prepares thorough and challenging course syllabi, course materials and examinations; returns examinations and assignments with comments in a timely manner; is punctual and prepared for class and is readily available to students outside class time for discussion and counseling.

Category 2 (2 points). A faculty member in this category performs satisfactorily. Student evaluations rate this faculty member as an “average” teacher showing neither extremely good nor extremely poor qualities. Students learn from this faculty member, but would benefit from better organization of lecture materials and presentation, a wider variety of classroom methods and more innovation in the classroom. This faculty member would benefit from developing behaviors such as those described in “Category 1.”

Category 3 (1 point). A faculty member whose teaching needs more improvement and observation. Peer and student evaluations consistently rate this faculty member as “below average” with some of the following performance problems: does not use class time wisely, shows little enthusiasm for the subject matter or classroom interaction, does not return examinations and assignments in a timely manner, does not manage the classroom well, is not available to students, and habitually misses classes, is late for class, or is ill-prepared, etc. This level of performance often leads to student complaints, but with direction and improvement, this faculty member could become a satisfactory

teacher. A faculty with consistent ratings in this category without improvement should not be considered for “performance” or “merit pay.”

Category 4 (0 points). A faculty member whose teaching performance is not acceptable. Student evaluations consistently rate this faculty member as “below average.” Perceptions are that this person does not seem prepared for classroom activities, does not seem current on the subject matter and suffers from other problems mentioned in “Category 3.”

Intellectual Contributions Designations

Only intellectual contributions since the last evaluation (for merit this would suggest activity since the last merit adjustment) should be included in a faculty member’s performance evaluation. Both output during the performance review period and activity that will result in output in a later period are evaluated.* Scholarly publications which result from consulting, professional development activities and both internal and external grant activity are encouraged.

*Note that activity that is included in one evaluation period and is published in a subsequent period will count at a diminished value in the period of publication.

Category 1. A faculty member whose scholarly productivity is considered outstanding by peers. This would generally include more than one of the following in any combination: publications in a refereed journal (including an education or professional journal), or funded external grants, refereed proceedings from scholarly meetings, research monograph, textbook, scholarly book or chapters for a scholarly book, plus evidence of other scholarly activity. Productivity in nationally recognized journals or at nationally recognized professional meetings will be considered as being of a higher caliber than those appearing at the regional level.

Category 2. A faculty member whose scholarly activity is good. This may include at least one of the Category 1 activities and one or more of the following: material published as part of a textbook; papers published in trade journals and/or non-referred journals; refereed proceedings from professional meetings, case studies with teaching notes; external grant proposal submission, funded university-level research grant, the creation of generally available instructional software, papers under revision as result of peer review and journal editor instructions to revise and resubmit, plus evidence of other scholarly activity. However, the sum total of all activity is not equivalent to that of an “outstanding” faculty member.

Category 3. A faculty member who is clearly active, with one or more written pieces, such as university-level research grant proposal submission, unpublished papers presented at conferences, panel discussions, published book reviews, in-house publications and working papers, papers sent out for review plus other scholarly activity.

Category 4. A faculty member who exhibits little or no scholarly activity. For example, a presentation at an “in-house” colloquium, a funded School of Business research grant

and a completed manuscript that is under in-house review but is not yet submitted for external journal editor review.

Implementation: For each OIC, 0.25 points up to a maximum of 1 total for OIC. For peer reviewed journal articles, 1 point for each article with a maximum total of 3 points in research or scholarly.

Service Designations

Serving as faculty advisor to students groups, counseling students, helping students to secure jobs, participating at open houses; being available to colleagues; developing new programs; committee work for the university, school and department; contributing to department and faculty councils; fulfilling other needs of the department such as lunch with recruiters; coordinating departmental picnics; keeping the department updated on technology, etc., are all internal service activities which lead to satisfied students and high quality programs. Service activities outside the University include active participation in academic and accounting/information systems professional organizations, professional contributions to organizations, teaching in professional development programs, and consulting with the local/area business community. It may also include improving relations with alumni, as well as current and potential recruiters and donors, many of whom are alumni. Other service activities outside the university would include “community service” activities as they relate to the discipline. The individual faculty member must substantiate the quality of his/her time spent and contributions in the service area.

Category 1(3 points). A faculty member who is recognized as outstanding in the quality and quantity of service. This faculty member seeks out opportunities to contribute to the Department, School or University, attends scheduled university, school and department meetings, and regularly participates in many of the activities listed above or intensely contributes in a few of them. This person willingly accepts teaching assignments as dictated by the departmental, school and university needs.

Category 2 (2 points). A faculty member who is recognized as very good in the quantity and quality of service. This faculty member volunteers for projects occasionally, attends scheduled university, school and departmental meetings, open houses, etc., is willingly to serve when asked, and makes some contributions in many of the activities listed above or regularly contributes in a few of them. This person accepts teaching assignments as dictated by departmental, school and university needs.

Category 3 (1 point). A faculty member who does what is asked of him/her, but little more, this person attends meetings and open houses as requested, provides some service to school and department, keeps regular office hours, and is normally available for Texas State activities.

Category 4 (0 points). Not acceptable, a faculty member who provides minimal service. This person does not consistently exhibit the behaviors outlined under “Category 3.”