

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA MUMA COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURE AND CRITERIA

This document presents the procedure and criteria used in the annual evaluation of faculty in the Muma College of Business consistent with provisions of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) related to faculty evaluations. These criteria are applied uniformly in all schools in the Muma College of Business. These criteria, along with the documented and measurable performance outcomes specified, have been developed by the administration in the Muma College of Business with input from faculty. As required by the current CBA, implementation of these procedures and criteria are recommended by a majority vote of Muma College of Business full-time in-unit faculty members.

All full-time faculty members are evaluated annually. The period of the evaluation is for the preceding calendar year from January 1 through December 31. Performance evaluation in each category of teaching, research, and service is based on the faculty member's assigned duties. The evaluation in each category is assigned a numerical value of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5, respectively, which corresponds to the ratings used in the Sustained Performance Evaluations (SPE). Numerical values in the midpoints of the five categories are also used, when appropriate, for example an evaluation of 4.5 when performance is better than 4 but does not rise to the level of a 5.

Faculty Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to provide all the required data and any additional information that should be considered in the evaluation of performance in an annual report, for each of the following three categories: teaching, research, and service. Failure to provide an annual report results in disqualification for merit or other pay consideration that relies on the faculty annual evaluation. In addition, a rating of unacceptable is assigned to any category where no evaluative material was provided, except for the category of teaching, where the state-mandated common student evaluations will be used to determine the evaluation of teaching.

Director Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of the director to evaluate the faculty member using the following guidelines while considering all the information provided by the faculty member. As part of the director's written evaluation the faculty member should be provided with measurable objectives that will be assessed at the next annual evaluation.

Teaching

Student evaluations of teaching in courses with enrollments of more than five students are the starting point for evaluation of teaching using the following criteria:

- (1) *unacceptable* if the average student evaluation of teaching scores for all courses taught was 2.0 or lower on the 5.0 scale (where 5.0 is outstanding) and there is insufficient additional evidence to support a higher rating;
- (2) *weak* if the average student evaluation of teaching scores was greater than 2.0 and less than 3.0 for all courses taught and there is insufficient additional evidence to support a higher rating;

- (3) *satisfactory* if the average student evaluation of teaching scores for all courses taught was equal to or higher than 3.0 and less than or equal to 3.75 and there is insufficient additional evidence to support a higher rating;
- (4) *strong* if the average student evaluation of teaching scores across all courses taught was greater than 3.75 and less than or equal to 4.5 and there is insufficient additional evidence to support a higher rating; and
- (5) *outstanding* if the average student evaluation of teaching scores was consistently above 4.5 across all courses taught and there is insufficient additional evidence to support a rating of *outstanding* (e.g., finalist or winner of a teaching award, new course developed, etc.).

The final assignment of the rating for teaching includes consideration of the level of courses taught (undergraduate, graduate), class sizes, primary delivery mode (mass lecture, online, case-based), the departmental and college average evaluations, written student comments, and if the employee's annual evaluation of teaching in the previous calendar year was less than satisfactory, or if employee agrees to it an observation of classroom teaching performed in accordance with the applicable provisions of the CBA. Consideration is also given to additional evidence provided by the faculty member regarding the quality of teaching, including but not limited to assignments and assessments employed in courses, course syllabi, innovations introduced into courses and co-curricular activities that are aimed at improving student success, and efforts to address creativity and/or analytics in the courses taught and co-curricular activities. The chair will convey in the written evaluation the factors that have been used in the final assignment of the rating.

Research

Research activity of faculty with research assignments should be aimed at making a scholarly contribution (as defined in Section I.A.3.b of the Tenure & Promotion Guidelines for the college) to the faculty member's primary or related academic disciplines. Faculty members who are tenured or tenure-earning with research assignments higher than 40 percent are expected to produce more and better quality research than faculty members with lower research assignments and those in non-tenure-earning positions. For non-tenure-track faculty with research assignments between 10 and 30 percent, the following criteria are modified such that meeting the criteria for a 3 may warrant a rating of 4 and meeting the criteria for 4.0 may warrant a rating of 5.

Because publishing research can be a lengthy process consideration will also be given to the research pipeline in terms of "revise and resubmit" outcomes, highly rated yet unfunded competitive grant applications, presentations at respected academic conferences, and work-in-progress. The rating for research also considers evidence provided of research impact (e.g., citations, h-index, and adoption of research in practice). To avoid counting published research multiple times, each contribution is recognized in the year in which final acceptance of publication is received rather than in the year in which it is actually published (clearly, an article can be accepted and published in the same year). Note that final acceptance of publication (e.g., letter from the editor) should be included as part of the annual report for the year under review.

Securing competitive research grants (e.g., NSF and NIH) may warrant ratings of 4 or 5 depending on the magnitude of funding obtained, the overhead rate, and the degree of competitiveness of the grant. Typically, faculty who serve as a PI/Co-PIs for externally funded, competitive grants can count the grant as a UTD/FT50 journal publication if the grant value represents \$150K or more.

To encourage interdisciplinary research and also research in new and promising areas that have the potential to influence business thinking and practice, due consideration may also be given to research published in interdisciplinary journals that are not included on the UTD/FT50 or the ABDC journal list. However, given the difficulty of assessing the quality of publications in several disparate areas, it will be the responsibility of the

faculty member to provide evidence of the impact and quality of such works.

Scholarly contributions other than journal articles, for example scholarly books, monographs, and chapters in scholarly books may be considered in assigning the research rating, but do not substitute for research in high quality peer-reviewed refereed journals. The faculty member must provide evidence of the impact and quality of the scholarly contribution of such works.

The evaluation score in the area of research is assigned using the following criteria, with consideration given to the above listed factors. If the faculty member has no publication acceptances during the annual evaluation period, higher ratings may be warranted based on tangible evidence from the above listed factors.

- (1) No or very little effort was put into research activities (e.g., no attempt was made to conduct research or to engage in research-related activities, continuing research did not progress to completion and projects were not submitted for publication in discipline-based peer-reviewed journals that conform to the Muma COB Research Publication Policy or accepted for presentation at respected academic meetings).
- (2) A submission to an A* or A journal on the ABDC list or to a journal with a similar impact factor that conforms to the Muma College of Business Research Publication Policy progressed beyond the desk review stage (assigned to a review team), or a paper was accepted for presentation at a respected academic meeting.
- (3) A UTD/FT50 submission progressed beyond the desk review stage (assigned to a review team), or a paper was accepted for publication in an A* or A journal on the ABDC list or a journal with a similar impact factor that conforms to the Muma College of Business Research Publication Policy.
- (4) A UTD/FT50 submission progressed to (a next round of) R&R status, or two papers were accepted for publication in A* or A journals on the ABDC list or journals with a similar impact factor that conform to the Muma College of Business Research Publication Policy.
- (5) A paper was accepted for publication in a UTD/FT50 journal, or two UTD/FT50 submissions progressed to (a next round of) R&R status.

Service

Faculty members with higher service assignments are expected to demonstrate more significant service undertakings in relation to faculty members with lower service assignments.

All service activities should be aimed at advancing one or more of the strategic priorities of the faculty member's school, the Muma College of Business, or the university. In assigning a rating for service, consideration is given to the type of committee(s) assignments, role in the committee(s), the level of the committee (school, college, university, external), and the extent to which external (non-university) service brings visibility and national recognition to the school, college, and/or the university. Evidence of the faculty member's efforts and contributions in both internal and external service may be solicited by the school director.

The evaluation of service is assigned using the following criteria:

- (1) The faculty member refused to fulfill any of the assigned service obligations assigned (e.g., committee work) and was absent for a majority of school and/or committee meetings;
- (2) The faculty member missed several school and/or committee meetings and/or did not fulfill service obligations in a timely manner and to the satisfaction of the school director or the chair(s) of the committee(s) to which the faculty member was assigned;
- (3) The faculty member performed all assigned service obligations at the minimum level of acceptability;

- (4) The faculty member performed all assigned service obligations in a manner that advanced the strategic priorities of the school, college, or university, and/or external service was extensive and noteworthy for the school, college, and/or university; and
- (5) The faculty member performed all assigned service obligations with distinction in a manner that significantly advanced the strategic priorities of the school, college, or university, and/or external service resulted in significant visibility and recognition to the school, and/or the university.

Annual Review Appeals Process

Faculty who are not satisfied with their evaluation can write a response to be included in their personnel file along with the annual review. Faculty can appeal the evaluation by requesting that the school's Committee A (or its equivalent) conduct an independent evaluation of the annual report. The appeal should include the rationale and basis for the appeal and may include clarification to already submitted materials. The appeal cannot include new material that was not included in the original annual report. The results of Committee A's evaluation will be included in the appropriate location in the FIS system and it will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

Conflict of Interest

The evaluator cannot evaluate a Related Person. A related person is one of the following: husband; wife; parent; child; brother; sister; spouse of a child, brother, sister, or parent; or parent, child, brother, or sister of spouse; grandparent; grandchild; aunt, uncle, first cousin, niece or nephew. A "Related" person also includes a person who is engaged to be married to the evaluator or who otherwise holds himself or herself out as or is generally known as the person whom the evaluator intends to marry or with whom the evaluator intends to form a household, or any other person having the same legal residence as the evaluator. (USF Policy 0-027).