CISQMPPS 5.01 Faculty Evaluation Policy

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this policy is to set forth guidelines for faculty evaluations by the Chair and Personnel Committee of the Department of Computer Information Systems and Quantitative Methods.

McCOY COLLEGE OF BUSINESS POLICIES

CBAPPS 5.01 Faculty Evaluation

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS POLICY AND PROCEDURE DOCUMENTS

8.10 Tenure and Promotion Review

Also see the current Faculty Handbook.
Academic Affairs Policy & Procedure Documents:

None is specific to the Annual Activity Plan or Annual Activity Report.

For information concerning teaching, research, and service refer to the following CBAPPS:

- 2.01 - 2.16 Curriculum Policies
- 3.01 - 3.12 Academic Requirements and Advising Policies
- 4.01 - 4.13 Teaching
- 5.01 - 5.03 Scholarly Activities & Grants
- 5.06 Workload Policy

GENERAL INFORMATION

The purpose of this departmental PPS is to provide the procedure and guidelines to be used by the Chair of the Department for annual faculty evaluations.

DEFINITIONS

The following five-point rating scale will be used to evaluate teaching, research, and service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Well above standards set by department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Above standards set by department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Meets standards set by department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Below standards set by department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Well below standards set by department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Time Period

The department’s faculty evaluation system will consider faculty performance over the preceding period from January 1 through December 31 or as mandated by the university. Only completed work will be considered.

Eligibility

All faculty members are eligible to participate in the annual evaluation.

I. Teaching

Teaching is understood to include not only classroom performance, but other factors, such as preparation for courses, effective testing, student support outside of the classroom, staying current in the discipline, as well as curriculum improvement and development. Teaching performance is evaluated over four categories. These are: classroom performance as reported by student evaluations and peer reviews where appropriate; faculty workload as reported by number of classes, number of preparations (new and existing), and class size and type, level of course (lower level, upper level, graduate), (required or elective); faculty development and collaboration as reported by the faculty member in their annual review.

Department Standard:

The minimum Department Standard is defined as successfully meeting all of the teaching activities that minimally meet the expectations of the department and are evaluated at a rating of 3.

An average student evaluation score of 3.5 is equivalent to a department evaluation score of 3.0, for its portion of the teaching component range of 0 – 5.

The student evaluation equivalent score will be used as a baseline, with adjustments based on faculty workload, number of class preps, class size, class type, level of course (lower level, upper level, graduate), (required or elective), number of new course preps, course development activities, and other teaching activities as appropriate, to determine the final teaching value. Scores will be rounded to the nearest whole number of 1 through 5.

II. Scholarly/Creative Activity

Scholarly/creative activities include research that leads to teaching enhancement and/or contribution to the body of knowledge.

Department Standard:

Minimum departmental standards/expectations correspond to the McCoy College AQ/PQ policy standards as defined in CBAPPS 5.07.

For evaluation purposes, peer reviewed journal articles (PRJs) are assigned a value of one and all other forms of intellectual contributions* (OICs) are assigned a value of .5.
The departmental research evaluation score is based on a rolling 3-year average of faculty research production where the formula is calculated as:

\[ AS = \frac{(\text{Current year PRJ's + OIC's}) + (\text{Previous year's PRJ's + OIC's}) + (\text{2 year previous PRJ's + OIC's})}{3}. \]

The faculty member’s research evaluation score would be assigned based on the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-year average</th>
<th>Evaluation Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 &lt; AS &lt; .2$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$.2 \leq AS &lt; .4$</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$.4 \leq AS &lt; .6$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$.6 \leq AS &lt; .8$</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$.8 \leq AS$</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example: a faculty member with 1-PRJ in Year 1, and 1-OIC in year 2, and 1-PRJ in year 3 would have an average score of $(1 + .5 + 1) / 3 = .83$. Their evaluation score would be a 5.

*A list of accepted intellectual contributions is provided as part of the annual faculty activity report.

III. Service

Service includes any activities that contribute to the accomplishment of internal and external service mission of the department, school, and university, as well as, assisting the faculty member to achieve his/her personal goals.

Department Standard:

Departmental standards/expectations are defined as a record of effective service in department, college, university, community, and professional areas. It is expected that each fulltime faculty member will actively participate as part of the departmental curriculum committee, attend at least one graduation ceremony a year, college and university level committees, and student and promotional related activities.

Individual faculty service expectations are determined in coordination with the Department Chair when reviewing the faculty activity plan during the annual faculty evaluation period.*

Faculty evaluation scores will be based on a comparison of the faculty member’s activity report as it compares to their activity plan.

*A list of accepted service activities is provided as part of the annual faculty activity report.
Procedure:

1. By approximately December 1 of each academic year, faculty members will be reminded in writing, that the process for evaluating faculty performance will begin shortly after the beginning of the spring semester.

2. On or before February 1, each faculty member will provide the department chair documentation of all teaching, scholarly, and service activities for the preceding year as part of the Annual Faculty Activity Report. The report template is provided in Appendix A.

3. The department chair will evaluate the performance materials submitted by each faculty member independent of the recommendations of the personnel committee. The results of the chair evaluation of each faculty member will be recorded on the form shown in Attachment B.

4. After the chair has completed his/her evaluations, the personnel committee, individually or collectively, shall be provided an opportunity to evaluate their departmental colleagues and provide the chair with feedback, which will be recorded on the form shown in Attachment C.

5. Based upon a review of the personnel committee recommendations, the department chair may make adjustments in his/her evaluations as appropriate. The written evaluations submitted by the personnel committee and the chair’s responses shall be made available to the Dean upon request.

Composite Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Track Yr 3-5</th>
<th>FT Lecturer</th>
<th>PT Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>0%**</td>
<td>0%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty members not on tenure-track are encouraged to engage in scholarly/creative activities but are not required to do so.
IV. Annual Faculty Activity Report

On or before February 1, each faculty member will provide the department chair documentation of all teaching, scholarly, and service activities for the preceding year as part of the Annual Faculty Activity Report. The report template is provided in Appendix A.

Please be advised that Digital Measures has an option under ‘Run Ad Hoc Reports’ for the Faculty Activity Report. This means that if you are maintaining your various activities in Digital Measures, then this report will pull in all that information and format it appropriately. I strongly encourage you to consider this option as it also supports your vita development and other college and university documentation requirements.

Documentation:

1. Teaching

All faculty members should list their activities in each of the following areas:

Classroom Performance: Student evaluations and Peer reviews
- Student evaluations provide feedback on individual class, overall course, and overall department evaluation scores.
- Student e-mails.
- Peer reviews are required for some faculty. Other faculty may request peer reviews from the personnel committee. Requests must be made prior to the assignment of required peer reviews.
- University and Program letters of recognition and accommodation.
- Other activities deemed relevant to Classroom Performance

Faculty Workload: Number of classes taught, Number of Preparations, Average Class size
- Direction of honors’ theses, or masters’ theses
- Out of classroom meetings, not including office hour visits
- Activities associated with the development or revision of courses
- Other activities deemed relevant to Faculty Workload

Faculty Development: Self reported on vita pulled from Digital Measures
- Formal study in relevant academic areas
- Attendance at conferences, short courses, or workshops
- Activities associated with acquisition of skills or knowledge necessary for the development or revision of courses
- Other activities deemed relevant to Faculty Development

Collaboration: Self reported on vita pulled from Digital Measures
- Being a course coordinator
- Teaching a specified support course (CIS 1323, QMST 2333, CIS 3380)
- Timely submission of assessment results
- Providing materials for and assisting faculty in preparation for a new course
- Other activities deemed relevant to Collaboration

Other: Any other activities that the faculty member deems relevant to Teaching.
2. Scholarly/Creative

Faculty members should list their achievements in the scholarly and creative areas. Only completed work will be considered; e.g., articles published and presentations made. All scholarly/creative contributions should be related to the faculty member’s primary or reference disciplines. It is recommended that refereed journal articles appear on the McCoy College list of approved journals. Various scholarly/creative activities may include but are not limited to:

Published refereed journal articles (PRJs)

Other Professional Research/Contributions (ICs):

- Professional certification (one time credit during review period)
- Published textbook
- Published chapter in textbook
- Published instructional material (manuals, study guides, etc.)
- Published peer-reviewed case
- Published non-peer-reviewed case
- Published book review
- Published standardization or professional examination questions
- Published peer-reviewed research note(s) in academic or prof. journals
- Published non-peer-reviewed research note(s) in academic or prof. journals
- National conference presentation with paper published in proceedings
- National conference presentation with published abstract
- Regional conference presentation with paper published in proceedings
- Regional conference presentation with published abstract
- Conducted professional workshop
- Externally funded research grant
- Published articles in non-peer-reviewed journals
- Published Software (one per product cycle)
3. Service

Faculty members should list their achievements in the area of service. Activities in this area may include but are not limited to:

Academic
  Departmental
   Directing or coordinating programs (administrative)
   Innovative curriculum or program development
   Judging local, district, area, regional, or national contests or shows
   Sponsoring major contests (local, state, regional, or national)
   Conducting TEA, summer, or externally funded short courses
   Conducting workshops or seminars (local, state, regional, or national)
   Conducting self studies (programmatic or required)
   Sponsoring student organizations
   Recruiting students
   Conducting study tours in professional fields
   Chairing and/or serving on departmental committees
   Advising students

College
  Conducting self-studies (programmatic or required)
  Directing or coordinating college-level programs
  Serving on or chairing college-level committees
  Sponsoring college-level organizations
  Recruiting students

University
  Conducting self-studies
  Directing or coordinating university-level programs
  Serving on or chairing university-level committees
  Sponsoring university-level organizations
  Recruiting students

Professional
  Participating on accreditation teams
  Serving on chairing major committees or boards of professional organizations
  Serving on editorial or review boards or as editor of professional publication
  Serving as an officer in professional organizations
  Coordinating major conferences
  Making public appearances in professional capacity
  Book Reviewer cited as contributor in text
  Unpaid Consulting
  Serving as session chair or track chair for a professional conference

Community
  Working with civic/social/service organizations (Chamber of Commerce, church, etc.)
  Working on civic events
  Working on joint city-university projects
  Public service (school board, city council, Tax Equalization Board, etc.)
Attachment A

Faculty Activity Report

Department of CIS and QM  
McCoy College of Business  
Texas State University – San Marcos

January 1, 20__ to December 31, 20__

Faculty Member’s Name: _______________________ Date:_______________

I. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS/CREATING A LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Please indicate your teaching load for the year in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 20__ Semester</th>
<th>Summer 20__ Terms</th>
<th>Fall 20__ Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks: For each course, please summarize key activities that you accomplished. These activities must be relevant to the courses you taught and must be over and beyond those that would be considered normal class preparation e.g. innovative approach to teaching difficult concepts; routine supplemental instruction; special projects; etc. In addition, please comment on how well your actual activity compared with the activity plan that you had submitted.
II. INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS: RESEARCH & SCHOLARSHIPS
(Please use APA style when citing your intellectual contribution)

A. Published Books:
   a. Textbook
   b. Instructor Manual
   c. Study Guide
   d. Other

B. Published Journal Articles:
   a. Refereed Journal Articles
   b. Non-Refereed Journal Articles

C. Journal Articles (Accepted, Forthcoming, or in Press)
   a. Refereed Journal Articles
   b. Non-Refereed Journal Articles

D. Professional Conference Proceedings (list in order of National and Regional)
   a. Refereed Proceedings Articles
   b. Non-Refereed Proceedings Articles
   c. Conference Abstracts and/or Presentations

E. Funded Research Grants
   a. External:
   b. Internal (University, College):

F. Invited Talks, Presentations and Lectures to Professional Organizations

G. Workshops Conducted

H. Other

I. Works Under Review by Professional Journals
III. SERVICE: INSTITUTIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL

University:

McCoy College:

Department:

Professional Associations:

Community:

II. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES:

III. OTHER COMMENTS:
Attachment B

FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

January 1, 20___ to December 31, 20___

Faculty Member’s Name: ___________________________ Date: __________________

A. Evaluation of Teaching

Justification for teaching score:

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

B. Evaluation of Research

Justification for research score:

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

C. Evaluation of Service

Justification for service score:

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

Composite Evaluation:

Rating    Explanation
5.........................Well above standards set by department.
4.........................Above standards set by department.
3.........................Meets standards set by department.
2 .........................Below standards set by department.
1.........................Well below standards set by department.

Tenured  Tenure Track  FT  PT
Yr 3-5  Lecturer  Lecturer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure Track Yr 3-5</th>
<th>FT Lecturer</th>
<th>PT Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>0%**</td>
<td>0%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The faculty evaluation score, for full time faculty that have been with Texas State University for less than 3 years, will be determined by the Department Chair and reviewed by the Personnel Committee.

**Faculty members not on tenure-track are encouraged to engage in scholarly/creative activities but are not required to do so.
EVALUATION

January 1, 20___ to December 31, 20___

Faculty Member’s Name: ______________________Date:________________

SECTION A: TO BE COMPLETED BY FACULTY MEMBER

1. Overall, I evaluate my accomplishments as compared to my previous year’s activity plan as:

   __________ Below Expectations
   __________ At Expectations
   __________ Above Expectations

Comments____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Faculty Member’s Signature: _______________ Date: __________________

SECTION B: TO BE COMPLETED BY THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR

1. Overall, I evaluate the faculty member’s accomplishments of as compared to his/her activity plan as:

   __________ Below Expectations
   __________ At Expectations
   __________ Above Expectations

Comments____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Faculty Member is: ______AQ ______PQ ______Other (For 1/1/20__ to 12/31/20__)

____________________________________________________________________________
Chair’s Signature:   Date:
Faculty Activity Plan
Department of CIS and QM
McCoy College of Business
Texas State University – San Marcos

January 1, 19___ to December 31, 20___

Faculty Member’s Name: ____________________Date:__________________

1. Objectives and Plan for Excellence in Teaching:
   Include your plans for
   a. improvements in courses you are currently teaching:
   b. teaching new courses
   c. developing new courses

2. Objectives and Plan for Excellence in Research:
   Include your plans for
   a. building a strong research stream
   b. enhancing the quality of your research outlet
   c. enhancing current research activity.

3. Objectives and Plan for Excellence in Service:
   Include your plans for increasing participation in service oriented activities, including service to the profession and community.

________________________________              ________________________
Faculty Member’s Signature    Date:
Faculty Activity Plan
Department of CIS and QM
McCoy College of Business
Texas State University – San Marcos

January 1, 19__ to December 31, 20__

Chair’s Remarks:

1. Faculty Member’s Activity Plan:

   I ______ (agree) ______(disagree) with the faculty member’s plan.

   Comments:________________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________________________

2. Faculty Member’s Assigned Workload for 20__ - 20__ Academic Year

   Workload Plan A_______Workload Plan B_______Workload Plan C_______

3. Recommended Development Plan to Maintain AQ or PQ status
   a. For tenured and tenure-track faculty members NOT assigned to Workload Plan A to regain AQ status
   b. For Lectures and instructors assigned to Workload Plan C to maintain their PQ status.

____________________________   _________________
Chair’s Signature     Date
Department of Computer Information Systems
and Quantitative Methods

CISQMPPS 5.02 Faculty Merit Review Policy

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this policy is to set forth guidelines for faculty merit review by the Chair and Personnel Committee of the Department of Computer Information Systems and Quantitative Methods.

McCOY COLLEGE OF BUSINESS POLICIES

CBAPPS 5.01 Faculty Evaluation
CBAPPS 5.04 Merit/Performance Policy

UNIVERSITY POLICIES

AAPPS 7.10 Procedures for Awarding Merit and Performance Raises
AAPPS 8.10 Tenure and Promotion Review
Also see current Faculty Handbook

GENERAL INFORMATION

The purpose of this departmental PPS is to provide the procedure and guidelines to be used by the Chair of the Department and the Personnel Committee when determining the recommendations to be made with regard to the granting of merit adjustments.

DEFINITIONS

A MERIT raise is defined as a salary increase awarded to faculty members whose performance exceeds the expected criteria of the Department as described later under the Expectations section.

It should be noted that the evaluation for Merit is separate and independent from the evaluation for Tenure. For tenure track faculty, the requirements for tenure may exceed those of the departmental standards for Merit, and that consistently achieving excellent merit scores does not necessarily indicate progress toward tenure.

Evaluation Time Period

The department’s evaluation system combines MERIT evaluation with the faculty member’s normal annual evaluation. In determining MERIT raises, the Personnel Committee, the Department Chair, and the Dean will consider faculty performance over the preceding three year period as mandated by the university.
Eligibility

To be eligible for MERIT raises faculty must meet the following criteria:

- Be on at least a 50% workload
- If tenured or tenure-track, be academically qualified as defined by CBAPPS 5.07 Criteria for Academic and Professional Qualifications

Faculty members who wish to be excluded from merit consideration should notify the Department Chair in writing by February 1.

Process

The faculty merit review process is broken into two parts. Part 1 applies to those faculty that have been with Texas State University full time for less than 3 years. Part 2 applies to all faculty that have been with Texas State University full time for three years or more.

Part 1:

Merit evaluation, for full time faculty that have been with Texas State University for less than 3 years, will be determined by the Department Chair and reviewed by the Personnel Committee. The determination will be based the portfolio of accomplishments achieved in teaching, research, and service submitted in their annual faculty evaluation report.

Part 2:

Merit evaluation, for full time faculty that have been with Texas State University for 3 years or more, will be determined by the following process.

The Department Chair will evaluate faculty performance with respect to teaching, research and service using the composite result of the annual faculty evaluation. The allocation of merit will determined as a weighted average of evaluation of the 5-point scores achieved over the current year and the previous two years. The weights are allocated as 1/3 for each year.

For example a person who received a composite rating of 4 in 2009, 4.6 in 2010, and a 4.3 in 2011 would receive a merit review rating of 4.3.

Once all scores have been determined, the raise percentage will be allocated proportionally based on the available raise pool, university and college restrictions, and adjustments deemed appropriate by the department chair.

Last Updated: 11/4/2011