Policy and Procedures for the
The Department of Accounting,
McCoy College of Business Administration, Texas State University

PPS 5: Personnel Evaluation, Reappointment, Merit and Promotion Decisions

PPS 5.04.01 Merit/Performance Policy

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 for tenured and tenure track faculty are 40% teaching, 40% scholarly/creative and 20% service; for lecturers and clinical faculty the weights are 40% teaching, 20% scholarly/creative and 40% service. (Research for lecturers is encouraged but not required. See PPS 5.07 for AQ/PQ.)

Teaching Designations

Category 1 (3 points). A faculty member who is clearly excellent in the classroom compared with his or her peers. Peer evaluations, if available, rate this faculty member an excellent instructor, with an excellent understanding of the course material and demonstrated motivation or interest in teaching this course. 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 combined with indications of intellectual rigor suitable for the course content; demonstrated enthusiasm and depth of understanding 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 and provides intellectual rigor suitable for the course content. Peer evaluations, if available, rate this faculty member as demonstrating some intellectual depth of understanding of the course material, but suggest that more should be present. Student evaluations rate this faculty member as an
“average” teacher showing neither extremely good nor extremely poor qualities, but demonstrates reasonable competence and depth of understanding of the course material. Students learn from this faculty member at a level commensurate with the level of the course, but would benefit more if the faculty member spent more time in preparation and 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 considerable improvement and observation. Peer evaluations, if available, rate this faculty member as not demonstrating an intellectual depth of understanding of the course material, lack of motivation or interest in teaching this course. 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. 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. Peer evaluations and suggestions are ignored. 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 peer-reviewed journal (PRJ) activity is included only when it is in print (published) and when the journal is on college/department’s journal list. Publication quality will be assessed based on the journal quality list in place at the time of manuscript submission. Faculty members planning to submit a manuscript to a journal not on the college/department journal list are encouraged to petition to have the journal added to the list through the process set out by the McCoy Research Committee. Publications in journals not included in the college/department journal list will be categorized as an Other Intellectual Contribution (OIC). Definitions of PRJ and OIC are as defined by AACSB and McCoy Colleges CBAPPS.
Multiple presentations based on the same paper will not be considered in merit decisions.

**Category 1.** A faculty member whose scholarly productivity is considered outstanding by peers. This must include one or more publications in a highly rated refereed journal A+ (including an education or professional journal). Generally this would also include one or more than one of the following in any combination: publications in mid-tier or lower journals, funded external grants, refereed proceedings from scholarly meetings, research monograph, textbook, scholarly book or chapters for a scholarly book. Only rigorously peer reviewed acceptances at regional, national or international conferences are considered. Nationally recognized peer reviewed professional presentations will be considered as being of a higher caliber than those appearing at the peer reviewed regional level. However, in no case are presentations or proceedings considered as equal to peer reviewed publications in quality journals.

**Category 2.** A faculty member whose scholarly activity is good. This must include at least one publication in a mid-tier journal (B). 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 top and mid-tier peer reviewed journal articles, 1 point for each OIC and lower tiered publications, 0.25 points up to a maximum of 1 total for OIC, for each article with a maximum total of 3 points in research or scholarly.

Go to A+, A, B and C. C is for PQs and Clinical

**Service Designations**
Internal service activities are an integral part of faculty responsibilities and essential for an academic department that maintains strong relations with stakeholders and stays professionally current. As part of their obligations as members of the department, all full-time professors and lecturers are expected to provide meaningful service of value to the department, college, university, profession and/or community. This includes participation at scheduled faculty meetings, annual attendance at graduation, student organization professional meetings, honor society inductions, Awards Day and other designed representations for the department. Examples include committee work for the university, school and department; maintaining or improving accreditation documentation, contributing to department and faculty councils; serving as faculty advisor to students groups, developing new programs; participating at open houses; coordinating departmental functions; and keeping the department updated on technology, etc.

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 that enhance the reputation of the Department, College and/or University. 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. The faculty member’s service adds value to this institution. 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 and service 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. The faculty member’s service adds value to this institution. This faculty member volunteers for projects occasionally, attends scheduled university, school and departmental meetings, open houses, etc., is willing 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.

*Category 4 (0 points).* Not acceptable, a faculty member who provides minimal to no service. This person does not consistently exhibit the behaviors outlined under “Category 3.”