

Faculty Performance Review Policies, Procedures, and Instruments

This document contains the policies, procedures, and evaluation instrument related to faculty performance approved by the Robert C. Vackar College of Business & Entrepreneurship (RCVCOBE) faculty. The policies and procedures included are:

1. Policy on Full-Time Faculty Workload
2. Policy on Faculty Classification
3. Policy on Target Journal List
4. Policy on Tenure & Promotion and Annual Progress Towards Tenure Reviews
5. Policy on Promotion Criteria
6. Performance Evaluation Instrument

These policies resulted from the proposed policies offered by a task force represented by faculty from each department and various ranks. The task force chair presented the proposed policies to town halls in each of the six departments, and the dean presented them to town halls for staff and students. These town halls took place between March 26, 2021 and April 5, 2021. The task force incorporated feedback from these eight town halls into the final versions voted upon by the permanent full-time faculty in the college. The dean sent the final proposed policies to the faculty on April 29, 2021, with a two-week window for review and voting. On May 14, 2021, the policies were passed by a vote of 61 in favor and 10 opposed.

The task force members were:

Dr. Arno Forst (Chair), Associate Professor of Accounting
Dr. Kevin Cruthirds, Associate Professor of International Business
Dr. Ahmed Elnahas, Assistant Professor of Finance
Dr. Reto Felix, Associate Professor of Marketing
Ms. Maria Leonard, Lecturer II, Management
Dr. Bin Wang, Associate Dean and Professor of Information Systems

Policy on Full-time Faculty Workload

1. General Provisions for Faculty Workload

1.1. The purpose of this faculty workload policy is to set forth guidelines for the equitable and fair distribution of workloads for full time faculty across, as well as within, departments at VCOBE, while at the same time permitting each department head, under the supervision of the dean, to best deploy faculty to foster student success and advance the department's mission.

1.2. The duties that commonly constitute a faculty member's workload fall under the areas of instruction, research/scholarship or creative activity, service, clinical duties, community engagement, and administration, and are tied to the faculty member's classification as follows:

Faculty Classification	Teaching	Research	Service
Lecturer*	90	0	10
Professor of Practice*	80	0	20
Clinical Professor	70	10	20
Tenured Teaching Faculty	60	20	20
Tenured Research Faculty	50	30	20
Tenure-Track Faculty	40	50	10
Doctoral Eligible Faculty	40	50	10

*With approval of the Department Chair and Dean, Lecturers and Professors of Practice can choose to allocate ten percent of their Teaching to Research. An election to reallocate ten percent of Teaching to Research will generally be binding for a three-year period.

1.3.1 The College bases teaching expectations for its full-time faculty on a weighted student credit hours (WSCH) model. Considering a faculty member's release time for research and service obligations according to the faculty's classification, faculty is expected to teach WSCHs within the following annual average target ranges over a three-year period:

Faculty Classification	Range Maximum	Range Minimum
Lecturer	1,858	1,548
Lecturer with 10% research	1,651	1,376
Professor of Practice	1,651	1,376
Professor of Practice with 10% research	1,445	1,204
Clinical Professor	1,445	1,204
Tenured Teaching Faculty	1,238	1,032
Tenured Research Faculty	1,032	860
Tenure-Track Faculty	908	688
Doctoral Eligible Faculty	908	688

1.3.2 For faculty with administrative assignments, WSCH range maximums and minimums will be determined proportionate to the additional administrative duties assigned and so specified in the offer letter.

1.3.3 Faculty WSCH teaching targets are computed over a three-year average. Accordingly, depending on departmental need, faculty may exceed or miss their three-year average WSCH target ranges in a given year. However, department heads should strive to keep faculty in their designated WSCH ranges on an annual basis to minimize fluctuations in teaching loads to the extent possible.

1.3.4 For faculty changing classifications, the new WSCH range maximum and minimum apply as of the effective date of the faculty reclassification. In this case, faculty shall teach WSCH within the appropriate range for his or her new faculty designation for the remaining year or years of the three year workload period with no consideration given to any shortage or overage accrued in the year(s) prior to the reclassification.

1.3.5 For faculty holding a joint appointment, the department head of the faculty member's primary academic unit, in consultation with the head(s) of the unit(s) to which the faculty member is jointly appointed, will set the workload and productivity requirements.

1.3.6 Department heads will review and annually report to the dean faculty teaching loads and WSCHs for all faculty members in the department for the preceding year. They will also share current enrollment and WSCH information with their faculty. Department heads will ensure that faculty achieve their designated WSCH ranges over a three-year period on average. Failure to meet the established WSCH range minimums for individual faculty members, or for the department in the aggregate, may result in an unsatisfactory performance evaluation for the department head and/or the removal from administrative duties.

1.4.1 WSCH will be computed as the number of students enrolled in the class at census day, multiplied by the number of credit hours of the class, multiplied by a weight determined by the State of Texas Funding formula in force for the 2020/21 academic year, as detailed below:

Course Number Range	Weights from 2020/21 funding formula
1000-2999	1.13
3000-4999	1.79
5000-7999	3.27
8000-9999	28.23

To allow for more stable planning, the 2020/21 funding formula weights will be applicable for purposes of this policy until the conclusion of the 2023/24 academic year at which time the then current weights will become binding for the following three year period, and so forth.

1.4.2 Recognizing that smaller sections are often unavoidable to meet departmental needs each lecture-based course is considered to have a specific minimum enrollment regardless of actual enrollment, as detailed below:

Course Number Range	Minimum Enrollment Threshold
1000-2999	40
3000-4999	25
5000-7999	15
8000-9999	3

1.4.3 Non-lecture-based courses, such as Dissertation or Thesis supervision, Scholarship Seminar, Independent Studies, and Internship Courses are not subject to these minimum enrollment thresholds and count with their actual enrollment only. However, per doctoral student, no more than a total of twenty-four credit hours of dissertation supervision (Dissertation Residency or Extension) shall count for purposes of computing a faculty member's workload.

1.4.4 All full-time faculty, regardless of their classification, shall teach at least one lecture-based course per semester. Faculty classified as Doctoral Eligible Faculty shall not teach less than three lecture-based courses per Academic year.

2. Other Provisions

2.1. Full-time faculty generally is required to maintain a minimum of one office hour per week requiring physical presence for each lecture-based three credit hour class assigned. Faculty teaching entirely online may offer their office hours online.

2.2 Specific course assignments shall be determined by the head of each department in consultation with the faculty member based on departmental need while also taking into account research and service activities expected from faculty, the experience, qualification and preference for teaching a specific sub-discipline, geographic location, as well as any and all aspects relevant to the difficulty of the teaching assignment, including, but not limited to, typical class size, delivery format, graduate instruction, team-taught courses, writing intensive courses, or courses with service learning components.

VCOBE Full-time Faculty Classification Policy

1. The purpose of this policy is to set forth guidelines for the classification of full-time faculty at VCOBE. Faculty classifications are relevant for faculty workload and annual performance evaluations.

2. Definitions

Department – An academic unit organized within a college, usually devoted to a particular academic discipline. This academic unit may be referred to as a department, school, or center, and the unit’s head (usually a chair or director) reports to the dean of the college.

3. VCOBE recognizes the following full-time faculty classifications:

Title	How classified?
Lecturer	Faculty is classified in this category according to their offer letter.
Professor of Practice	Faculty is classified in this category according to their offer letter.
Clinical Professor	Faculty is classified in this category according to their offer letter.
Tenure-Track Faculty	Faculty is classified in this category according to their offer letter.
Tenured Teaching Faculty	Default classification for all tenured faculty not otherwise classified.
Tenured Research Faculty	Faculty is classified in this category according to section 1.6.
Doctoral Eligible Faculty	This status is acquired or sustained by meeting the VCOBE doctoral eligible faculty status criteria.

4. Lecturers, Professors of Practice, Clinical Professors, and Tenure-Track Faculty are so designated in their offer letter.

5. Tenure-stream faculty will be classified as Doctoral Eligible Faculty upon meeting doctoral eligible faculty classification requirements set by the VCOBE PhD committee and approved by the Dean.

6. For tenured faculty, a classification as Tenured Teaching Faculty or Tenured Research faculty will be determined in a conversation between the faculty member and the department chair by considering departmental needs and faculty preference. However, a classification as Tenured Research Faculty requires a minimum record of scholarship equal to approximately half of the research productivity of Doctoral Eligible Faculty.

7. To allow for consistent annual faculty performance evaluations and planning for workload purposes, classifications will generally be binding for a three-year period. Faculty classifications will be determined at the time of hire or, initially for existing faculty, in the Spring 2021 semester and every three years thereafter. Faculty reclassifications during the three-year period will have immediate effect.

VCOBE Policy on Target Journal List

1. Purpose, General Provisions, and Definitions

1.1. The purpose of this policy is to set forth guidelines for the establishment of a Target Journal List for the Robert C. Vackar College of Business and Entrepreneurship (VCOBE) that focuses on high quality research, but is also reflective of VCOBE's mission. As such, the Target Journal List will give faculty clear guidance which journals to aim for to achieve, for instance, tenure and promotion. Importantly, a uniform Target Journal List for VCOBE will also ensure that faculty research goals at the individual level are consistent with VCOBE's strategic goals for elevating its research profile. The Target Journal List will be the sole journal list used by VCOBE for all purposes, including, but not limited to, tenure and promotion decisions, the determination of doctoral eligible faculty status, and faculty annual performance evaluations.

1.2. The Target Journal List will be maintained by the VCOBE Research and Engagement Committee.

1.3. Department – An academic unit organized within the VCOBE, usually devoted to a particular academic discipline. This academic unit may be referred to as a department, school, or center, and the unit's head (usually a chair or director) reports to the Dean of the college.

2. Journal ranks

2.1. VCOBE considers four levels of academic journals as outlined below. These four levels are meant as guides, with the recognition that journal quality is a continuous measure and there will be variation within levels.

2.1.1. Elite Journals

Research published in Elite journals has the highest level of influence on the discipline. This category includes a small number of the highest impact journals. Publication in these outlets requires an extensive amount of time for manuscript preparation, vetting, and revision.

2.1.2. High Impact Journals

Research published in High Impact journals has a high level of influence on the discipline. This category includes a small number of very highly regarded journals that are general in scope or are leading journals in specific subdisciplines of a given field.

2.1.3. Medium Impact Journals

Research published in Medium Impact journals has an influence on the discipline, but the journal may be more limited in readership or focus on a more specific subdiscipline. This category includes a moderate number of other general scope journals as well selected influential journals from various sub-disciplines of a given field.

2.1.4. Other Journals (Peer Reviewed Journals with Limited External Validation of Impact)

Research published in other peer reviewed journals not included in VCOBE's Target Journal List of Elite, High Impact, and Medium Impact journals are considered publications in "Other Journals".

3. Supplemented Chartered Association of Business Schools' Academic Journal Guide as the basis of VCOBE's Target Journal List

3.1. The Academic Journal Guide (AJG) published by the British Chartered Association of Business School (CABS) has developed into a leading guide for scholars to assess the range and quality of journals in business and management. The CABS AJG bases its journal ranking on peer review, editorial and expert judgement, and statistical information relating to the journal's impact by means of citations. It has become commonly used by AACSB accredited business school, including several of VCOBE's peer institutions. As such, VCOBE adopts the most current (2018) CABS AJG as the basis for the development of its Target Journal List.

3.2. Mapping of the CABS AJG to VCOBE's Target Journal List

3.2.1. All journals classified as level 4*and 4 in the CABS AJG will be included as Elite journals in VCOBE's Target Journal List.

3.2.2. All journals classified as level 3 in the CABS AJG will be included as High Impact journals in VCOBE's Target Journal List.

3.2.3 All journals classified as level 2 in the CABS AJG will be included as Medium Impact journals in VCOBE's Target Journal List.

3.2.4. All journals classified as level 1 in the CABS AJG and all other peer reviewed academic business journals not included as Elite, High Impact, or Medium Impact journals in the Target Journal List are considered Other Journals.

3.3. Process of limited supplementation of the CABS AJG

3.3.1. While the CABS AJG is a well vetted list with a focus on high quality, VCOBE recognizes that the possibility of minor misalignment exists between VCOBE's mission and a journal list that is of British origin and which has been primarily compiled for the use of member schools of CABS.

3.3.2. To provide proper incentives for faculty to publish in high quality journals relevant to VCOBE's mission, each department will be allowed to recommend for inclusion in the Target Journal List no more than six additional High Impact and six additional Medium Impact journals (twelve journals total from each department) for which other substantive evidence of high or medium impact exists.

3.3.3. Journals recommended for inclusion will be determined by the tenure stream faculty in each department. If a department spans more than one discipline, fair consideration shall be given to the interests of all disciplines represented in the department to arrive at a recommendation. Department chairs will submit their department's journals recommended for inclusion in the Target Journal to the VCOBE Research and Engagement Committee.

3.3.4. Journals recommended by departments for inclusion in the Target Journal List will remain effective until CABS releases an update to its AJG, at which time departments will make new recommendations in light of any changes to the AJG journal rankings that have occurred.

4. Frequency, procedures, and consequences of updates of the Target Journal list

4.1. CABS has in the past from time to time released updates to its AJG. VCOBE's Target Journal List will remain in effect until such time CABS will release an update to its AJG. The updated CABS AJG will become the new basis for VCOBE's Target Journal List with immediate effect. Departments will be requested to provide updated recommendations for supplemental journals according to section 3.3.

4.2. To protect the good faith of faculty who have targeted certain journals in reliance on VCOBE's Target Journal List then in effect, faculty will be protected from the consequences of downgrades in journal rank. For tenure & promotion decisions, the determination of doctoral eligible faculty status, faculty annual performance evaluations, and other considerations by VCOBE and its departments, all publications will be considered with the higher journal rank manifested in the Target Journal in effect at the time of the submission. This section 4.2. does not apply to the switch from the former VCOBE endorsed journal list, the Australian Business Deans Council's (ABDC) Journal Quality List, to VCOBE's new CABS AJG based Target Journal List described herein.

4.3. As a consequence of any new Target Journal List taking immediate effect (in accordance with section 4.1.), if a journal is upgraded in rank on the Target Journal List, a publication in such journal shall count with its higher rank for tenure & promotion decisions, the determination of doctoral eligible faculty status, faculty annual performance evaluations, and other considerations by VCOBE and its departments.

5. Effective Date. The VCOBE Target Journal List as compiled by the process detailed herein shall supersede VCOBE's currently adopted journal list, the Australian Business Deans Council's Journal Quality List effective in Fall 2021 for all purposes and considerations unless otherwise provided in UTRGV's Handbook of Operating Procedures.

Policy on Tenure and Promotion and Annual Progress towards Tenure Reviews for Tenure Track Faculty

1. Purpose, Definitions, General Provisions

1.1. The purpose of this document is to provide college-wide uniform guidance for the requirements for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, as well as for annual progress towards tenure reviews, of tenure-track faculty at the Robert C. Vackar College of Business and Entrepreneurship (VCOBE). In addition to the expectations articulated in this document, expectations for the evaluation may also be expressed in the candidate's original appointment offer letter, the departmental tenure and promotion policies, and the annual progress towards tenure reviews.

1.2. Department – An academic unit organized within the VCOBE, usually devoted to a particular academic discipline. This academic unit may be referred to as a department, school, or center, and the unit's head (usually a chair or director) reports to the dean of the college.

1.3. All Personnel Actions/Evaluations will be undertaken following the guidelines specified in the [Handbook of Operating Procedures](#) (HOP), by the departments, and in this document. In case of discrepancies between standards and/or guidelines developed by the departments, by VCOBE, or the Division of Academic Affairs (including the HOP), the latter of the documents prevail.

1.4. Guiding Principles. Evaluations for annual progress towards tenure reviews, tenure, and promotion will consider expectations for research, teaching, and service. Many factors and criteria, both subjective and objective, are considered in recommending a faculty member for reappointment, tenure, and advancement in academic rank. The overall evaluation of a candidate for reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall include consideration of the candidate's personal integrity and professional behavior, as recognized by the university community. A sound ethical approach to all aspects of teaching, research, and service are expected of all who seek a positive progress towards tenure recommendation, tenure, and promotion.

Judgments based on race, color, sex, religion, national origin, age, disability, genetic information, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, or other legally protected categories are expressly forbidden.

2. Criteria for Granting Tenure

2.1. The granting of tenure is a decision that plays a crucial role in determining the quality of UTRGV faculty and the national and international status of UTRGV and VCOBE. The awarding of tenure must be based on convincing documented evidence that the candidate has achieved a significant body of scholarship, excellence as a teacher, and effectiveness in providing service. The candidate must also instill confidence in his or her ability to continue and sustain, over the long term, a program of high quality scholarship, teaching, and service relevant to the mission of the university, VCOBE, department, and profession.

2.1.1. For purposes of the tenure decision, VCOBE places particular emphasis on research and teaching. Although service receives less weight than research and teaching for the tenure decision, it is expected that all faculty contribute positively in this area. In evaluating a candidate for tenure, there is an important judgment component; the following criteria are meant to guide the reviewer but not to replace the judgment of those reviewing the file.

2.1.2. Target Journal List. VCOBE uses its Target Journal List to evaluate research for the purpose of progress towards tenure reviews, tenure, and promotion decisions. Reference to Elite, High Impact, Medium Impact, and Other journals corresponds to the ranking of the respective journal in VCOBE's Target Journal List. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to follow the guidance provided by the Target Journal List in their submission decisions.

2.2. Research. In evaluating a candidate's research portfolio for tenure, VCOBE expects the candidate to meet general and discipline specific requirements.

2.2.1. With respect to the general requirement, regardless of the candidate's discipline, all candidates seeking tenure must be classifiable as doctoral eligible faculty based on their publication record at the time of the application for tenure.

2.2.2. With respect to discipline specific requirements, VCOBE expects that candidates seeking tenure have achieved a minimum record of scholarship that with respect to quantity and quality of publications is at par with the typical five-year publication record of tenured faculty in the same discipline at VCOBE's peer institutions, i.e., Florida Atlantic University, Kent State University, Louisiana Tech University, New Mexico State University, Old Dominion University, and the University of Massachusetts-Boston.

Based on a peer review of faculty publications in VCOBE's Target Journal List at these peer institutions, the expected minimum quantity of publications in journals ranked Medium Impact or higher on VCOBE's Target Journal List, and the expected minimum quality of these publications, as demonstrated by a minimum number of points from publications in Elite (100 points per publication) and High Impact (40 points per publication), are as follows:

Discipline	Minimum number of publications ranked Medium Impact or higher on VCOBE's Target Journal List	Minimum points from Elite and High Impact publications (High Impact = 40 points, Elite = 100 points)
Accounting	3	80
Economics	4	120
Finance	4	160
International Business and Entrepreneurship	4	200
Information Systems	5	160
Management	4	200
Marketing	5	160

2.2.3. VCOBE values collaboration among faculty and interdisciplinary research. Publication in peer reviewed journals outside the candidate's core discipline will count for the candidate. However, while it is acceptable to publish in disciplines outside the candidate's core discipline, at least half of the candidate's publications in elite and high impact journals must be from the candidate's discipline.

2.2.4. VCOBE values jointly authored scholarship as well as individually authored scholarship; there is no requirement for sole-authored publications. However, a successful candidate must demonstrate his/her ability to conduct independent research. Thus, the candidate's file should include a description of his/her relative contribution to each co-authored paper.

2.2.5. While Elite, High Impact, and Medium Impact peer reviewed journal articles are emphasized, published books, published book chapters, refereed presentations at academic conferences, invited research presentations, successful external grant activity, and other research activities are also valued as part of the research portfolio of a candidate. Other aspects considered in the evaluation of the candidate's research portfolio include the external reviewers' evaluations of the importance of the research, as well as the impact of the research as evidenced by SCOPUS citations.

2.2.6. Apart from meeting criteria, a positive prognosis is required that the candidate is likely to continue and sustain, over the long term, a program of high-quality scholarship. Accordingly, a successful candidate must display a strong publication record as well as a strong pipeline of research in progress.

2.3. Teaching. In evaluating a candidate's teaching portfolio for tenure, VCOBE primarily considers the two components of course design and course delivery. The awarding of tenure requires excellence in teaching as evidenced by either i) satisfactory course design and effective course delivery or ii) effective course design and satisfactory course delivery. Evidence for continuous improvement of course design and delivery, and the effective use of assessments of learning outcomes to inform the candidate's teaching are important.

2.3.1. Assessing the Quality of Course Design. Course design focuses on the structure of the course, the content of the course, and the assessment of learning outcomes. The quality of the course design will be evaluated based on the quantitative and qualitative results in student course evaluations, grade distributions, peer reviews of teaching, course materials (syllabi, exams, assignments), and the candidate's narrative about teaching. Evidence for continuous improvement of course design and the effective use of assessments of learning outcomes to inform the course design are important.

2.3.1.1. Satisfactory Course Design. A candidate will have a satisfactory course design if the course is designed in a manner that provides the student with the knowledge and skills required for basic application of the course content. Examples of this include a course that is organized, covers the appropriate content, maintains currency, and has appropriate assessments. Quantitative results in student course evaluations should be on par with the departmental average. It is expected that all courses will meet the standard of satisfactory course design. Major design issues raised in the peer reviews of teaching or the progress towards tenure reviews are expected to be addressed and improved upon.

2.3.1.2. Effective Course Design. Effective course design exceeds the satisfactory standard with courses that incorporate intentional planning designed to help students achieve significant learning. While the nature of an effective course design may vary depending on the class enrollment, subject content, and program, examples of this may include a variety of assessment tools specifically suited for the course, the integration of material from a variety of sources, design features that facilitate advanced application of the course content, etc. Quantitative results in student course evaluations should be in the 75th percentile of the department. In the narrative on teaching, the candidate must articulate the intentional planning that went into the course design.

2.3.2. Assessing the Quality of Course Delivery. Course delivery focuses on the act of teaching, including what happens in front of the classroom and other student interactions. For fully on-line courses, it includes the communication of material in any multimedia materials included in the course and interactions with students throughout the course. The quality of course delivery will be assessed based on peer reviews of teaching, quantitative and qualitative results in student course evaluations, and the candidate's narrative about teaching. Evidence for continuous improvement of course delivery and the effective use of assessments of learning outcomes to inform the course delivery are important.

2.3.2.1. Satisfactory Course Delivery. A candidate will demonstrate satisfactory course delivery if he/she is able to convey course content that provides the students with knowledge and skills required for basic application of the course content. For example, this includes being understandable, clear, organized, and respectful. Satisfactory course delivery should be evidenced by peer reviews and student evaluations that demonstrate satisfactory communication of course material. Major delivery issues raised in the peer reviews of teaching or the reappointment reviews are expected to be addressed and improved upon.

2.3.2.2. Effective Course Delivery. Effective course delivery exceeds the satisfactory standard with delivery that helps students achieve significant learning. Effective course delivery is evidenced by peer reviews and student evaluations that demonstrate exceptional communication of course material.

2.3.3. Other Factors Assessed in Evaluating the Teaching Portfolio. Although emphasis is put on the quality of course design and course delivery, participation in teaching conferences, professional development in teaching, and pedagogical research in business are also valued as part of the teaching portfolio of a candidate. Service on thesis and dissertation committees are also valued activities that support the candidate's teaching record.

2.4. Service. In evaluating a candidate's service portfolio for tenure, service to the department, college/university, community, and profession will be considered. Both the quantity of service and the quality of service are important. VCOBE expects a record of service that demonstrates the candidate's value to the functioning of the institution. Service to the profession and community are highly encouraged and valued, but are not a substitute for service at the department or college/university level.

3. Promotion to Associate Professor

3.1. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor. VCOBE follows the Promotion procedures as outlined in the HOP. To be promoted to Associate Professor, candidates must be recommended for tenure upon meeting the criteria specified in section 2.

4. Annual Progress towards Tenure Reviews

4.1. Importance of Faculty Development Plan. Tenure-track faculty will, with the guidance of the department chair and in consultation with a faculty mentor, develop, and annually revise, a personal faculty development plan that will provide a road map leading to the achievement of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor over the probationary period. Purpose of the plan is to define milestones in the areas of teaching, research, and service that upon successful completion will lead to meeting the criteria for tenure as outlined in section 2. The faculty development plan will provide an important yardstick to assess the candidate's satisfactory progress towards achieving tenure.

4.2. Reviewers at all levels, departmental tenure and promotion committees, department chairs, the VCOBE tenure, promotion and annual review committee, and the dean, are held to provide fair and honest feedback on the candidate's progress towards tenure to reduce a possible gap between perceptions of performance between the candidate and the department or college. While progress towards tenure reviews are conducted annually, a comprehensive and more thorough review will take place after year two.

4.3 Reviewers will provide formal feedback whether the candidate is making (1) satisfactory progress in all three areas, (2) satisfactory progress in all but one area, with defined short term goals to remedy the area of deficiency, or (3) unsatisfactory progress in more than one area with

defined short term goals to remedy the multiple areas of deficiency. Two consecutive reviews with unsatisfactory progress in any area may result in the removal from tenure track.

4.4. A judgment of satisfactory progress in any of the areas of teaching, research, and service only requires a probabilistic assessment that it is more likely than not that a candidate will meet expectations for tenure by the time of the tenure decision. Positive progress towards tenure reviews leading up to the tenure decision are therefore no guarantee of a positive tenure decision.

4.5. In the area of research, satisfactory progress requires the candidate to demonstrate progress in the execution of his or her faculty development plan typically by developing, and moving forward, a successful pipeline of research at various stages of progress, i.e., working projects, manuscripts submitted to conferences, manuscripts presented at conferences, manuscripts under review, manuscripts in the revise and resubmit stage, and manuscripts accepted for publication.

4.6. In the area of teaching, satisfactory progress requires the candidate to demonstrate progress in the execution of his or her faculty development plan towards achieving the standard of satisfactory, or effective, course development and course delivery over the probationary period. The candidate must achieve acceptable teaching performance, as evidenced by at least satisfactory course design and delivery, typically by the mid-point of their probationary period.

4.7. Service assignments for tenure-track faculty are minor initially, but will grow in significance over the probationary period. In the area of service, satisfactory progress requires the candidate to demonstrate progress in the execution of his or her faculty development plan by gradually advancing with respect to the quantity of service, but also the effectiveness with which the service obligations are discharged.

5. Effective Date

5.1. This *Policy on Tenure and Promotion and Annual Progress towards tenure Reviews for Tenure Track Faculty* will take effect in the fall 2021. However, sections 2 and 3 will not be applicable to faculty hired prior to fall 2020 unless that faculty member chooses to be governed by the changes and affirms that choice in writing to the department chair. To assure equitable reviews of tenure-track faculty affected by revisions in the standards/criteria, all review levels shall take into account when the changes occurred in the faculty member's probationary period when assessing their dossiers.

Policy on Promotion Criteria

The criteria for promotion within the Robert C. Vackar College of Business and Entrepreneurship (VCOBE) are established to define both the quality of performance and the **minimum achievements** expected of faculty applicants to be considered for promotion.

All references to journal rankings (*Elite*, *High Impact*, and *Medium Impact*) are to categories based on the VCOBE Policy on Target Journal List.

All references to scores, activities, or achievements are to values or items designated for activities or achievements in the VCOBE Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation Instrument.

Effective Date: This *Policy on Promotion Criteria* will be effective in fall 2021. For faculty hired prior to fall 2021 it will be effective in fall 2023 unless that faculty member chooses to be governed by the changes and affirms that choice in writing to the department chair. To assure equitable reviews of faculty affected by revisions in the standards/criteria, all review levels shall take into account when the changes occurred in the faculty member's probationary period when assessing their dossiers.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

During the applicable review periods set by the UTRGV *Handbook of Operating Procedures* (HoP) and *Tenure-Track/Tenure and Promotion Reviews Process and Guidelines* published by the Provost at the [Faculty Resources](#) webpage, the applicant should achieve the following items:

Category / Criteria for Promotion	For Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor
Research	<p>In the five academic years (AYs) prior to the application for promotion and following promotion to Associate Professor¹,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) scholarly publications meeting discipline-based research requirements in Section 2.2 of the <i>VCOBE Policy on Tenure and Promotion and Annual Progress towards Tenure Reviews for Tenure Track Faculty</i>, 2) external grants may be used to substitute scholarly journal publications as follows based on the cumulative UTRGV amounts for principal investors and individual portions for other roles: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. \$10,000 to 99,999 – one Medium Impact journal publication, b. \$100,000 to 499,999 – one High Impact journal publication, c. \$500,000 or more – one Elite Journal publication
Teaching	<p>In the five AYs prior to the application for promotion and following promotion to Associate Professor,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) average Student Evaluations of Teaching of 4.2 or higher, and 2) peer teaching observations as required by UTRGV institutional guidelines, and 3) annual performance evaluation score of 3 or higher in teaching each AY.
Service	<p>In the five AYs prior to the application for promotion, and following promotion to Associate Professor, at least three annual performance evaluation scores of 4 in service with annual performance evaluation scores of 3 in service for the remaining AYs.</p>

¹ Faculty whose performance exceeds the promotion criteria in research, teaching and service may apply one year early.

Promotion for Clinical Professors

In the previous five AYs at the current rank and during the applicable review periods set by the UTRGV *Handbook of Operating Procedures (HoP)* and *Guidelines for Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Full-time Lecturers, Professors in Practice and Clinical Faculty* published by the Provost at the [Faculty Resources](#) webpage, the applicant should achieve the following items:

Category	From Assistant Clinical Professor to Associate Clinical Professor	From Associate Clinical Professor to Full Clinical Professor
Teaching	1) Average Student Evaluations of Teaching of 4.2 or higher, 2) Peer teaching observations as required by UTRGV institutional guidelines, and 3) At least three annual performance evaluation scores of 4 in teaching with annual performance evaluation scores of 3 in teaching for the remaining AYs.	Following promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, a repetition of the achievements in teaching for promotion.
Research	An annual performance evaluation score of 3 or higher in research for each AY.	Following promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, a repetition of the achievements in research for promotion.
Service	At least three annual performance evaluation scores of 4 in service with annual performance evaluation scores of 3 in service for the remaining AYs.	Following promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, a repetition of the achievements in service for promotion.

Promotion for Professors of Practice

In the previous five AYs at the current rank and during the applicable review periods set by the UTRGV *Handbook of Operating Procedures (HoP)* and *Guidelines for Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Full-time Lecturers, Professors in Practice and Clinical Faculty* published by the Provost at the [Faculty Resources](#) webpage, the applicant should achieve the following items:

Category	From Assistant Professor of Practice to Associate Professor of Practice	From Associate Professor of Practice to Full Professor of Practice
Teaching	1) Average Student Evaluations of Teaching of 4.2 or higher, 2) Peer teaching observations as required by UTRGV institutional guidelines, and 3) At least three annual performance evaluation scores of 4 in teaching with annual performance evaluation scores of 3 in teaching for the remaining AYs.	Following promotion to Associate Professor of Practice, a repetition of the achievements in teaching for promotion.
Service	At least three annual performance evaluation scores of 4 in service with annual performance evaluation scores of 3 in service for the remaining AYs.	Following promotion to Associate Professor of Practice, a repetition of the achievements in service for promotion.
Research* (Only for Professors of Practice with 10% research workload)	An annual performance evaluation score of 3 or higher in research for each AY.	Following promotion to Associate Professor of Practice, a repetition of the achievements in research for promotion.

Promotion for Lecturers

In the previous three AYs at the current faculty rank and during the applicable review periods set by the UTRGV *Handbook of Operating Procedures (HoP)* and *Guidelines for Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Full-time Lecturers, Professors in Practice and Clinical Faculty* published by the Provost at the [Faculty Resources](#) webpage, the applicant should achieve the following items:

Category	From Lecturer I to II	From Lecturer II to III	From Lecturer III to Senior Lecturer
Teaching	1) Average Student Evaluations of Teaching of 4.2 or higher, 2) Peer teaching observations as required by UTRGV institutional guidelines, and 3) At least two annual performance evaluation scores of 4 in teaching with annual performance evaluation scores of 3 in teaching for the remaining AY.	Following promotion to Lecturer II, a repetition of the achievements in teaching for promotion.	Following promotion to Lecturer III, a repetition of the achievements in teaching for promotion.
Service	At least two annual performance evaluation scores of 4 in service with annual performance evaluation scores of 3 in service for the remaining AY.	Following promotion to Lecturer II, a repetition of the achievements in service for promotion.	Following promotion to Lecturer III, a repetition of the achievements in service for promotion.
Research* (Only for Lecturers with 10% research workload)	An annual performance evaluation score of 3 or higher in research for each AY.	Following promotion to Lecturer II, a repetition of the achievements in research for promotion.	Following promotion to Lecturer III, a repetition of the achievements in research for promotion.

Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation
For Academic Year _____ - _____

Name: _____

Date of Evaluation: _____

Position/Rank: _____

Time in Current Position: _____

1. OVERVIEW

1.1. Purpose and Method

The purpose of the performance evaluation system is to allow faculty to have a clear understanding of their current performance. The evaluation will guide faculty toward performing in furtherance of the missions, strategic objectives and goals of UTRGV, VCoBE and its departments and schools. The process that includes self-reporting, completing the evaluation form, review by peers, and meetings for feedback provides faculty with meaningful information and recognition of strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for improvements as required by the UTRGV *Handbook of Operating Procedures*, [ADM 06-502 \(Annual Faculty Evaluation\)](#). The system serves as a tool for decision-making by departments/schools and the college in the areas of annual reviews, promotion, post-tenure, and when available, merit salary raises.

1.2. Documentation

This document is to be appended to the Faculty Review Dossier required for all UTRGV VCoBE full-time tenured and non-tenure track faculty. The dossier will provide the material and narrative to support the review and evaluation process. The dossier requirements and timeline pathways are found in the Faculty Resources provided by the Provost.

1.3. Outcomes

Each review level in the Annual Faculty Evaluation process requires ranking of the faculty member in one of the following four (4) categories: “4” – Exceeds expectations; “3” – Meets expectations; “2” – Does not meet expectations; or “1” – Unsatisfactory. The definitions are proscribed in [ADM 06-502](#) C. as follows:

4. *Exceeds expectations* - Reflects a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for the UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit.
3. *Meets expectations* - Reflects accomplishments commensurate with what is normal for UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit.
2. *Does not meet expectations* - Indicates a failure as defined by the unit beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance, but of a character that appears to be subject to correction.
1. *Unsatisfactory* - Failing to meet expectations for the faculty member’s unit, rank, or contractual obligations in a manner that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide remediation or assistance, or involves *prima facie* professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence. The same units that specify the standards for exceeding, meeting, and failing to meet expectations should also specify the criteria for performance that is unsatisfactory.

The performance category in which each faculty member falls is determined by applying the Grand Total Score from the Evaluation Score Summary found below to the following table of ranges. Provided, however, that faculty members must meet both Basic Teaching Requirements in Section 3.1 to receive an overall performance evaluation of “Meets Expectations” or higher.

<u>Exceeds Expectations</u>	<u>Meets Expectations</u>	<u>Does Not Meet Expectations</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>
4.00	3.00-3.99	2.00-2.99	< 2.00

1.4. Merit Pay

If a pool for merit pay raises is available in a given year, 70% of the merit pool shall be distributed equally, in the form of a fixed percentage pay increase, to the group of faculty receiving an Evaluation Score of 3.00 or higher or making satisfactory progress towards tenure in all areas of review in accordance with Section 5 of VCoBE’s *Policy on Tenure and Promotion and Annual Reappointment Reviews for Tenure Track Faculty*. The remainder of the merit pool, shall be used, not necessarily in equal amounts, to reward outstanding performance among faculty achieving an Evaluation Score of 3.5 or higher determined by the Dean and department chairs.

If a pool for merit pay raises has not been available in one or more consecutive years prior to the evaluation year, merit pay decision shall be made based on the average Evaluation Score achieved by the faculty member over the years in which a merit pool was not available up to and including the current evaluation year.

2. INSTRUCTIONS

2.1. Description

The evaluation is comprised of three sections covering performance for teaching, research (if applicable), and service. The evaluation includes both a self-evaluation report and a review level score based on faculty narratives with supporting evidence. The Performance Scores for teaching, research (if applicable), and service will be weighted by the corresponding faculty workload weight in each category to obtain the Grand Total Score. Unless clearly instructed otherwise, teaching and service points are earned only from activities in the corresponding academic year (AY) reported in this instrument, and research points are based on a three-year average.

2.2. Steps for completing the Faculty Performance Evaluation

1) Determine your faculty workload weight percentages for teaching, research (if applicable) and service based on the following table.

<i>FACULTY CLASSIFICATION</i>	<i>TEACHING</i>	<i>RESEARCH</i>	<i>SERVICE</i>
Lecturer	90%	0%	10%
Lecturer with 10% research	80%	10%	10%
Professor of Practice	80%	0%	20%
Professor of Practice with 10% research	70%	10%	20%
Clinical Professor	70%	10%	20%
Tenured Teaching Faculty	60%	20%	20%
Tenured Research Faculty	50%	30%	20%
Tenure-Track Faculty	40%	50%	10%
Doctoral Eligible Faculty	40%	50%	10%

2) In the **Evaluation Score Summary** below, enter selected *Weight* for each **SECTION** based on your *Faculty Classification* (sum of *Weights* = 100%). Enter your **RESEARCH Performance Score** (1-4) if applicable. A review level (department/school committee or department chair/school director) will enter the *Performance Scores* for **TEACHING** and **SERVICE** and then add the *Weighted Scores* for your *Grand Total*.

Evaluation Score Summary

<i>SECTION</i>	<i>WORKLOAD WEIGHT (W)</i>	<i>PERFORMANCE SCORE (1-4) (S)</i>	<i>WEIGHTED SCORE [W × S=WS]</i>
Teaching			
Research (if applicable)			
Service			
<i>Grand Total</i>	100%		

3. TEACHING

Teaching is evaluated using assessments in four areas: Basic Teaching Requirements, Teaching Effectiveness, Teaching Innovation and Accomplishments, and Teaching Narratives.

3.1. Basic Teaching Requirements

Faculty must meet both requirements below to receive a 3 or higher Teaching Performance Score and a “Meets Expectations” or higher overall performance evaluation.

<i>BASIC TEACHING REQUIREMENTS</i>	<i>YES / NO</i>
Met class at scheduled time unless there were extenuating circumstances	
Held one hour of office hour per week for each three-credit lecture-based course taught	

3.2. Teaching Effectiveness (from Student Evaluations)

Enter each *Course Number & Section* taught in the evaluation year and the average student evaluation score from the Mandated Question Results line of the Course Evaluation Report found in the Course Evals Application accessed from the [MyUTRGV portal page](#). Calculate the *Average Score*, then multiply the *Average Score* by 3 to obtain the Teaching Effectiveness Points.

	<i>COURSE NUMBER & SECTION</i>	<i>STUDENT EVALUATIONS SCORE (OUT OF 5)</i>
<i>Example</i>	<i>BUSA xxxx.01</i>	<i>4.80</i>
Course 1		
Course 2		
Course 3		
Course 4		
Course 5		
Course 6		
Course 7		
Course 8		
Course 9		
Course 10		
Course 11		
Course 12		
	<i>Average Score</i>	
Teaching Effectiveness Points: Multiply <i>Average Score</i> by 3 [x.xx × 3=?]		

3.3. Teaching Innovation and Accomplishments

For each activity that describes your teaching activities/achievements in the year of evaluation, circle or select the point values that apply and add up the points. **Each bullet point can only count once per AY.**

<i>TEACHING ACCOMPLISHMENTS</i>	<i>POINT VALUE</i>
Teaching Awards/Honors; each bullet point can only count once per AY.	
▪ Major teaching award/honors at the University level or higher in the last five AYs including the AY under evaluation	5
▪ Teaching award/honors at departmental/college level in the last five AYs including the AY under evaluation	3
High Impact Pedagogies (HIP); each bullet point can only count once per AY.	
▪ Invited one or more discipline-relevant speakers	1
▪ Taught one or more Service Learning courses designated by UTRGV Office of Engaged Scholarship & Learning ¹	1
▪ Incorporated flipped classroom ²	1
▪ Incorporated experiential learning ³	1
▪ Incorporated student research experiences in undergraduate or master's courses	1
▪ Incorporated travel abroad or Collaborative Online International Learning ⁴ programs	1
▪ Enhanced student learning through frequent homework assignments	1
▪ Incorporated writing-intensive assignments or projects	1
▪ Incorporated e-portfolios ⁵	1
▪ Incorporated game(s) and/or simulation	1
▪ Used appropriate technology to enhance course delivery (excluding basic use of Blackboard)	1
▪ Used self-created comprehensive exams not based on publisher-provided contents	1
▪ Participated in student learning outcomes and learning goals assessment	1
Table continued on next page	

¹ List of courses and instructors at <https://www.utrgv.edu/engaged/service-learning/courses/index.htm>.

² Definition at <https://www.utrgv.edu/cte/resources/flipped-classrooms/index.htm>

³ Definition and examples at <https://www.utrgv.edu/engaged/get-started/index.htm>.

⁴ Definition at <http://www.coilconsult.com/what-is-coil-.html>.

⁵ Definition and examples at <https://teaching.berkeley.edu/resources/assessment-and-evaluation/design-assessment/e-portfolio>.

Course-Related Information; each bullet point can only count once per AY.	
▪ Taught three or more preps in the AY (excluding compensated offload teaching)	1
▪ Designed one or more new courses	3
▪ Taught physically on two or more campuses in the AY (excluding compensated offload teaching)	1
▪ Completed Quality Matters blueprinting of one or more courses through the Center for Online Teaching and Technology	2
▪ Provided recorded lecture videos in asynchronous online courses	1
▪ Provided optional synchronous online/offline meetings for asynchronous online courses	1
▪ Significantly redesigned one or more existing courses	1
▪ Incorporated sustainability, ethical or social responsibility-related materials	1
▪ Incorporated discipline-relevant software and technology (e.g., SAP, QuickBooks, Tableau, SAS, STATA, R, SPSS)	1
▪ Non-compensated teaching beyond maximum workload	1
▪ Engaged in non-compensated teaching activities towards student success (e.g., tutoring, review classes)	1
Professional Development; each bullet point can only count once per AY.	
▪ Attended two or more teaching development sessions at UTRGV	1
▪ Attended one or more external teaching development sessions/workshops	1
▪ Achieved CFA, CPA, or State Bar professional certification in the last five AYs	4
▪ Achieved professional certification other than CFA or CPA (e.g., CFP, CMA, SAP, PMP, SHRM) or successfully passing part of the CFA or CPA exam	2
▪ Maintained professional certification or license by meeting continuous professional education requirements (e.g., CPA, CFA, CLE)	2
▪ Presented one or more times on teaching/pedagogy at a relevant conference/workshop/training	1
Graduate Teaching; each bullet point can only count once per AY.	
▪ Chaired one or more dissertation committees beyond maximum workload	3
▪ Member of one or more dissertation committees	1
▪ Chaired one or more thesis committees beyond maximum workload	2
▪ Member of one or more thesis committees	1
Teaching-Related Grants (Amount Awarded for AY under Evaluation)	
▪ External grant: 1 point per \$10,000 (rounded up to the nearest \$10,000; 10 points maximum)	
Other Teaching-related Accomplishments (not listed above); one point each, maximum five points	
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
Teaching Innovation and Accomplishment Points: Add Total Points (up to a max of 15 points)	

3.4. Teaching Narratives

Use the Teaching Narratives section in the Faculty Portfolio Tool (FPT) to substantiate your teaching effectiveness, innovation, accomplishments or provide additional information not included in the above point-based evaluation.

Attach any evidence of teaching effectiveness and accomplishments you wish to be considered such as:

- Student Evaluation comments with no edits/omissions are encouraged, not required.
- Peer observations of teaching
- Syllabi
- Sample of assignments or assessments

Up to 5 **BONUS** points may be awarded by the department/school committee or chair/director based on quality, not quantity, of teaching using the teaching narratives and any supplemental teaching materials. Bonus points are reserved for outstanding performance and will not be given to all faculty members in each department.

Teaching BONUS Points: _____

(to be filled out by the department/school committee and reviewed/confirmed by the chair/director)

3.5. Summation of Teaching Points; Conversion of Teaching Points to Teaching Performance Score

<i>SECTION</i>	<i>POINTS EACH SECTION</i>
Teaching Effectiveness Points from Section 3.2.	
Teaching Innovation and Accomplishment Points from Section 3.3.	
Teaching Narrative Bonus Points from Section 3.4.*	
<i>Total Teaching Points*</i>	

*To be filled out by the department/school committee and reviewed/confirmed by the chair/director.

Conversion of Total Teaching Points to Teaching Performance Score

<i>TOTAL TEACHING POINTS</i>	<i>TEACHING PERFORMANCE SCORE</i>
27 points or higher*	4
21 to 26.99*	3
15 to 20.99	2
Below 15	1

*Faculty must meet both Basic Teaching Requirements in Section 3.1 to receive a teaching performance score of 3 or higher.

A review level (department/school committee or department chair/school director) will enter the **Teaching Performance Score** in the Score column and Teaching row of the Evaluation Score Summary on page 3.

3.6. Peer Observations of Teaching

[ADM 06-502 \(Annual Faculty Evaluation\)](#) requires “Peer evaluations of teaching as per the department or college and University guidelines.” [ADM 06-505 \(Faculty Tenure and Promotion\)](#) requires that “Effective teaching is assessed by multiple indicators including, but not limited to, performance on student evaluations, **peer observation of teaching**, and pedagogical preparations.” The Provost provides [Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching](#).

Indicate the date on which peer observations took place:

Tenured Faculty (at least once every three years): _____
Clinical Professors, Professors of Practice, Senior Lecturers (at least once every three years): _____
Clinical Assistant or Clinical Associate Professors (at least once per academic year): _____
Assistant or Associate Professors of Practice (at least once per academic year): _____
Lecturers I, II, or III (at least once per academic year): _____

4. RESEARCH

4.1. Research Performance I (to be used by *Doctoral Eligible* and *Tenured Research Faculty* only)

4.1.1. Research Accomplishments

Research is evaluated using the sum of the assessments in five areas: Journal Publications, Academic Conferences, Scholarly Book Publications, Research Grant Funding and Other Scholarly Activities and Outcomes.

For each research accomplishment type below, enter the Quantity and total Point Value. Then add up the points to obtain the Total Research Points for the AY.

RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHMENTS	QUANTITY / AMOUNT	POINT VALUE
Journal Publications (as rated in the target journal list approved by VCoBE)		
Elite (60 points each)		
High impact (30 points each)		
Medium impact (15 points each)		
Peer-reviewed (5 points each)		
Academic Conferences		
Best paper – refereed major conference (5 points each)		
Paper or extended abstract presented - refereed major conference (2 points each)		
Best paper – other conference (3 points each)		
Paper or extended abstract presented – other conference (1 point each)		
Abstract presented – conference (1 point each)		
Scholarly Book Publications (does not include textbooks)		
Scholarly book publication, first edition (50 points each)		
Scholarly book publication, subsequent edition (15 points each)		
Peer-reviewed scholarly book chapter in an edited book (5 points each)		
Book chapter in an edited book without peer-review (2 points each)		
Research Grant Funding (amount awarded for AY under evaluation)		
External grant: 1 point per \$10,000 (rounded up to the nearest \$10,000; 10 points maximum)		
Completing a research report for a grant of \$5,000 or more (2 points each)		
Application to a major (e.g. NSF) research grant agency (2 points each)		
Successfully obtaining an internal (University FRC) research grant (1 point each)		
Other Scholarly Activities & Outcomes		
University or higher research award in the last five AYs (5 points each)		
College or department research award in the last five AYs (3 points each)		
Reported research impacting the local region (2 points each)		
Publishing an instructional field media contribution (1 point each)		
Total Research Points		

Transition Rule: For the purpose of annual reviews, Research Points are calculated using a three-year rolling average of scores based on dates of publication acceptance. Mindful that in the years prior to the adoption of this Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation instrument, which takes effect in the fall of 2022 for the evaluation of AY 2021/22, VCoBE used a different instrument with at times different point values as well as a different Target Journal List (ABDC), faculty may either use the Research Points as determined by the old instrument for prior years (AY 2019/20 and AY 2020/21), or recompute their research points for prior years applying this new instrument and VCoBE’s new Target Journal List (modified CABS AJG).

Enter the Research Points earned from each applicable year, then calculate the average points:

Review Year - 1	
Prior Year - 2	
Prior Year - 3	
Average Research Points	

4.1.2. Conversion of Average Research Points to Research Performance Score

RESEARCH PERFORMANCE SCORE	DOCTORAL ELIGIBLE FACULTY	TENURED RESEARCH FACULTY
4*	≥ 20 points	≥ 12 points
3*	15 to 19.99 points	9 to 11.99 points
2	10 to 14.99 points	6 to 8.99 points
1	< 10 points	< 6 points

*Faculty must maintain *Scholarly Academic* faculty qualifications to receive a research performance score of 3 or higher.

Enter the **Research Performance Score** in the Score column and Research row of the **Evaluation Score Summary** on page 3.

4.2. Research Performance II (to be used by *Tenured Teaching Faculty, Clinical Professors, Professors of Practice with a research component and Lecturers with a research component only*)

4.2.1. Research Accomplishments

Research is evaluated using the sum of the assessments in four areas: Journal Publications, Conferences, Book Publications, Research Grant Funding, and Other Scholarly Activities & Outcomes.

For each research accomplishment type below, enter the Quantity and total Point Value. Then add up the points to obtain the Total Research Points for the AY.

RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHMENTS	QUANTITY/ AMOUNT	POINT VALUE
Journal Publications (as rated in the target journal list approved by VCoBE)		
Elite (60 points each)		
High impact (30 points each)		
Medium impact (15 points each)		
Peer-reviewed (5 points each)		
Practitioner journal (2 points each)		
Conferences		
Best paper – refereed major academic conference (5 points each)		
Paper or extended abstract presented - refereed major academic conference (2 points each)		
Best paper – other academic conference (3 points each)		
Abstract presented – academic conference (1 point each)		
Presentations – professional conference (2 points each)		
Book Publications (does not include textbooks)		
Discipline-relevant book publication, first edition (50 points each)		
Discipline-relevant book publication, subsequent edition (15 points each)		
Discipline-relevant book chapter in an edited book (5 points each)		
Discipline-relevant book chapter in an edited book without peer-review (2 points each)		
Research Grant Funding (amount awarded for AY under evaluation)		
External grant: 1 point per \$10,000 (rounded up to the nearest \$10,000; 10 points maximum)		
Completing a research report for a grant of \$5,000 or more (2 points each)		
Application to a major (e.g. NSF) research grant agency (2 points each)		
Successfully obtaining an internal (University FRC) research grant (1 point each)		
Other Scholarly Activities & Outcomes		
University or higher research award in the last five AYs (5 points each)		
College or department research award in the last five AYs (3 points each)		
Reported research impacting the local region (2 points each)		
Client-based research project (2 points each)		
Publishing an instructional field media contribution (1 point each)		
Total Research Points		

Transition Rule: For the purpose of annual reviews, Research Points are calculated using a three-year rolling average of scores based on dates of publication acceptance. Mindful that in the years prior to the adoption of this Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation instrument, which takes effect in the fall of 2022 for the evaluation of AY 2021/22, VCoBE used a different instrument with at times different point values as well as a different Target Journal List (ABDC), faculty may either use the Research Points as determined by the old instrument for prior years (AY 2019/20 and AY 2020/21), or recompute their research points for prior years applying this new instrument and VCoBE’s new Target Journal List (modified CABS AJG).

Enter the Research Points earned from each applicable year, then calculate the average points:

Review Year - 1	
Prior Year - 2	
Prior Year - 3	
Average Research Points	

4.2.2. Conversion of Total Research Points to Research Performance Score

RESEARCH PERFORMANCE SCORE	TENURED TEACHING FACULTY (20% RESEARCH WORKLOAD)	CLINICAL PROFESSORS PROFESSORS OF PRACTICE WITH RESEARCH LECTURERS WITH RESEARCH (10% RESEARCH WORKLOAD)
4*	≥ 8 points	≥ 4 points
3*	6 to 7.99 points	3 to 3.99 points
2	4 to 5.99 points	2 to 2.99 points
1	< 4 points	< 2 points

* Tenured Teaching Faculty, Clinical Professors, Professors of Practice with 10% research work load, and Lecturers with 10% research work load must maintain *Scholarly Academic* faculty qualification to receive a research performance score of 3 or higher.

Enter the **Research Performance Score** in the Score column and Research row of the **Evaluation Score Summary** on page 3.

5. SERVICE

5.1. Service Accomplishments

For each activity that describes your service activities/achievements in the AY of evaluation, add the corresponding point value to the Point Value column and add up all relevant points in the total service accomplishments points earned row.

<i>SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS</i>	<i>POINT VALUE</i>
Service Awards / Honors	
Major service award/honors at the University level or higher in the last five AYs including the AY under evaluation (5 points)	
Service award/honors at departmental/college level in the last five AYs including the AY under evaluation (3 points)	
University Committees (Up to two university committees/task forces/working groups; 3 points if chair of committee/task force/working group; 2 points if member; multiply points by 1.5 if met six times or more in AY)	
1.	
2.	
College Committees (Up to two college committees/task forces/working groups; 3 points if chair of committee/task force/working group; 2 points if member; multiply points by 1.5 if met six times or more in AY)	
1.	
2.	
Department Committees (Up to four department/school committees/task forces/working groups; 3 points if chair of committee/task force/working group; 2 points if member; multiply points by 1.5 if met six times or more in AY)	
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
Service to Students	
Student organization advisor (3 points)	
Traveled to field-related conferences with students (2 points)	
Mentored students in field-relevant academic competitions or presentations (5 points)	
Engaged in experiential learning activities with students not related to a course that you taught in the AY under evaluation (1 point)	
Other Institutional Service Not Included Above (1 point each, up to 5 points)	
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
Table continued on next page	

Service to Academia (3 points per journal editor of an elite or high impact journal; 2 points per journal editor of other peer reviewed journal, conference track chair, elite/high impact journal editorial board member, or elite/high impact journal referee; 1 point for all other service to academia: e.g., journal editorial board member, referee, conference referee or discussant, grant reviewer). Up to 5 activities in total.	
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
Community Service (each item can only be counted once)	
Engaged in executive or professional education (1 point)	
Engaged in non-compensated external consulting (1 point)	
Served as officer (or other leadership position) of local, regional, state, or national field-relevant professional organizations (2 points)	
Served as officer (or other leadership position) of local, regional, state, or national community organizations (1 point)	
Presented or served as keynote speaker at field-relevant professional organizations or conferences (1 point)	
Gave one or more field-relevant presentation at K-12 schools (1 point)	
Performed member service in a local, regional, state, or national professional organization (1 point)	
Performed member service in a local, regional, state, or national community organization (1 point)	
Engaged in economic development projects with community partners (1 point)	
Service-Related Grants (Awarded Amount for AY Under Evaluation)	
External grant: 1 point per \$10,000 (rounded up to the nearest \$10,000; 10 points maximum)	
Total Service Accomplishments Points	

5.2. Service Narratives

Use the Service Narratives section in the Faculty Portfolio Tool (FPT) to substantiate your service effectiveness, accomplishments or provide additional information not included in the above point-based evaluation.

Up to 5 **BONUS** points will be awarded by the department/school committee or chair/director based on service narratives. Bonus points are reserved for outstanding performance and will not be given to all faculty members in each department.

Service Narratives BONUS Points: _____

(to be filled out by the department/school committee and reviewed/confirmed by the chair/director)

5.3. Summation of Service Points; Conversion of Service Points to Service Performance Score

<i>SECTION</i>	<i>POINTS EACH SECTION</i>
Service Accomplishments Points from Section 5.1.	
Service Narrative Bonus Points from Section 5.2.*	
<i>Total Teaching Points</i> *	

*To be filled out by the department/school committee and reviewed/confirmed by the chair/director.

Conversion of Service Points to Service Performance Score

<i>SERVICE PERFORMANCE SCORE</i>	<i>DOCTORAL ELIGIBLE FACULTY AND LECTURERS (10% SERVICE WORKLOAD)</i>	<i>TENURED RESEARCH FACULTY, TENURED TEACHING FACULTY, CLINICAL PROFESSORS, AND PROFESSORS OF PRACTICE (20% SERVICE WORKLOAD)</i>
4	≥ 12 points	≥ 24 points
3	9 to 11.99 points	18 to 23.99 points
2	6 to 8.99 points	12 to 17.99 points
1	< 6 points	< 12 points

A review level (department/school committee or department chair/school director) will enter the **Service Performance Score** in the Score column and Teaching row of the Evaluation Score Summary on page 3.