

**UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA
MUMA COLLEGE OF BUSINESS**

ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURE AND CRITERIA

Submitted: December 2023

Approved by the Office of the Provost: December 7, 2023

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

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

Faculty Responsibilities

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

Director Responsibilities

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

Teaching

Evaluation of teaching shall be composed of two equally weighted components: student assessment of teaching and supplemental materials.

Student assessment of teaching in courses with enrollments of more than five students shall represent 50% of the evaluation score. Evaluation of the teaching component will be based on the overall simple average of the eight questions on the student assessment form over all courses taught in the evaluation period. The following criteria

shall be applied:

- (1) *unacceptable* if the average student assessment of teaching score was 2.0 or less on the 5.0 scale (where 5.0 is outstanding),
- (2) *weak* if the average student assessment of teaching score was at least 2.0 but less than 3.0,
- (3) *satisfactory* if the average student assessment of teaching score was at least 3.0 but less than or equal to 3.75,
- (4) *strong* if the average student assessment of teaching score was at least 3.75 but less than or equal to 4.5, and
- (5) *outstanding* if the average student assessment of teaching score was above 4.5.

Supplemental materials shall represent 50% of the evaluation score. Evaluation of the supplemental materials component shall be based on supporting evidence provided in any or all the following categories: pedagogy, adaptation, and/or professional development. Efforts in the areas of pedagogy and professional development could relate to activities completed in prior years, if the faculty member clearly indicates how those activities influence teaching in the current year. The following criteria shall be applied:

- (1) *unacceptable* if the supporting evidence reflects poor teaching quality and/or lack of effort at improvement (or no evidence is provided)
- (2) *weak* if the supporting evidence reflects fair teaching quality and/or minor effort at improvement
- (3) *satisfactory* if the supporting evidence reflects moderate teaching quality and/or moderate effort at improvement
- (4) *strong* if the supporting evidence reflects very good teaching quality and/or very good effort at improvement
- (5) *outstanding* if the supporting evidence reflects excellent teaching quality and/or outstanding effort at improvement.

Appendices to these evaluation guidelines are provided to assist in preparing and evaluating supplemental materials. The director will convey in the written evaluation the factors that have been used in the final assignment of the rating.

Research

Research activity of faculty with research assignments should be aimed at making a scholarly contribution (as defined in Section I.A.2.b of the Tenure & Promotion Guidelines for the college) to the faculty member's primary or related academic disciplines. Faculty members who are tenured or tenure-earning with research assignments higher than 40 percent are expected to produce more and higher quality research than faculty members with lower research assignments and those in non-tenure-earning positions. Note: the evaluative ratings are specified separately for tenured/tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-track faculty.

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

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

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

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

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

The criteria for tenured and tenure-track faculty follow:

- (1) *Unacceptable*: The faculty member does not meet the college's AACSB criteria for "scholarly academic" designation. In addition, there was no or very little effort put into research activities within the last year. A fractional rating (1.5 = unsatisfactory/weak) shall be awarded to distinguish between no and some effort.
- (2) *Weak*: The faculty member does not meet the college's AACSB criteria for "scholarly academic" designation. Considering the faculty member's current research pipeline, it is unlikely that it will be met within the next two years. Within the past year, there was a submission to a journal on the ABDC list or to a journal that conforms to the Muma College of Business Research Publication Policy progressed beyond the desk review stage (assigned to a review team), or a paper was accepted for presentation at a respected academic meeting. A fractional rating (2.5 = weak/satisfactory) shall be awarded if more of the criteria are met and the quality of the effort is higher (e.g., submission to higher quality journals).
- (3) *Satisfactory*: The faculty member meets the college's AACSB criteria for "scholarly academic" designation, and is likely to continue to meet the criteria within the time period allowed by the MCOB AACSB standard based on research/scholarly activity during the year and the current pipeline of working papers. A fractional rating (3.5 = satisfactory/strong) shall be awarded if one or more of the following criteria are met within the past year: (a) a UTD/FT50 submission progressed beyond the desk review stage (assigned to a review team), (b) a paper progressed to a first round R&R at an A* or A journal on the ABDC list, (c) tangible evidence of research activity is presented, for example data collection or survey development efforts aimed at producing papers targeted to UTD/FT50/ABDC journals, (d) research in prior years generates significant impact in the current year (citations, awards, other recognition), conducting grant writing activity aimed at securing federal funded grants (e.g., NSF/NIH), and/or (f) securing a privately funded, state funded grant, or any other research grant.
- (4) *Strong*: The faculty member meets the college's AACSB criteria for "scholarly academic" designation and is likely to continue to meet the criteria within the time period allowed by the MCOB AACSB standard based on research/scholarly activity during the year and the current pipeline of working papers. In addition, within the past year, one or more of the following criteria are met: (a) a UTD/FT50 submission is in R&R status, (b) one paper was accepted for publication in an A* journal on the ABDC list or is in advanced round of review

(3rd or beyond), (c) two papers were accepted for publication in A journals on the ABDC list, (d) continued effort on a multi-year federal grant, (e), award of a non-federal, externally funded grant, and/or (f) a grant submission was rejected but received favorable reviews inviting resubmission. A fractional rating (4.5 = strong/outstanding) shall be awarded if more of the criteria are met and the quality of the effort is higher (e.g., a UTD/FT50 R&R and an A* ABDC journal acceptance).

- (5) *Outstanding*: The AACSB criteria for “scholarly academic” designation is met and is likely to continue to meet the criteria within the time period allowed by the MCOB AACSB standard based on research/scholarly activity during the year and the current pipeline of working papers. In addition, one or more of the following criteria have been met within the past year: (a) a paper was accepted for publication in a UTD/FT50 journal, (b) two papers were accepted for publication in A* journals AND at least one UTD/FT50 submission progressed beyond the desk review stage, (c) a federal grant was awarded.

The criteria for non-tenure-track faculty who have a higher teaching assignment and a low (but non-zero) research assignment are based primarily on efforts to maintain and surpass the AACSB faculty qualification standards for “scholarly academic” or “practice academic” (depending on the faculty member’s designation). The specific criteria for non-tenure-track faculty with a research assignment greater than zero follow:

- (1) *Unacceptable*: The faculty member does not meet the college’s AACSB criteria for “scholarly academic” or “practice academic” designation. In addition, there was no or very little effort put into scholarly activities aimed at meeting either designation within the last year. A fractional rating (1.5 = unsatisfactory/weak) shall be awarded to distinguish between no and some effort.
- (2) *Weak*: The faculty member does not meet the college’s AACSB criteria for “scholarly academic” or “practice academic” designation. The faculty member has made some effort towards meeting the standards of their respective AACSB qualification, but will not meet the minimum standard based on current accomplishments. A fractional rating (2.5 = weak/satisfactory) shall be awarded based on the degree and quality of effort documented (e.g., work-in-progress scholarly articles).
- (3) *Satisfactory*: The faculty member meets the college’s AACSB criteria for “scholarly academic” or “practice academic” designation based on research/scholarly activity during the year, and is likely to continue to meet the criteria within the time period allowed by the MCOB AACSB standard based on current scholarly efforts (e.g., articles under review at peer-reviewed journals). A fractional rating (3.5 = satisfactory/strong) shall be awarded based on the degree and quality of effort documented (e.g., number of articles under review).
- (4) *Strong*: The faculty member exceeds the standards of the college’s AACSB criteria for “scholarly academic” or “practice academic” based on research/scholarly activity during the year as evidenced by one or more of the following criteria: (a) four (three) peer-reviewed journal articles in five years for SA-graduate (SA-undergraduate), and/or (b) meeting the tenured and tenure-track criteria for “satisfactory.” A fractional rating (4.5 = strong/outstanding) shall be awarded based on the degree and quality of effort documented (e.g., articles in higher quality journals).
- (5) *Outstanding*: The faculty member greatly exceeds the standards of the college’s AACSB criteria for “scholarly academic” or “practice academic” based on research/scholarly activity during the year as evidenced by one or more of the following criteria: (a) five (four) peer-reviewed journal articles in five years for SA-graduate (SA-undergraduate), and/or (b) meeting the tenured and tenure-track criteria for “strong.” A fractional rating (4.5 = strong/outstanding) shall be awarded based on the degree and quality of effort documented (e.g., articles in higher quality journals).

Service

In determining an annual service rating consideration will be given to the faculty member’s service assignment and rank, committee role (e.g., chair, vice chair), type (i.e., time/effort required), and level [internal

(school/college/university) or external (professional/community)], and the extent to which the faculty member's service brings national visibility and recognition to the school, college, and/or university.

All service activities should be aimed at supporting and/or advancing the strategic priorities of internal and/or external organizations. Evidence of the faculty member's efforts and contributions may be solicited by the school director. Service activities performed strictly in exchange for course release(s) or for both course release(s) and financial compensation will be scored based on the quality of execution while those undertaken strictly for financial compensation will not be considered. Paid internal administrative activities are not considered service.

The evaluation of service is assigned using the following criteria:

- (1) *Unacceptable*: The faculty member declined most assigned committee work and was absent from a majority of committee meetings and therefore was unsatisfactory in service;
- (2) *Weak*: The faculty member substantively contributed when present for committee and/or external organization meetings but exhibited a pattern of absenteeism and/or not fulfilling assigned service obligations in a timely manner and therefore did not meet service expectations;
- (3) *Satisfactory*: The faculty member consistently attended and satisfactorily contributed to committee and/or external organization meetings and therefore met service expectations;
- (4) *Strong*: The faculty member substantially contributed to assigned service activities and/or undertook external service work which was beneficial for the school, college, and/or university and therefore exceeded service expectations; and
- (5) *Outstanding*: The faculty member exceptionally contributed to assigned service activities and advanced the strategic priorities of the school, college, or university, and/or carried out external service work which resulted in improved visibility and recognition of the school, college, and/or university and therefore exceeded service expectations.

Annual Review Appeals Process

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

Faculty Approved December 1, 2023 (for implementation in 2024)