

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

College of Business

INSTRUCTION (includes student advising)

A faculty member's annual instruction performance evaluation is linked to his/her level of activity in course management, content delivery, content currency, and student advising for the 3-year evaluation window. The following activities are considered for each rating:

NOTE: Items marked with asterisk (*) apply only to graduate faculty

(4) Preeminent: In addition to instructional activities expected for lower ratings, the faculty member must excel in accomplishing some of the following illustrative activities:

- Development and delivery of illuminating, well-organized presentations
- Integration of the current state of knowledge into content
- Integration of relevant research findings into content
- Publication of textbooks in one's academic discipline
- Publication of discipline-based scholarship, contributing to practice, and/or learning and pedagogical research in a recognized journal relevant to one's academic discipline
- Significant external instructional grants/contracts
- Dissertation committee chair*

(3) Excellent: In addition to instructional activities expected for ratings below, the faculty member must accomplish some of the following illustrative activities:

- Development of appropriate written/oral assignments in each course taught
- Development of appropriate supplemental course material for each course taught
- Implementation of new pedagogical methods as appropriate
- Achievement and maintenance of professional certification(s) in one's academic discipline, as appropriate
- Relevant professional experience
- Other external instructional grants/contracts
- Dissertation committee member*

(2) Satisfactory: The faculty member must satisfactorily perform all of the following illustrative activities:

- Development and distribution of an appropriate and complete syllabus for each course taught
- Syllabi and content of courses taught conform to material in course catalog
- Effective student advising (as defined by LA Tech University Policy 2109: Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty)
- Regular, punctual, and complete attendance of scheduled class sessions
- Student evaluation average of at least 3.0 over all classes taught for the 3-year evaluation window with grade distributions consistent with the University System of Grading
- Administration of appropriate examinations in each course taught
- Publication and maintenance of appropriate office hours
- Timely submission of grades and grade reports for each course taught
- Demonstration of a fluent speaking command and use of the English language
- Utilization of appropriate technology in delivery of content
- Attendance and participation in academic/professional programs related to instruction
- Graduate advisory committees*
- Involvement in DBA comprehensive examinations*

(1) Needs Improvement: This rating is warranted by a deficiency in any one of the following:

- Development and distribution of an appropriate and complete syllabus for each course taught
- Effective student advising
- Regular, punctual, and complete attendance of all scheduled class sessions
- Student evaluation average is below 3.0 over all classes taught for the 3-year evaluation window with grade distributions consistent with the University System of grading
- Administration of appropriate examinations in each course taught
- Publication and maintenance of appropriate office hours
- Timely submission of grades and grade reports for each course taught
- Demonstration of a fluent speaking command and use of the English language
- Graduate advisory committees*
- Involvement in DBA comprehensive examinations*

(0) Unsatisfactory: This rating is warranted by a deficiency in more than one of the following:

- Development and distribution of an appropriate and complete syllabus for each course taught

- Effective student advising
- Regular, punctual, and complete attendance of all scheduled class sessions
- Student evaluation average is below 2.75 over all classes taught for the 3-year evaluation window with grade distributions consistent with University System of Grading
- Administration of appropriate examinations in each course taught
- Publication and maintenance of appropriate office hours
- Timely submission of grades and grade reports for each course taught
- Demonstration of a fluent speaking command and use of the English language
- Graduate advisory committees*
- Involvement in DBA comprehensive examinations*

RESEARCH (Tenure Track Faculty)

The annual evaluation of the research performance of a faculty member is linked to his/her level of activity in discipline-based scholarship¹, contributing to practice, and/or learning and pedagogical research as reflected by the mission of the College of Business. The following activities are considered for each rating:

- (4) **Preeminent**: The faculty member must achieve the “Preeminent Category” activity “a” during the 3-year evaluation window.
- (3) **Excellent**: The faculty member must meet criterion “a” shown below during the 3-year evaluation window. Multiple “Excellent Category” activities during the 3-year evaluation window can be considered for a rating of up to (3.5).
- (2) **Satisfactory**: The faculty member must meet at least two of criterion “a” shown below during the 3-year evaluation window. Multiple “Satisfactory Category” activities during the 3-year evaluation window can be considered for a rating of up to (2.5).
- (1) **Needs Improvement**: This rating is considered for any faculty member who does not meet the criteria necessary to achieve a “Satisfactory” rating, but does have criteria b, c, d, or e activities under the “Satisfactory Category” or “Needs Improvement Category.” If the faculty member does not meet the criteria for a “Satisfactory” rating, multiple “Satisfactory Category” activities during the 3-year evaluation window may be considered for a rating up to (1.5).
- (0) **Unsatisfactory**: This rating is considered for any faculty member who has produced no research activity during the 3-year evaluation window.

¹ Discipline-based research is *not* journal specific but rather discipline specific. Acceptable discipline-based research includes research across discipline boundaries where an individual utilizes skills or research specific to his or her primary discipline to make or enhance a contribution in another discipline.

- **PREEMINENT CATEGORY ACTIVITIES**
 - a. A research article in elite Level I journals (required)

- **EXCELLENT CATEGORY ACTIVITIES**
 - a. A discipline-based research article in Level I journals (required activity)
 - b. Peer reviewed special topic scholarly books (excluding textbooks)
 - c. Significant external research grants/contracts

- **SATISFACTORY CATEGORY ACTIVITIES**
 - a. A discipline-based research article in refereed Level II journals (required activity)
 - b. Peer reviewed book chapters in edited books (excluding textbooks)
 - c. Other external research grants/contracts
 - d. National or international presentations or proceedings
 - e. Other articles in refereed Level II journals

- **NEEDS IMPROVEMENT CATEGORY ACTIVITIES**
 - a. Non-refereed publications
 - b. Regional presentations or regional proceedings
 - c. Papers under review for publication
 - d. Work in progress
 - e. Internal grants/contracts

RESEARCH (Non-tenure Track Faculty)

The requirements for designations of “Preeminent” and “Excellent” for research are the same for both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty. The “Satisfactory” research evaluation of a non-tenure track faculty member will include learning/pedagogical research and contributions to practice in the faculty member’s field².

- (4) Preeminent: The faculty member must achieve the “Preeminent Category” activity “a” during the 3-year evaluation window.

- (3) Excellent: The faculty member must meet criterion “a” shown below during the 3-year evaluation window. Multiple “Excellent Category” activities during the 3-year evaluation window can be considered for a rating of up to (3.5).

² Learning/pedagogical research listed for the “Research” evaluation cannot be considered for the “Instruction” evaluation. Contributions to practice listed for the “Research” evaluation cannot be considered for the “Service” evaluation.

- (2) Satisfactory: The faculty member must achieve at least two of the “Satisfactory Category Activities” shown below during the 3-year evaluation window. The faculty member achieving four or more “Satisfactory Category” activities during the 3-year evaluation window can be considered for a rating of up to (2.5).
- (1) Needs Improvement: This rating is considered for any faculty member who has only one of the listed “Satisfactory Category Activities” during the 3-year evaluation window.
- (0) Unsatisfactory: This rating is considered for any faculty member who has produced no research activity during the 3-year evaluation window.

▪ **PREEMINENT CATEGORY ACTIVITIES**

- a. A research article in elite Level I journals (required)

▪ **EXCELLENT CATEGORY ACTIVITIES**

- a. A discipline-based research article in Level I journals (required activity)
b. Peer reviewed special topic scholarly books (excluding textbooks)
c. Significant external research grants/contracts

▪ **SATISFACTORY CATEGORY ACTIVITIES**

- a. Any “Satisfactory Category Activities” listed for Tenure Track faculty
b. Use of professional expertise for consulting and/or related business activities (activity must be significant in duration, i.e., at least 40 hours during a given year).
c. Published articles on learning/pedagogical research or applications to practice in refereed or non-refereed journals
d. Presentations of learning/pedagogical research or applications to practice to professional groups or organizations
e. Development and presentation of discipline-specific professional development courses for a professional audience
f. Development and dissemination of discipline-specific case studies
g. External or internal grants/contracts

SERVICE

A faculty member’s annual service performance evaluation is linked to his/her level of activity in institutional service, professional service, public service, and grants and sponsored activity for the 3-year evaluation window. The following activities are considered for each rating:

(4) Preeminent: To be considered for this level, the faculty member must excel in accomplishing most of the activities expected for ratings below, and also excel in some of the following additional illustrative activities:

- Service as a board member or officer in national and/or regional academic and/or professional organizations
- Service as an editor for a journal in one's academic discipline
- Service as an editorial board member for an academic journal in one's discipline
- Active involvement with our strategic partners
- Attainment of external funding (grants) for service
- Active participation in interdisciplinary thrusts of the University and College, such as the Center for Entrepreneurship and Information Technology (CEnIT) and the Small Business Development Center (SBDC)

(3) Excellent: To be considered for this level, the faculty member should excel in many of the activities expected for ratings below, and also accomplish well some of the following additional illustrative activities:

- Participate in organized College/academic unit student recruiting activities
- Service as a faculty advisor for student organizations at the University, College, and/or Department levels
- Service as a reviewer for an academic journal and/or a reviewer for external grant proposals
- Active participation in national and regional academic and/or professional organizations as a program chair, track chair, session chair, discussant, and/or paper reviewer
- Active participation on University-level committees
- Presentation in continuing education programs to national, regional, and local academic and/or professional organizations
- Using one's professional expertise to assist public and/or non-public organizations
- Significant external service grants/contracts
- Serves as an external reviewer for a tenure decision at another institution

(2) Satisfactory: To be considered for this level, the faculty member must demonstrate proficiency in some of the following illustrative activities:

- Active participation on College and Departmental committees
- Active membership in national, regional, local academic and/or professional organizations
- Other external service grants/contracts

(1) Needs Improvement: This rating is warranted by a deficiency in any one of the following:

- Active participation on College and Departmental committees
- Active membership in national, regional, local academic and/or professional organizations

(0) Unsatisfactory: This rating is warranted by a deficiency in more than one of the following:

- Active participation on College and Departmental committees
- Active membership in national, regional, local academic and/or professional organizations

COLLEGIALITY

As stated in Louisiana Tech University Policy 2109, “Faculty are to conduct themselves in a professional and collegiate manner consistent with being a productive citizen of the department, college, and University community.”

Collegiality refers to behavior that is professional, cooperative, and respectful. Collegiality may be evaluated across instruction, research, and service, and will serve to be one of several criteria that may be related to the “satisfactory” level of performance in these areas. Non-collegial behavior is that which does not meet the definition of collegiality as stated above and is also consistent, severe, and persistent enough to detract from the productivity of faculty and staff. Respectful disagreement and infrequent/isolated incidents of discord should not be designated as non-collegial behavior, as differences of opinion are crucial to the health of any academic environment. Examples of non-collegial behavior include:

- Frequently insulting other faculty members in front of students
- Consistently lacking involvement in faculty meetings and job candidate interviews
- Regularly being unwilling to offer minimal assistance to other faculty members when expertise, help, or advice is requested

Using the above guidelines, non-collegial and/or unprofessional behaviors may impact the overall rating, but may not do so by greater than -1.0 (minus one) point.