

WOODY L. HUNT COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
The University of Texas at El Paso

ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION PROCESS

Updated and Approved by Faculty
May 9, 2025

Updated and Approved by Faculty
September 30, 2022

Updated and Approved by Faculty
May 13, 2022

Revised Draft from Executive Committee
May 5, 2022
Approved May 15, 2021

Approved by Executive Committee
September 12, 2019

Updated
November 16, 2019

Approved by Faculty
November 22, 2019

Hunt College of Business Annual Merit Evaluation Process

The annual merit evaluation process encompasses the policies and procedures in the Handbook of Operating Procedures ([4.5 - Evaluation of Faculty for Merit Salary Increase Updated November 4, 2016](#)). It is informed by the College-specific criteria supporting section 4.5.3 and as outlined in the remainder of this document.

GUIDING PHILOSOPHY

The active involvement of faculty in all facets of teaching, research, and service is vital to the vibrancy of the Hunt College of Business in serving its multiple stakeholders: learners, alumni, donors, the University, and the community. In addition to the range of stakeholder interests in the performance of the College, it is also incumbent upon the College to maintain its AACSB accreditation and contribute to the University's R1 designation as a research institution. As such, the Hunt College of Business criteria for faculty performance for teaching, research, and service will inform our accomplishments as a College and reflect upon areas for continuous quality improvement. Please note that the annual merit review process differs from the College's cumulative third-year review, promotion and tenure, and post-tenure processes.

TEACHING

The evaluation of teaching is complex and multifaceted. For this reason, it is incumbent upon department committees to review a faculty member's entire portfolio of work related to teaching that goes beyond the formal student evaluations of the course and instructor. It is equally important that teaching evaluations are more formative in nature, as teaching is a process of continuous improvement. Teaching cannot be evaluated similarly to research, where outcomes are straightforward to ascertain with publication rankings.

Teaching will be rated as follows: 1 (lowest rating), 2, 3, or 4 (highest rating). The individual rating reflects the following: 4-Exceeds Expectations, 3-Meets Expectations, 2-Does Not Meet Expectations, and 1-Unsatisfactory.

The primary criteria for the rating will be (a) the effectiveness with which the subject matter is taught and (b) the learning of the subject matter by the students (i.e., student learning outcomes associated with the College's Assurance of Learning criteria). In general, the rating will take into account the following types of evidence:

- a. A faculty member's self-assessment of teaching performance
- b. An up-to-date teaching philosophy
- c. Syllabi for each course with clearly defined learning objectives (see [Bloom's Taxonomy](#)), corresponding course activities and assessments, and adherence to department-specific criteria associated with courses
- d. Format and frequency of tests, homework assignments, quizzes, and other graded material, including an unambiguous and straightforward grading policy.

- e. Student evaluations of teaching performance (number of students enrolled in each class, number of respondents, overall instructor mean, and overall course mean)
- f. Grade distributions
- g. Peer review(s) of teaching
- h. Breadth and depth of coverage of the subject matter reflect up-to-date disciplinary knowledge and introduce appropriate rigor for the level of the course
- i. Organization of the course and the quality of delivery; incorporation and discussion of active and experiential learning strategies
- j. Faculty accessibility and interaction with students outside the classroom
- k. Faculty involvement with student research (undergraduate [RSRC 4033] and graduate, including supervision of capstone projects, theses, and dissertations, along with membership on thesis and dissertation committees)
- l. Inclusion of community-engaged activities in courses
- m. Integration of a writing component in courses in relation to the enrollment in the course.
- n. Number of course preparations and recognition of class sizes
- o. Development of new courses, substantial revisions to existing courses, and/or alternative delivery formats for courses (i.e., face-to-face, hybrid, hyflex, or online)
- p. A clear, concerted, and documented effort to incorporate innovative practices and technology, such as AI, in teaching and learning.
- q. Participation in on-campus, primarily, and other professional development opportunities related to teaching and/or participation and presentations at pedagogical-oriented conferences.
- r. Recipient of College/University teaching award(s)
- s. Recipient of widely recognized external teaching award(s)
- t. Active participation/support in the college's Assurance of Learning efforts in terms of the assessment of student learning outcomes, collection and analysis of assessment data, and recommendations drawn from assessment results for those courses designated for assessment taught by the faculty member.
- u. Timely upload of all course syllabi each semester in compliance with HB 2504.

To qualify for a merit rating of 3 or higher in teaching, faculty members must update their teaching-related materials as appropriate in Faculty Success and provide documentation related to the items listed above.

A sample evaluation instrument for teaching is provided in SharePoint. The instrument is intended to guide the annual evaluation of teaching by signaling the values instructors are expected to uphold in their teaching at the Hunt College of Business. While the annual evaluation rating is expected to closely align with the evidence gathered and demonstrated in this instrument, the assignment of a final evaluation rating on teaching is ultimately at the discretion of faculty committees, department chairs, and the dean. This instrument is for guidance only.

RESEARCH

As in the case of teaching, research productivity includes many activities ranging from high-quality peer-reviewed journal articles to external grant funding. While the focus of departments' research efforts is to promote high-quality peer-reviewed journal articles, it is also in the College's long-term strategic interests to enhance the College's overall research productivity across disciplines in recognizing the breadth of contributions made by faculty. AACSB accreditation defines intellectual contributions within peer-reviewed journals as follows: basic or discovery scholarship, applied or integration/application scholarship, and teaching and learning scholarship. Other intellectual contributions include editorial-reviewed journal articles, peer-reviewed academic/professional meeting proceedings, academic/professional meeting presentations, competitive research awards received, and intellectual contributions selected by the school. In addition to the items specified within the AACSB standards, the Woody L. Hunt College of Business will also recognize intellectual contributions such as scholarly books, edited books/volumes, chapters in edited books/volumes, and peer-reviewed journal articles related to community-engaged scholarship in the merit review process. Please note that the thresholds for faculty qualifications for AACSB require peer-reviewed journal articles, as outlined below, in addition to the other intellectual contributions mentioned.

1. Research will be rated as follows: 1 (lowest rating), 2, 3, or 4 (highest rating). The individual rating reflects the following: 4-Exceeds Expectations, 3-Meets Expectations, 2-Does Not Meet Expectations, and 1-Unsatisfactory.

2. The list below describes the range of research activities:

- a. Refereed journal articles
- b. Scholarly books
- c. Edited books/volumes
- d. Chapters in edited books/volumes
- e. Competitive external grant submissions/awards
- f. Professional conference paper presentations
- g. Peer-reviewed conference proceedings
- h. Interdisciplinary peer-reviewed journal articles with at least one UTEP faculty member outside the College.

As with any research effort, there is a continued focus/debate on defining the quality of the research outlet. This debate centers on such issues as impact factors, the reputation of the institution/organization with which the journal or editorial office is affiliated, the professional standing of the editor(s)/editorial board, journal acceptance rate, etc. Hunt College will use the most recent ABDC ranking to determine journal quality. The ABDC journal list is available through the following link: <https://abdc.edu.au/abdc-journal-quality-list/>. In light of the University's interest in interdisciplinary collaboration, peer-reviewed journal articles that (1) do not appear on the ABDC journal list, (2) are not typically considered business journals, and (3) are published with a UTEP faculty member outside the College will be given credit as noted below.

The points assigned to various scholarly activities only signal the relative value placed by Hunt College on these activities. The points guide faculty members in planning their scholarly activities and enable Department Chairs and Merit Review Committees to rate each faculty member's scholarly productivity as 1 (lowest rating), 2, 3, or 4 (highest rating) during the evaluation year. The scholarly productivity rating is one input into the faculty member's overall evaluation.

In order to maintain AACSB accreditation, it is vital that the faculty of the College be classified as Scholarly Academic (SA). The college defines faculty as Scholarly Academic as follows:

Achieving Scholarly Academic Qualification: Upon being hired, a faculty member will be qualified as a scholarly academic (SA) if the faculty member meets one of the following criteria:

- The faculty member has completed a terminal degree in a field directly related to the faculty member's area of teaching within the five years prior to hire.
- The faculty member holds a terminal degree that is more than five years old in a field directly related to the faculty member's area of teaching. In the most recent six years, the faculty member engaged in activities and produced intellectual contributions that would have allowed that faculty member to maintain SA status if the faculty member had been subject to the College's faculty qualification and sufficiency guidelines.
- A faculty member with a terminal degree not directly related to the faculty member's field of teaching may be considered an SA, subject to review and approval by the College's Executive Committee. In keeping with AACSB Business Standard 3, "Additional terminal degrees may also be appropriate for SA status when the degree is closely related to the field of teaching and the faculty member sustains currency through scholarly activities in that field consistent with this standard."

Maintaining Academic Qualification: Once hired, a faculty member demonstrates maintenance of scholarly academic qualification through significant intellectual contributions. SA faculty members maintain their SA qualification through one of the following paths:

- A faculty member is classified as SA for three years after entering ABD status as a Ph.D. student.
- A faculty member is classified as SA for five years after completion of the faculty member's Ph.D.
- If a faculty member's Ph.D. is older than 5 years, the faculty member must have published three peer-reviewed journal articles within the last six years from the ABDC journal list with at least one of these publications designated as Category A or above in the ABDC journal list.
- A non-tenure track faculty member whose primary focus is on teaching and whose Ph.D. is older than five years is classified as SA when they have published two peer-reviewed journal articles in publications that are in the ABDC list within the last six years.

Regarding the ABDC journal ranking, the quality of the journals is denoted as follows: A* (highest quality), A, B, and C (lowest quality). The maximum number of co-authors on publications to be considered for the full assignment of points in the annual merit evaluation is five. For publications with more than five authors, the points assigned to a particular publication will be the journal points divided by the number of co-authors. For example, a faculty member is one of six co-authors on an A* journal article would receive (240/6) 40 points. Sole-authored publications at any level will be given a 25% increase in points associated with the journal level. To facilitate the assignment of the 1-4 merit rating in research and in order to be inclusive of the quality and breadth of research output produced, the following mapping of a points system is outlined as follows:

Rating 4:	240 points or more
Rating 3:	120-239 points
Rating 2:	70-119 points
Rating 1:	69 points or less

Quality Weights for Journals:

Level A* journal article	240 points
Level A journal article	180 points
Level B journal article	70 points
Level C journal article	35 points

Quantity Weights for Journal Publications:

Articles	1.00
Notes and short papers (appearing in a separate section of the journal)	0.75

To award publications in high-quality journal outlets, the points assigned to published/accepted journal articles at the A* level are for three years, and those at the A level are valued for two years. Points assigned for journal articles at levels B and C are valued only in the year published or accepted.

Given the College's focus on U.S.-Mexico Trade and Commerce, peer-reviewed publications on U.S.-Mexico trade and commerce will receive a 20% increase in points associated with the journal level.

In addition to the journal articles, the following points are assigned to research output other than refereed journal articles valued in the year of the merit evaluation. As outlined previously, a 20% increase in points will also be allocated for each scholarly work in the table below related to U.S.-Mexico trade and commerce.

Research Activity	Points	Maximum points per activity per year
Scholarly book	120	120
Edited book (volume)	50	50
Chapter in edited book (volume)	25	25
External grant submission submitted and documented through R&I	30	60
External grant awarded documented through R&I	20 points for each \$15,000 awarded	Unlimited
Interdisciplinary peer-reviewed journal article not on the ABDC journal list coauthored with at least one UTEP faculty member outside College; journals are not typically considered to be in business	35	70
Professional practice standards or public policy report with review process	15	30
Peer-reviewed case studies	15	30
Peer-reviewed conference proceedings	10	20
Conference presentation	5	10

Example: A faculty member publishes a level A co-authored journal article (four coauthors) and a level B journal article (sole-authored) along with an external grant award (submission credit given the previous year) for \$100,000 and two paper presentations. The points awarded are as follows:

Level A journal article: 180 points

Level B journal article (sole-authored): $(70 \text{ points} \times 1.25) = 87.5 \text{ points}$

Grant award \$100,000 with three investigators: $[(\$100,000/\$15,000) \times 20] = 133.33 \text{ points}$

Two paper presentations: $(5 \text{ points} \times 2) = 10 \text{ points}$

Total points: 400.83 points

The faculty member would receive a rating of 4 on research in the evaluation year and can use the 180 points for the Level A publication next year.

To qualify for a merit rating associated with research, the faculty member must update their research-related materials as appropriate in Faculty Success, maintain Scholarly Academic status per AACSB faculty qualifications, and provide documentation related to previously listed items.

Faculty members may be specifically hired to engage in interdisciplinary research. For these faculty, expectations regarding teaching and service remain the same as for all other faculty members, subject to any stipulations outlined in their appointment or offer letter. However, the allocation of research points may differ.

Publications in interdisciplinary journals (i.e., journals not listed in the ABDC list) will be awarded points as specified in the previous table. Faculty designated as Interdisciplinary Faculty Members (IFMs) may petition the college for additional research activity points for publications not on the ABDC list. To do so, they must submit a written request and supporting documentation (e.g., alternative journal rankings) to the Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development. This request must be submitted at least two weeks before the annual evaluation document deadline, typically no later than January 31.

Upon receiving the request, the college will convene a representative committee of tenured faculty members from all departments to review the petition. Department merit review committees and chairs cannot award additional points independently. The college committee will evaluate the request using the information provided by the IFM, as well as widely recognized journal ranking lists and quality indicators, such as InCites Journal Citation Reports, AJG, FT50, reputable external-to-the-college rankings, and discipline-specific journal rankings. Based on its deliberations, the committee will make a recommendation to the dean and communicate this to the IFM. The dean will then consider this input when arriving at his/her recommendation.

It is important to note that AACSB faculty standards (e.g., the SA qualification) for IFMs are the same as those for other tenured and tenure-track faculty. The IFM designation is granted by the dean, typically at the time of hiring and in consultation with the Provost's Office.

SERVICE

Faculty members are expected to fully, actively, consistently, and thoughtfully participate in a wide range of service activities, all of which serve an important function in the College's operations and the shared responsibility inherent in the University's governance structure. The college's service philosophy rests on the idea of faculty leadership. It refers to the roles and responsibilities of faculty members beyond their core teaching and research duties. It involves guiding, mentoring, and engaging with colleagues and students, as well as supporting institutional initiatives to advance the mission of the University. Faculty leadership can take various forms, including:

1. **Academic Leadership** – Leading curriculum development, program assessment, and accreditation efforts to enhance the quality of education.
2. **Committee Leadership** – Chairing or serving in a key role on University, college, or department committees that influence policy, governance, and decision-making.
3. **Mentorship and Development** – Advising junior faculty, mentoring students, serving on dissertation committees, and supporting professional growth among peers and students.
4. **Research Leadership** – Leading research centers, interdisciplinary initiatives, or large-scale funded projects contributing to the institution's research profile.
5. **Community, Institutional, and Professional Engagement** – Representing the institution in external organizations, collaborating with industry or government partners, participating in public service initiatives, and engaging in academic and discipline circles.
6. **Strategic Problem-Solving** – Taking the initiative to address ongoing challenges within the department or college, such as improving faculty workload balance, enhancing student success, or fostering excellence.

- 7. Innovation and Technology Adoption** – Spearheading efforts to integrate new technologies such as AI, improve pedagogical methods, or develop innovative academic programs.

Unlike administrative roles, faculty leadership typically does not involve direct managerial authority and additional compensation. It relies on collaborative communication and a commitment to institutional service and improvement. Strong faculty leadership enhances the academic environment, fosters innovation, and contributes to the long-term success of the college and University. Ultimately, faculty involvement in the form of service provides a sense of belonging and shared responsibility and improves overall faculty productivity and job satisfaction. Therefore, it is important for all faculty to cultivate an environment in which service is respected and valued.

Service will be rated as follows: 1 (lowest rating), 2, 3, or 4 (highest rating). The individual rating reflects the following: 4-Exceeds Expectations, 3-Meets Expectations, 2-Does Not Meet Expectations, and 1-Unsatisfactory. Below is a description of the range of service activities and expectations based on tenure status and seniority.

University- and Community-Related Service Activities:

Junior tenure-track faculty members are expected to be active and engaged department citizens from the outset; their service expectations should remain reasonable during their first three years at UTEP to allow them to focus on developing their research and teaching. During this initial period, these faculty members typically receive a service rating of 3 unless their contributions significantly exceed or fall below expectations, in which case a higher or lower rating may be assigned. A clear justification needs to be offered to the faculty member and others in the sequence of recommendations as to why a rating other than three was assigned in the case of junior faculty members. Following the completion of the third year, Hunt College expects junior faculty to be fully embedded in the life of the college by taking the initiative and demonstrating leadership on the service side.

As faculty gain seniority, expectations for service responsibilities and leadership (distinct from administrative duties) increase in depth and breadth. This includes taking the initiative to address persistent challenges, improve the curriculum, adopt and disseminate information about effective pedagogies, mentor junior faculty, advance the discipline, department, college, and University goals, etc. Senior faculty members play a key role in the life of the University. They must show productive and thoughtful involvement with a distinct impact on others (students, faculty, community, etc.) to receive a merit rating of 3 and above.

Faculty members serving as chairs of University, College, and/or Departmental Committees should receive greater consideration in their service rating, reflecting the scope and impact of their committee responsibilities. To ensure that department merit committees, department chairs, and the dean can assign appropriate ratings, faculty members must provide detailed documentation of their service activities. This should include a discussion of their contributions,

particularly when they exceed typical expectations. Demonstrating the impact of service activities on students, faculty, the department, the college, the community, and discipline helps convey the significance of these efforts. For instance, leading the VITA program at UTEP exemplifies high-impact service, as it directly benefits the El Paso community by assisting approximately 200+ residents in filing their tax returns each year. Being the editor of a reputable journal also signifies a high-impact service activity because of its essential role in advancing knowledge in a particular discipline. However, discussing the journal's quality/impact is important by providing evidence associated with rankings, citations, etc.

Depending on their workload assignment, non-tenure track faculty members are expected to engage in service activities impacting the department, college, university, and community. In consultation with the department chair, each NTT faculty member must have a development plan that addresses service by setting clear expectations consistent with the Hunt Business mission and also aligns with AACSB classification expectations.

Professional Service Activities (non-exhaustive):

- Journal editor
- Journal associate editor
- Journal editorial board member
- Journal referee, ad-hoc reviewer
- External grant reviewer
- External reviewer for promotion and tenure cases (other universities)
- Chair/discussant at regional/national academic conference
- Chair/co-chair of an academic conference
- External member of master theses and doctoral dissertations (other universities)
- Advisory boards outside the University
- Major office within one's national, regional, or professional organization
- Major (non-paid) consultation and service to civic organizations, social agencies, government, business, or industry that is of benefit to the faculty member's teaching, research, or administrative work at UTEP. This refers to individual leadership and initiative on a project that has a significant and lasting impact on the policies or operations of the agency, including direct and unambiguous impact on the Paso del Norte community.
- Major office or assignment in a state professional organization or minor offices within one's national or regional professional organization.
- Presentation (non-paid) of speeches/papers at trade or professional meetings (e.g., meetings targeted at what is primarily a non-academic audience).
- Recipient of College/University service award
- Recipient of external service award

To qualify for merit review associated with service, the faculty member must update their service-related activities as appropriate in Faculty Success and provide documentation related to the items listed above.

A sample evaluation instrument for service is provided in SharePoint. The instrument is intended to guide the annual evaluation of service by signaling the college's service expectations. While the annual evaluation score is expected to closely align with the evidence gathered and demonstrated in this instrument, the assignment of a final evaluation score is ultimately at the discretion of faculty committees, department chairs, and the dean. This instrument is for guidance only.

OVERALL MERIT EVALUATION:

Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty, Scholarly Academic

To be considered for merit pay, tenured and tenure-track faculty members classified as Scholarly Academic (SA) must maintain SA status and receive at least a merit rating of 3 in teaching, research, and service. Note that ratings below 3 for teaching, research, or service may trigger the development of a consultative performance plan by the Department Chair and/or Dean.

Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty, Practice Academic

To be considered for merit pay, tenured faculty members classified as Practice Academic (PA) must maintain PA status and receive at least a merit rating of 3 in teaching, practice-related activities, and service. Note that ratings below 3 for teaching and service may trigger the development of a consultative performance plan by the Department Chair and/or Dean.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty, Scholarly Academic

To be eligible for a salary increase, non-tenure track faculty members who hold a terminal degree and are classified as Scholarly Academic (SA) must maintain SA status and have a satisfactory annual evaluation in their teaching, research, and service responsibilities that are associated with this classification.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty, Practice Academic

To be eligible for a salary increase, non-tenure track faculty members who hold a terminal degree and are classified as Practice Academic (PA) must maintain PA status and have a satisfactory annual evaluation in their teaching, practice-related activities, and service responsibilities that are associated with this classification.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty, Scholarly Practitioner

In order to be eligible for a salary increase, non-tenure track faculty members who do not hold a terminal degree and are classified as Scholarly Practitioner (SP) must maintain SP status and have a satisfactory annual evaluation in their teaching, research, and service responsibilities that are associated with this classification.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty, Instructional Practitioner

In order to be eligible for a salary increase, non-tenure track faculty members who do not hold a terminal degree and classified as Instructional Practitioner (IP) must maintain IP status and have a satisfactory annual evaluation in their teaching, instructional practice-related activities, and service responsibilities that are associated with this classification.

In order to perform these evaluations, and similar to tenured/tenure-track faculty members, non-tenure track faculty members are required to provide relevant materials regarding teaching, research, and service in Faculty Success.

The overall rating will be on the sum of the weights assigned to the respective teaching, research/practice-related activities, and service ratings based on a faculty member's workload in accordance with the College's Workload Policy.

Appendix 1. Examples of Practice-Related Activities

- Publication of an article in a national or international journal or magazine with a significant practice audience
- Publication of a practice-related newsletter with at least regional distribution
- One year as editor or co-editor of a practitioner journal or magazine
- Two years as associate editor or on the editorial board of a practitioner journal or magazine
- Employment in a practice area closely related to the area of teaching
- Consulting and/or conducting a research project for a business, nonprofit, government agency, or economic development agency
- Board membership on a board of directors of a company or nonprofit organization
- Faculty internships
- Leadership roles in a practice-related organization, e.g., American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA), Association of Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE)
- Delivery of executive education, CPE, invited speeches, and/or training for business or trade groups
- Obtaining/maintaining a new license or certification
- For an individual who holds a professional license or certification (e.g., CPA)--eight hours at practice-related conferences other than or in addition to that needed to maintain a license or certification
- For an individual who does not hold a professional license or certification, practice-related conference attendance
- Receipt of practice-related grants

Appendix 2. Examples of Scholarly Related Activities

- Publication of a paper in a peer-reviewed academic journal
- Publication of a scholarly book
- Publication of a business case with instructional material
- Chapter in a scholarly compendium
- Publication of an edited volume
- Publication of a paper in peer-reviewed conference proceedings
- Research monograph
- Public policy analysis on behalf of the university
- Final written report on a significant, funded research project
- Article in a national or international magazine or non-peer-reviewed journal
- Book review in an academic or practitioner journal
- Authorship of a significant grant proposal
- Completing a research-based learning project with a company, governmental entity, or non-profit.
- Presentation of paper at a regional, national, or international conference
- Presentation of paper at external workshop
- Serve as reviewer for an academic research journal
- Service as a journal editor or co-editor for a discipline-based or pedagogical journal
- Service as an associate editor or member of a journal editorial board for a discipline-based or pedagogical journal
- Service in a leadership position in a regional, national, or international academic organization
- Service as special editor at an academic conference
- Receipt of a non-Hunt Business competitive research award
- Receipt of a grant
- Receipt of a patent award