



THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION PROCESS
Revised Draft from Executive Committee
May 5, 2021
Approved May 15, 2021

Approved by Executive Committee
September 12, 2019

Updated
November 16, 2019

Approved by Faculty
November 22, 2019



College of Business Administration Annual Merit Evaluation Process

The annual merit evaluation process encompasses the policies and procedures as given by 4.5 Evaluation of Faculty for Merit Salary Increase (updated November 4, 2016), <https://www.utep.edu/vpba/hoop.section-3/academic-policies-and-faculty-personnel-matter.html>, and informed by the College-specific criteria in support of section 4.5.3.

Department and College Procedures:

Consideration of an individual for merit salary increase will be initiated in the Department. The review for merit rating will focus upon the previous evaluation period and will conform to College or School policies specific to merit review.

A departmental faculty committee will review the documentation submitted by each faculty member and make a recommendation to the Department Chair. Composition and selection of any faculty committee will be determined by College or School procedures as specified below;

The Department Chair will review the documentation and the committee's merit rating recommendation for each faculty member. The Department Chair will forward the merit rating recommendation, the committee's recommendation, and the faculty member's documentation to the Dean.

The Dean will review each faculty member's file, arrive at a merit rating, and notify the faculty member of this rating in a dated, written memorandum. If the faculty member elects to appeal the Dean's recommended merit rating, the faculty member must notify the Dean in writing within ten (10) work days of the date of the memorandum. This appeal will be referred to a College merit rating appeals committee for review as outlined below. Merit rating recommendations that are not appealed will be forwarded to the Provost.

The Appeals Committee will comprise of faculty and/or administrators, as determined by College or School procedures approved by the Provost. The Appeals Committee will review the documentation and the merit rating recommendations of the Department Chair, the Dean, and any department faculty committee. The faculty member, Chair, and/or Dean may address the Appeals Committee. After deliberation, the Appeals Committee will formulate a recommendation. This recommendation will be sent to the Dean. The Dean will notify the faculty member of the recommendation of the Appeals Committee. The Dean will review the recommendation of the Appeals Committee in conjunction with the previous information and recommendations, and will arrive at a merit rating recommendation to be submitted to the Provost.

University Procedures:

The Provost will review the Dean's recommendation. If the Provost agrees with the Dean's recommendation, it will be forwarded to the President. If the Provost does not agree with the Dean's recommendation, it is returned to the Dean for further consideration. The Dean may consult with the faculty member, the Department Chair, and/or the College Appeals Committee. Following the re-consideration, the merit rating and justification are resubmitted to the Provost.

Documentation for Merit Rating

Each faculty member shall prepare and submit a faculty form or updated vita. The following materials will be on file in the department office for review by appropriate administrators and committees:

1. Material related to teaching and advising, e.g. student and/or peer evaluations, syllabi, examinations;
2. Copies of all publications listed in the vita update or faculty activity form;
3. Copies of any relevant unpublished work, e.g., preprints, technical reports, presentations at meetings;
4. Information related to department, college, university, professional, and community service.

Criteria

In accordance with approved College or School Policy, reviewed and accepted by the Provost, factors to be considered for a merit rating shall include, at a minimum, those basic duties of faculty members listed in 4.3.2 of the Handbook of Operating Procedures. Criteria noted in 4.4.5.5.3 and 4.4.6 of the Handbook of Operating Procedures may also be relevant. Each College or School will develop and distribute criteria specific to the faculty members affected.

Merit Evaluation in Special Cases

Faculty members whose appointment is not recommended for renewal will not be evaluated for a merit rating. They may still receive across-the-board faculty salary increases that may occur during the final year of their appointment.

First-year faculty members are not eligible for a merit salary increase; however, they will receive the average salary increase for their rank in the case of an across-the-board faculty salary increase.

Faculty members returning from leaves of absence will be evaluated and assigned a merit rating on the basis of their activities while on leave and the value of these activities to the University, Department, or profession.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty:

1. Faculty members in non-tenure-track positions will not be assigned a merit rating. However, they may be considered for faculty salary increases as outlined on pages 10 and 11 of this document;
2. The performance of faculty members in non-tenure-track positions will be evaluated on a regular basis; and
3. The results of the evaluations of faculty in non-tenure-track positions will be considered in decisions regarding possible reappointment.

Evaluation of Faculty Members with Non-Teaching Appointments (updated July 27, 2015)

UTEP is committed to regular, substantive reviews of its administrators with input from faculty members, staff, students, and where appropriate alumni, community leaders, and other sources in accordance with Regents' Rule 31101.

Evaluation of Faculty Members with Part-Time Administrative Appointments

Department Chairs, Program Directors, and Assistant and Associate Deans are faculty members with part-time administrative service appointments. They continue to have faculty responsibilities for teaching and research and are evaluated for annual merit on their performance in those dimensions as stated in 4.5 Evaluation of Faculty for Merit Salary Increase (updated November 4, 2016). As administrators, they will be evaluated by the responsible administrative officer who may consult with appropriate faculty members and other University officers with whom they work.

Evaluation of Faculty Members with Full-Time Administrative Appointments

Faculty members with 100% administrative appointments are evaluated through a combination of: an annual work plan and performance assessment program, directed by their supervisor, which may include input from faculty members, staff, students, and others where appropriate. Their evaluations may be further informed by a biennial faculty evaluation through the Faculty Senate process.

College of Business Administration Specific Criteria

First and foremost, the active involvement of faculty in all facets of teaching, research, and service are vital to the vibrancy of the College of Business Administration in serving its multiple stakeholders: students, 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 for the College to maintain its AACSB accreditation and contribute to the University's R1 designation as a research institution. As such, the College of Business Administration criteria for faculty performance with respect to teaching, research, and service will serve to both inform our accomplishments as a College and reflect upon areas for continuous quality improvement. Please note the merit pay review process is distinct from the College's third year review, promotion and tenure, and post-tenure processes.

TEACHING

It is obviously difficult to make a judgment about faculty performance in teaching with respect to the following dimensions and arrive at the overall rating. However, it is incumbent upon departmental merit review committees to be fair and equitable in the evaluation of faculty based on the portfolio of work related to their teaching performance in relation to the desired student learning outcomes as articulated in the College's Assurance of Learning standards for AACSB accreditation and in support of the department's degree programs, rather than simply focus on overall rating of the instructor.

1. Teaching will be rated as follows: 1 (lowest rating), 2, 3, 4, or 5 (highest rating). The individual rating reflects the following: 5-Exceptional, 4-Exceeds Expectations, 3-Meets Expectations, 2-Does Not Meet Expectations, and 1-Unsatisfactory.

2. 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. Faculty member's self-assessment of teaching performance
- b. Syllabi for each course with clearly defined learning objectives, and in adherence to department-specific criteria associated with courses
- c. Format and frequency of tests, homework assignments, quizzes and other graded material
- d. Student evaluations of teaching performance (number of students enrolled in each class, number of respondents, overall instructor mean, and overall course mean)
- e. Grade distributions
- f. Peer review of teaching
- g. Breadth and level of coverage of the subject matter reflects up-to-date disciplinary knowledge, and introduces appropriate rigor for the level of the course
- h. Organization of the course and the quality of delivery
- i. Faculty accessibility and interaction with students outside the classroom
- j. Faculty involvement with student research (undergraduate and graduate including supervision of capstone projects, thesis, and dissertations along with membership on thesis and dissertation committees)
- k. The inclusion of community-engaged coursework in courses
- l. The integration of a writing component in courses in relation to the enrollment in the course.
- m. The number of course preparations and recognition of class sizes
- n. The development of new courses, substantial revisions to existing courses, and/or alternative delivery format for courses (i.e. hybrid or fully online)
- o. Participation in on-campus professional development opportunities related to teaching and/or participation and presentations at pedagogical-oriented conferences.
- p. Recipient of College/University teaching award
- q. Recipient of External teaching award
- r. Active participation/support Assurance of Learning 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.

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

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, textbooks, case studies, professional practice standards or public policy, and intellectual contributions selected by the school. In addition to the items specified within the AACSB standards, the College of Business

Administration 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 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, 4, or 5 (highest rating).
2. The following 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. Textbooks
 - g. Professional conference paper presentations
 - h. Peer-reviewed conference proceedings
 - i. Case studies
 - j. Interdisciplinary peer-reviewed journal article with at least one UTEP faculty member outside the College.
 - k. Professional practice standards or public policy reports that have undergone review process.

As with any research effort there is a continued focus/debate on defining quality of the research outlet. Such debates center on such drivers 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. The College will use the most recent ABDC ranking to determine journal quality. The ABDC journal list is provided in a separate document and is also available through the following link: <https://abdc.edu.au/research/abdc-journal-list-2/>. In light of the university's interest in interdisciplinary collaboration across colleges, interdisciplinary peer-reviewed journal articles not appearing on the ABDC journal list and 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 the College on these activities. The points serve to guide faculty members in planning their scholarly activities and enable the Department Chair and Merit Review Committees to rate each faculty member's scholarly productivity as 1 (lowest rating), 2, 3, 4, or 5 (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 of vital importance 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 five 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 who has a terminal degree that is not directly related to the faculty member's field of teaching but has undergone a bridge program or other developmental endeavors to be able to teach and conduct research in that area may be considered SA subject to review and approval by the Qualification and Sufficiency (Q&S) subcommittee of the College's Executive Committee. In keeping with AACSB Business Standard 3, "The less related faculty members' doctoral degrees are to their fields of teaching, the more they must demonstrate higher levels of sustained, substantive academic and/or professional engagement to support their currency and relevance in their field of teaching and their contributions to other mission components."

Maintaining Academic Qualification: Once hired, a faculty member demonstrates maintenance of scholarly academic qualification through significant intellectual contributions. SA faculty members maintain their qualification as SA faculty 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 and the faculty member has published two peer-reviewed journal articles within the last five years from the ABDC journal list with at least one of these publications designated as Category A or above in the ABDC journal list.

Regarding the ABDC journal ranking, the quality of the journals are denoted as follows: A* (highest quality), A, B, and C (lowest quality). A rating of 5 requires at least an A* publication or two A publications (in the same year) from the ABDC journal list and the accumulation of 240 points. The maximum number of coauthors 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 coauthors. 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 1-5 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 5: 240 points, or more (A* journal publication or two A journal publications required among the 240 points accumulated)

Rating 4: 180-239 points

Rating 3: 120-179 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 0.75

(appearing in separate section of journal)

Comments 0.50

Replies 0.25

In order to award publication in high quality journal outlets, the points assigned to published/accepted journal articles at the level of A* and A are valued for two years. Points assigned for journal articles at levels B and C are valued in the year published or accepted only.

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.

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 ORSP	30	60
External grant awarded documented through ORSP	20 points for each \$15,000 awarded	Unlimited
Textbook	35	35
Interdisciplinary peer-reviewed journal article not on the ABDC journal list coauthored with at least one UTEP faculty member outside College	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 the following year. The faculty would not receive a rating of 5 since an A* journal was not included as part of the journal publications.

To qualify for merit review associated with research, the faculty member must update their research related materials as appropriate in Digital Measures, maintain Scholarly Academic status in accordance with AACSB faculty qualifications, and provide documentation related to the items listed above.

SERVICE

Faculty members are expected to participate in a wide range of service activities, all of which serve an important function both in terms of the College's operations and the shared responsibility inherent in the University's governance structure.

1. Service will be rated as follows: 1 (lowest rating), 2, 3, 4, or 5 (highest rating). The individual rating reflects the following: 5-Exceptional, 4-Exceeds Expectations, 3-Meets Expectations, 2-Does Not Meet Expectations, and 1-Unsatisfactory.

2. The following describes the range of service activities:

University-Related Service Activities:

Those faculty serving as Chairs of University, College, and/or Departmental Committees should be given greater consideration relative to the scope of the committee's duties in their service rating.

Faculty members are required to be specific as their service to University, College, and Departmental Committees (including serving as advisor to student organizations) to facilitate evaluation by the Department Chair and the Merit Review Committee.

Professional Service Activities:

Journal editor

Journal associate editor

Journal editorial board member

Journal referee

External grant reviewer

External reviewer for promotion and tenure cases (other universities)

External member of master theses and doctoral dissertations (other universities)

Advisory boards outside the University

Major office within one's national or regional 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.

Major office or assignment in a state professional organization or minor offices within one's national or regional professional organization.

Major office in a local professional organization or minor office within one's state professional organizations.

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 Digital Measures and provide documentation related to the items listed above.

OVERALL MERIT EVALUATION:

Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty, Scholarly Academic

In order 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 each area: 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

In order 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

In order to be eligible for a salary increase, non-tenure track faculty members who hold a terminal degree and 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

In order to be eligible for a salary increase, non-tenure track faculty members who hold a terminal degree and 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 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 Digital Measures.

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 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
- 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 conference other than or in addition to that needed to maintain license or certification
- For an individual who does not hold a professional license or certification, practice-related conference attendance
- Receipt of a practice-related grants

Appendix 2.
Examples of Scholarly Related Activities

- Publication of a paper in peer-reviewed academic journal
- Publication of a scholarly book
- Publication of an original textbook or revision
- Publication of a business case with instructional material
- Chapter in a scholarly compendium
- Publication of an edited volume
- Publication of 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
- Publication of a case study with instructional materials
- Book review in an academic or practitioner journal
- Publicly available working paper
- Authorship of a regular newspaper column
- Authorship of significant grant proposal
- Completion of a research-based, learning project with a company, governmental entity, or non-profit.
- Instructional software
- Presentation of paper at a regional, national, or international conference
- Presentation of paper at external workshop
- Serve as reviewer for an academic research journal
- Attendance at academic conferences providing discipline-related professional development
- 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- COBA competitive research award
- Receipt of a grant
- Receipt of a patent award