

8. Faculty Evaluation Standards

8.1 Purpose of Annual Evaluation Process

The purpose of the annual evaluation process is to provide faculty with clear expectations about what is necessary to be considered a productive faculty member. Data resulting from the annual review process shall be used as the basis for tenure and/or promotion, reappointment of non-tenured faculty, post-tenure review, awarding annual merit increases, and faculty awards/professorships. Although technically an annual review, the faculty review process should take a holistic approach that considers performance in the most recent three to five years with respect to research output, teaching progression, and major service activities. The most recent year should be considered as the single most important year but performance in other years should also be considered, especially for the purpose of merit given the variation of merit pools across multiple years (e.g., a faculty member should not be punished financially for achieving an exceptional year at a time when the merit pool is nominal).

Faculty members shall file the University Annual Professional Summary Report (reference 1.6 of the University Handbook (III. D.1) with the Department Head or Associate Dean and maintain and updated curriculum vitae in the Sedona database system. Peer evaluation is required as part of the periodic faculty review process (e.g., third-year review, continuation of probationary faculty, post-tenure review). Annually, Faculty members shall review their annual professional summary with their Department Head or Associate Dean each spring semester. The meeting with the Department Head or Associate Dean should evaluate past performance, address current faculty development concerns, and set goals for the coming year and beyond. The Engler College of Business Dean will periodically meet with each academic discipline to discuss academic programs and discipline needs.

Tenure-track faculty members engaged in their third year of service to the College shall submit an expanded annual professional summary encompassing their current and prior years of professional activity. The tenured faculty in the department, the Department Head or Associate Dean, and the Dean each participate in an extensive third-year review process to give faculty members a clear evaluation of progress toward tenure and promotion. The materials submitted are reviewed by the tenured faculty within the department and an evaluation is forwarded to the Department Head or Associate Dean. The tenured faculty and Department Head or Associate Dean evaluations are forwarded to the Dean. The composition of the committee will consist of the tenured faculty in the department and an outside member selected by the committee. The departmental committee must select a chair to lead the third-year review process. The Department Head or Associate Dean cannot serve on the departmental third-year review committee nor can the Department Head or Associate Dean participate in the deliberations.

The annual review process should follow standards that are consistent with the mission of the Engler College of Business. The mission of the Engler College of Business is composed of three dimensions: to provide quality instruction to its students, to create faculty intellectual contributions, and to provide service to its various stakeholders. Given the core mission, the intellectual contributions and service dimensions will serve to support the instructional dimension.

8.2 The Teaching Dimension

1. General Guidance

The teaching dimension of the Engler College of Business mission statement focuses on providing high quality undergraduate and graduate education in business and technology disciplines that produces readily employable professionals who are ethical leaders with a global perspective. The instructional dimension is divided into two segments: (1) Undergraduate—Responsible for providing an effective learning experience to students seeking a business degree, business minor, and course work for general education; and (2) Graduate—Responsible for providing an effective learning experience to students seeking a master’s degree offered by the Engler College of Business and to meet the selected needs of other graduate programs offered by the University.

All faculty members are expected to provide up-to-date instruction, improve effectiveness in their instructional assignments, contribute to program development, and meet College expectations for student access to faculty. Instructional responsibility measures include such things as number of courses, number of preparations, and number of students in courses, classroom contact hours, student/peer/administrative teaching effectiveness evaluations, and student advising. Examples of implicit performance criteria in instruction include, but are not limited to, the following factors:

- Courses taught at West Texas A&M University during the time frame being reviewed, including evidence of a high quantity of teaching via student enrollments and special course requirements.
- Development or revisions of courses, with emphasis on the preparation and use of innovative instructional materials, approaches, and techniques.
- Having an appropriate (as defined by the Department, College, and University) syllabus which is distributed at the first meeting of the class.
- Meeting with the class at the scheduled times unless there are extenuating circumstances.
- Outcome assessment and evidence of the use of some form of individual evaluation to assess student learning and the degree to which course objectives are being met.
- Evidence of continuous improvement.
- Evidence of high-quality feedback to students on projects, exams, and assignments designed to increase and enhance learning.
- Direction of internships, independent studies, and major student projects determined to be significant by College peers.
- Availability for meeting with students outside of the classroom and effectiveness in student advising in addition to normal office hours.
- Attendance at graduation, scholarship convocation, freshman convocation, and other events recognizing students for academic accomplishments, or those providing opportunities for student/faculty interaction.
- Student/peer/alumni/administrative evaluation of teaching effectiveness.
- Honors or recognition received for teaching effectiveness.
- Development activities focused on improving teaching effectiveness, including attendance at seminars, conferences, and workshops.

- Development of teaching/instructional materials including, but not limited to, textbooks, web teaching materials, and case studies and exercises.
- Returning homework, assignments, and exam grades to students in a timely fashion.

2. Consistency with University Policy

The Engler College of Business applies explicit instructional responsibilities that are consistent with the policies of West Texas A&M University as set forth in the University Faculty Handbook and as specifically addressed in the Annual Review of Faculty Form as follows.

A. Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness

- Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness;
- Peer, Department Head and/or Associate Dean(s), and/or alumni evaluations of teaching effectiveness;
- Effective participation in Core Curriculum courses based on incorporation of innovative teaching techniques and use of technology-based teaching strategies;
- Quality of instruction;
- Honors or other recognition for teaching effectiveness.

B. Teaching Innovation and Learning Assurance

- Development or revision of courses with emphasis on the preparation and use of innovative instructional materials, the incorporation of technology-based teaching strategies, classroom interactions, community-based learning, participatory learning opportunities and/or other student-engaging teaching techniques;
- Active role in developing new academic programs, majors and/or minors;
- Stimulation of student discussion and critical thinking;
- Incorporation and evaluation of student writing and research assignments in course requirements;
- Leadership in the development and successful accomplishment of a faculty-led Study Abroad course;
- Integration of theory with practice in course materials;
- Processes used for and the assessment of learning outcomes.

C. Teaching Load and Instructional Contributions

- Comparative assessment (to other departmental faculty) of course load responsibilities taught during the review period based upon the number of courses, the number of class/lab preparations, and the total classroom, lab and/or clinical contact hours per week;
- Direction of internships, independent studies, student research, major student projects, theses, dissertations, and/or capstone courses;
- Director, coach or mentor of student achievement in research or creativity.

D. Quality of Communications with Students

- Quality of course syllabi that communicate high academic expectations, assessment of student learning outcomes, timely return of graded materials, grading policy, and other course materials;
- Involvement with and effectiveness of student advising;
- Professional interactions with students that promote student learning and the mission of the University outside of the classroom;
- Maintenance of regular office hours and availability to students.
- Academic Development
- Engagement in activities that improve knowledge, ability or expertise such as participation at professional conferences or workshops that enhance teaching, advising, and/or learning outcomes assessment;
- Completion of professional certifications, internships, licensures or other professional development experiences that enhance professional effectiveness.

8.3 Evaluation Criteria for Teaching

Evaluation	Criteria for Evaluation
Outstanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching Portfolio demonstrates outstanding development of curriculum, courses, and assessment of Engler College of Business learning goals and objectives. • High levels of achievement in Teaching Criteria. • High levels of achievement based on departmental, College, and University norms for student, alumni, and peer evaluations.
Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching Portfolio demonstrates significant development of curriculum, courses, and assessment of Engler College of Business learning goals and objectives. • Exceeds the acceptable standards of the Teaching Criteria.
Satisfactory/Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching Portfolio demonstrates continuous improvement of courses. • Meets Teaching Criteria at acceptable levels. • Level of achievement is above minimum expectations for full-time faculty in the department and College.
Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The faculty member does what is required with effectiveness; but usually does not exceed expectations in all areas. • Meets Teaching Criteria at a minimum acceptable level.
Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The faculty member's performance ranks below expectations and must improve. • Faculty member should be given a written set of expectations for improvement should there be appointment continuation.

Teaching Portfolio: A faculty's syllabi, annual self-assessment, innovations, assurance of learning applications, etc.

Teaching Criteria: The (a) curriculum content requirements established by the faculty's department; (b) level of student/alumni satisfaction in the classroom while maintaining course rigor and academic standards; (c) level of peer/administrative reviews of classroom instruction.

8.4 The Intellectual Contribution Dimension

1. General Guidance

There are three categories of intellectual contributions associated with the Engler College of Business mission. Discipline-based scholarship contributions add to the theory or knowledge base of a faculty member's field. Contributions to discipline influence the profession in the faculty member's field. Learning and pedagogical research contributions influence the teaching-learning activities of the College. All participating faculty members are expected to continually augment the intellectual contributions of the College consistent with their classification as Scholarly Academic (SA), Practice Academic (PA), Scholarly Practitioner (SP), Instructional Practitioner (IP) faculty status.

Important characteristics of intellectual contributions include the work being subject to peer review and being publicly available. While both quality and quantity of intellectual contributions are important, the quality of the contribution is the more important criterion. Indicators of quality include publication in recognized (e.g., Cabell's directory) refereed academic and professional journals of the relevant discipline, receipt of awards for professional distinction, peer recognition via membership on editorial boards, and significant external funding for research. Collaboration, both within and across disciplines, in the creation of intellectual contributions is desirable and deemed to create an environment of collegiality through collaboration.

The evaluation of a faculty member's performance in the area of intellectual contributions includes, but is not limited to, the following factors:

- Publications (or verifiable acceptance) in refereed professional and academic journals.
- Publications of scholarly monographs and/or books.
- Papers presented at professional meetings and any subsequent publications in proceedings. Where possible, candidates should describe the review processes employed in selecting papers for presentation and their inclusion in proceedings.
- Publication of cases, chapters in textbooks, research comments, editorial comments, or invited articles in a peer-reviewed research outlet judged as being significant by College peers and the Department Head and/or Associate Dean(s).
- Research and/or publications having primary relevance to the local, state, or regional business communities.
- Consulting projects involving extensive applied research.
- Publication of professional software judged as significant by the faculty's peers and Departmental Head.
- Major editorial responsibilities such as editor-in-chief or executive editor of a journal or practitioner periodical.
- A funded grant proposal from a major external (e.g., federal or state government) source.
- Obtaining a Fulbright fellowship or equivalent.
- Creating and delivering professional education seminars that are well attended.
- Delivering speeches around the country to businesspeople through a contractual arrangement with a speaker's bureau.
- Authoring reports (from sponsored research) that are widely disseminated.

- Publishing (and sustaining the publication of) a newsletter or sequence of reports that attracts a significant subscription base.

2. Consistency with University Policy

The Engler College of Business applies explicit intellectual contribution responsibilities that are consistent with the policies of West Texas A&M University as follows.^b

A. Refereed Publications and/or Juried or Invited Exhibits or Performances

- Publication (or acceptance of publication) in refereed professional and academic journals of the results of research, analysis of cases, interpretations of knowledge, creative writing, instructional developments (including software), and/or pedagogical methodology;
- Publication of scholarly monographs, books, and/or chapters in books;
- Publication of technical reports having primary relevance to agencies or businesses at the local, state, or national level;
- Performances or exhibits of creative expressions that are performed or exhibited in a regional, national or international professional venue and/or are reviewed by documented professional authorities not associated with the University;
- Funded grant proposals from any external public or private source with special emphasis on external funding by state and national agencies;
- Patents or the commercialization of research;
- Professional consulting and/or commissions of creative work.

B. Professional Presentations of Knowledge or Creative Expressions

- Presentations of knowledge or creative expressions at professional conferences or exhibitions;
- Performances, exhibits of creative expressions, or presentations of knowledge at University-sponsored events;
- Invited lectures or presentations based on research, creativity, or professional expertise;
- Translation of research into practice by development or improvement of clinical practice guidelines, protocols or best practices.

C. Honors for Research or Creative Expressions

- External awards, honors or other recognition for intellectual contributions and/or creative contributions;
- University awards or honors for intellectual contributions and/or creative contributions.

^b For the purpose of annual evaluations, research is generally considered from the perspective of current year publications, accepted publications in press for the current or forthcoming year, and previous year publications.

8.5 Evaluation Criteria for Intellectual Contributions

Evaluation	Criteria for Evaluation
Outstanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantially beyond the criterion for Excellent in quantity and/or quality. • Some degree of distinction with respect to high quality • Exceptional level of achievement considered significant by College peers and administrators.
Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beyond the criterion for Satisfactory/Excellent in quantity and/or quality. • At least some published research in discipline-based scholarship in an established journal. Senior faculty are encouraged via the annual review process to provide general guidance as to defining what is acceptable with respect to defining established journal within the discipline (e.g., could apply a minimum of Engler College of Business rubric score of 7 in a discipline-specific journal within most recent five years as a target but standards and expectations are likely to deviate in quantity and/or quality across academic disciplines).
Satisfactory/Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beyond the criterion for Satisfactory in quantity and/or quality. • Engagement in impactful intellectual contributions beyond peer-reviewed journal articles considered.
Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Produces minimally adequate quantity/quality of research to meet basic requirements of faculty status appointment criteria (e.g., SA, PA, or SP). • Intellectual contribution portfolio lacks discipline specific research, external quality validation, or another characteristic of a portfolio exceeding satisfactory recognition.
Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The faculty member's performance ranks below expectations and must improve. • Faculty member should be given a written set of expectations for improvement should there be appointment continuation.

8.6 Peer Reviewed Journal Metrics Rubric

PEER REVIEWED JOURNAL METRICS			
TRAITS/POINTS	2	1	0
Listing	Journal clearly associated with one of the leading organizations within the discipline (e.g., AOM, AEA) or consistently recognized externally in the top 10% of all journals in the field or sub-field.	Journal listed by external database or index service such as Cabells, EBSCO, ProQuest, or Econ Lit.	Not listed by an externally recognized database or index service.
Publisher	Journal that is part of major publishing outlet with a stable of journals widely held in most academic libraries such as Taylor and Francis, Wiley-Blackwell, Elsevier, Emerald, Springer, Sage, or equivalent.	Journal associated with a national or regional academic organization with a clear and direct tie to an academic institution accredited by AACSB or equivalent.	Private/independent publisher that often publishes a stable of journals that are not widely held in library collections or associated with an academic institution accredited by AACSB or equivalent.
Financial	No explicit or implicit publication fees. Fees associated with optional additional publishing through an Open Access model is permitted contingent on the fees being independent of the review process. Fees associated with submission in a field where such charges are common with highly ranked journals are permissible.	Publication consideration with conference but conference registration not required and/or modest fees associated with publication.	The journal has page charges or similar fees in a field in which such charges are not common with highly ranked journal.
Established	Age of the journal is 30 years or older (e.g., volume number greater than 30) or younger journal with Impact Factor greater than 1.0.	Age of the journal is over 15 but less than 30 years established, or a younger journal with an Impact Factor between 0.3 to 1.0.	Emerging journal with less than 15 years of established history.
Impact/Editorial	Impact factor derived from ISI, Thomson Reuter data, or equivalent metrics that clearly establishes the reputation of the journal (e.g., Impact Factor greater than 1.0).	Journal with editor, editorial board, and majority of authors holding institutional affiliation with AACSB institutions or Impact Factor between 0.3 to 1.0 or discipline-related journal with significant national circulation to professionals.	Impact factor from a source that is not common with high ranking journals in the discipline and editor, editorial board, or majority of authors not associated with AACSB institution.

Notes: (1) Maximum point allocation for a journal is 10.

(2) Impact Factor is the number of citations the articles in a journal received in a given year divided by the number of articles published. The highest reported 3 to 5-year impact factor, as reported by Web of Science Journal Citations will be considered. A journal with an impact factor greater than 3.0 will automatically default to a score of 10.

(3). Upon acceptance of a journal article, a faculty member shall enter journal information, including the journal's International Standard Serial Number (ISSN), into the faculty information system. The faculty member shall also complete a Peer-Reviewed Journal Evaluation Forum and email it to the Journal Evaluation Committee chair. For fullest consideration to coincide with the Promotion and Tenure cycle and Annual Review cycle, faculty should submit journal information no later than August 15 and January 1, respectively.

(4) The chair of the Journal Evaluation Committee shall conduct an initial review and distribute it to the Journal Evaluation Committee for consideration. The Journal Evaluation committee shall hold a meeting to deliberate and vote on a journal score. The majority vote for a score shall be the recommendation of the committee. The Journal Evaluation Committee chair shall inform the faculty member by email with a total score and trait scores recommended by the Journal Evaluation Committee. The faculty member shall have five business days to appeal the score by using the Peer Reviewed Journal Appeal Form. When completed, the appeal shall be submitted to the Journal Evaluation Committee chair and will go to a give voting member subcommittee of the Journal Evaluation Committee. The subcommittee will contain at least one member from each academic department and will be randomly selected by the Journal Evaluation Committee chair and a voting member of the Journal Evaluation Committee.

The subcommittee shall have five business days to meet and send a recommendation to the Journal Evaluation Committee chair for consideration. After the opportunity to appeal has passed or the subcommittee has issued its recommendation, the Journal Evaluation Committee chair shall send a score recommendation to the COB administrative team for consideration. The COB administrative team shall make a final decision on the journal's score. The Journal Evaluation Committee chair shall inform the faculty member by email with the final total score.

(5) The Peer Reviewed Journal Metric is a general tool, but the peer and administrative reviews of faculty intellectual contributions is a robust process that may include many considerations beyond a guidance tool.

(6) Application of a rubric may result in a modest degree of variation across individual evaluators. In this specific rubric, faculty and administration believe the standard deviation is in the range of +1 or - 1.

(7) A previously scored journal may be considered for a new score after 2 years have elapsed since the most recent scoring. A faculty member shall initiate consideration of a new score using the Peer Reviewed Journal Appeal Form. When completed, the form shall be submitted to Journal Evaluation Committee chair, who will conduct an appeal process described in item 4.

(8) For the purposes of this rubric, "institution" is defined as "College of Business." Consideration for other discipline-specific affiliations will be made on a case-by-case basis.

8.7 The Service Dimension

1. General Guidance

The Engler College of Business must effectively serve constituents including students, the department, the College, the University, the academic profession, the business community, and the public. Individual participation in service activities complements the instructional dimension of the College mission by ensuring faculty remain intellectually active, providing for continuous improvement by community engagement, and enhancing the academic reputation of the College. The amount and nature of the service contribution are likely to differ as a function of individual skill, interests, and stage of career development.

The evaluation of a faculty member's performance in the area of service includes, but is not limited to, the following factors:

- Administrative duties.
- Service on Department, College, or University committees.
- Chairperson of Department, College, or University committees.
- Serve on the Faculty Senate.
- Consulting projects completed, the nature of each consulting project, time devoted to the consulting project, and whether external compensation was received.
- Provide in-house training and seminars to other faculty members.
- Serving as a mentor to colleagues or engagement in peer review process of colleagues.
- Leadership roles and committee assignments in professional organizations at the local, state, regional, or national levels.
- Holding an office in an active (i.e., the group met at least once during the year or that the position required some work) professional organization.
- Public service activities for governmental units at the local, state, or national levels.
- Serving as a session chair or serving in a voluntary capacity at a significant national or regional conference.
- Organizing a conference workshop, session, or panel judged as significant by departmental peers and Department Head and/or Associate Dean(s).
- Special projects assigned by the Department Head and/or Associate Dean(s), Dean, Provost, or President or other University official.

- Assist students in obtaining full-time employment and in obtaining and/or supervising internships.
- Student career advising and support.
- Creation of external development support for the College.
- Alumni relations and fund-raising activity.
- Attending College and University functions and meetings.
- Attendance at graduation, freshman convocation, and other events recognizing students for academic accomplishments, or those providing opportunities for student/faculty interaction.
- Participation at professional meetings.
- Membership in professional organizations.
- Community service judged as significant by departmental peers and Department Head and/or Associate Dean(s).
- Effectively serving on the editorial board of a journal.
- Book and manuscript reviewing judged as significant by departmental peers and Department Head and/or Associate Dean(s).
- Obtaining and maintaining significant professional certifications as judged by departmental peers and Department Head and/or Associate Dean(s).
- Effectively serving an active club or student organization as determined by the members of that club or student organization.
- Effectively serving as advisor to a significant active club or student organization where a significant time commitment is required.
- Effectively serving the College as a program director (e.g., SMIF, director of international programs, or MPA director) without release time.

2. Consistency with University Policy

The Engler College of Business applies explicit service responsibilities that are consistent with the policies of West Texas A&M University as follows.

A. Service to the University

- Service to the University through effective participation in administrative assignments;
- Service to the University through effective participation in committees or governance processes of the department, college and/or university;
- Service to the University through assisting student organizations or activities;
- Service to the University through non-credit or uncompensated teaching;
- Service to the University through active participation in the recruitment of students;
- Service to the University through leadership in the development of academic programs, curricula, or other special projects assigned by the Department Head and/or Associate Dean(s), Dean or provost;
- Service to the University as an effective elected member of the Faculty Senate, including Senate offices and committee assignments.

B. Professional Service to the Community, State, Nation or World

- Application of professional knowledge in (uncompensated) service to the community, state, nation, or world;
- Public service activities for governmental or non-governmental units at local, state, national, or international levels.

C. Service to the Profession

- Service to professional organizations through elected or appointed offices, committees, or conference assignments;
- Service to professional organizations through editorial assignments;
- Service to the profession through the publication of book reviews in professional outlets.

D. Honors for Service

- Honors for service to the University, community, state, nation, or the profession.

8.8 Evaluation Criteria for Service

Evaluation	Criteria for Evaluation
Outstanding	Meets requirements for Excellent plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exemplary leadership on Department, College, and/or University committees. • Exemplary leadership or high levels of contribution to academic, professional, and student organizations. • Exceptional level of achievement considered significant by College peers and administrators.
Excellent	Meets the requirements for Satisfactory/Excellent plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant leadership roles within Department, College, University committees and/or professional organizations. • Demonstrates significant contribution in academic, professional, or student organizations.
Satisfactory/Excellent	Performs accepted service roles including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance at graduation, scholarship convocation, freshman convocation, and other events recognizing students for accomplishments or providing student/faculty interaction. • Properly advising and supporting students. • Active participation in Department, College, and University meetings and committee assignments. • Participation in community service as a representative member of the University. • Service in academic, professional, and student organizations.
Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The faculty member does what is required with effectiveness, but usually does not exceed basic expectations in service activities.
Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The faculty member's performance ranks below expectations and must improve. • Faculty member should be given a written set of expectations for improvement should there be appointment continuation.

8.9 Collegiality and Professionalism Dimension

The Engler College of Business applies implicit collegiality and professionalism responsibilities that are consistent with the policies of West Texas A&M University as follows. Collegiality and professionalism is not a stand-alone review category but is an area that crosses the three primary performance categories of teaching, scholarly activity, and professional service.

A. Collaboration and Communication

- Supports collaborative decisions of the program, department, college and university;
- Serves as an active and productive participant in the development of academic programs;
- Abides by departmental, college and university policies;
- Serves as a mentor to faculty colleagues;
- Communicates in a professional manner with students, staff, faculty, administrators, and external constituents.

B. Participation and Professionalism

- Meets deadlines and prepares all required paperwork in a timely, accurate, and professional manner;
- Attendance at graduation and other events either recognizing students for academic accomplishments or providing opportunities for student-faculty interactions.

8.10 Relative Emphasis on Teaching, Intellectual Contributions, and Service

The Engler College of Business has published, as a component of its mission statement, clear expectations regarding the distribution of faculty effort in teaching, intellectual contributions, and service. The overall emphases of the Engler College of Business are as follows:^c

- Teaching— 50%^d
- Intellectual Contributions—30%
- Service—20%

With prior approval of the Dean, we provide consideration for flexibility for the individual faculty member by using a set of ranges for individual distribution of effort as follows:

- Teaching—40% to 70%
- Intellectual Contributions—15% to 40%
- Service—5% to 25%

^c Engler College of Business Faculty emphasis changed from 60-30-10 to 50-30-20 based on faculty approved vote in the fall of 2012

^d Teaching load for SA faculty is 9 hours and for Instructor faculty is 12 hours

Faculty administrators (e.g., Department Head and/or Associate Dean(s)) currently receive 6 hours of administrative release time for each long semester and 3 hours of release time during one summer semester. Given the administrative responsibilities, the ranges for distribution of effort are as follows:

- Teaching—40% to 50%
- Intellectual Contributions—20% to 30%
- Service—35% to 45%

This plan allows for reasonable individual faculty preferences in coordination with the departmental/college needs and goals. One feature is that it can be used to encourage probationary faculty (untenured, tenure track) to place appropriate emphasis into intellectual contributions to further their pursuit of tenure and promotion at the University. At the same time, it assures that adequate attention is paid to all three areas of contribution. The plan also allows for change in emphasis as faculty members progress through their careers. Finally, it assures that appropriate attention is paid to the central teaching mission of the University and Engler College of Business.

The plan requires that all faculty members in the Engler College of Business remain intellectually active. A specific objective is that all tenured and tenure-track faculty members achieve Scholarly Academic (SA) status to teach at the graduate level. This requires publication of a minimum of three refereed journal articles in a rolling five-year period and is a prerequisite for tenure. Once tenure is acquired, the same minimum requirements are strongly encouraged to maintain SA status. All faculty members are expected to participate in matters internal and external to the University. The service component, however slight, is still a serious expectation for every faculty member and a requirement for merit, tenure, and post-tenure review.

8.11 Clinical Faculty Definition and Promotion Standards

1. A clinical faculty member is defined as a person employed by the Paul & Virginia Engler College of Business at West Texas A&M University whose duties as specified in his or her letter of appointment include Instructional Responsibilities, Intellectual Contributions, and Professional Service, and whose rank, as identified in the letter of appointment, is Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, or Clinical Professor.
2. Appointment to any clinical faculty rank ordinarily requires completion of the appropriate terminal degree. Individuals appointed to Clinical Faculty positions are not eligible for tenure. Those in tenured or tenure-track appointments must forfeit their tenure position to be appointed to a Clinical position.
3. Assistant Clinical Professor. This is the entry-level rank and requires the completion of the appropriate terminal degree.
4. Associate Clinical Professor. Appointment to this rank requires the appropriate terminal degree and significant experience related to the position's responsibilities. Individuals pursuing the rank of Associate Clinical Professor are eligible to be considered for promotion to this rank after at least five (5) years at the rank of Assistant Clinical Professor. Years of service in a tenure-track or Instructor role may be applied to the five-year requirement by negotiation with the Dean. To achieve promotion, a faculty member must be considered "Outstanding" or "Excellent" in the evaluation categories of Instructional Responsibilities and Professional Service and at least "Satisfactory/Excellent" in the category of Intellectual Contributions (based on the definitions for each of these ratings in the Annual Review of Faculty). Faculty members with evaluations from all administrative levels lower than "Satisfactory/Excellent" in any category of evaluation during the last two years in the clinical appointment shall not be considered eligible for promotion, unless the candidate for promotion demonstrates extenuating circumstances such as serious illness or personal crises for such evaluations. Potential for development is also expected for promotion. Initial appointment at the Associate level may be made at the discretion of the Dean.
5. Clinical Professor. Appointment to this rank requires the appropriate terminal degree and evidence of outstanding performance in the academic field. Individuals pursuing the rank of Clinical Professor are eligible to be considered for promotion to this rank after at least four (4) years at the rank of Associate Clinical Professor. Years of service in a tenure-track or Instructor role may be applied to the four-year requirement by negotiation with the Dean. To achieve promotion, a faculty member must be considered "Outstanding" in at least one of the two evaluation categories of Instructional Responsibilities or Professional Service and "Excellent" in the other of these two categories and at least "Satisfactory/Excellent" in the category of Intellectual Contributions (based on the definitions for each of these ratings in the Annual Review of Faculty). Faculty members with evaluations from all administrative levels lower than

“Excellent” in the categories of Instructional Responsibilities and Professional Service during the three years preceding their application for promotion shall not be considered eligible for promotion. Faculty members with evaluations from all administrative levels lower than “Satisfactory/Excellent” in any category of evaluation during the last two years preceding their application for promotion shall not be considered for promotion, unless the candidate for promotion demonstrates extenuating circumstances such as serious illness or personal crises for such evaluations. Potential for development is also expected for promotion. Initial appointment to the rank of Clinical Professor may be made at the discretion of the Dean.

6. Clinical faculty will be reviewed on an annual basis by their direct supervisor. Such review will include requirements established in the initial letter of appointment and any additional requirements added during annual reviews. Clinical faculty are eligible for merit raises, as determined by the annual review.
7. Given clinical promotions and subsequent faculty base salary adjustments (e.g., 5% increase as the current norm) are not considered at the University level and the responsibility of the Engler College of Business, the Dean may limit the number of clinical faculty eligible for promotion to one per year. If more than one candidate seeks promotion in the same year, priority consideration in the current year is determined by the associate deans in the Engler College of Business and influenced by a combination of years of service and performance on annual review.
8. Clinical Faculty will prepare an annual activity report, in accordance with 12.99.99.W1/AA, Annual Review of Faculty Performance. The annual report will follow the same review process as other faculty.

First Level Process (Associate Deans): As front-line managers that annually review and evaluate clinical faculty, associate deans will put forth a rating (i.e., Outstanding, Excellent, Satisfactory/Excellent, and Satisfactory) for promotion in the categories of instructional responsibility (IR), intellectual contributions (IC), and professional service (PS). Clinical faculty must earn ratings from the associate deans consistent with the Engler COB Faculty Handbook for promotion (i.e., Excellent in IR, Satisfactory/Excellent in IC, and Excellent in PS to move forward in the process when pursuing promotion to the associate rank).

Second Level Process (Peers): A committee of peers (e.g., COB Promotion & Tenure Committee) will review clinical faculty and make a binary vote of *Meets Expectations* or *Does not Meet Expectations* when reviewing a clinical faculty member. The two guiding considerations clinical faculty are subject to when it comes to promotion are as follows: (1) Clinical faculty must earn ratings consistent with the Engler COB Faculty Handbook for promotion (i.e., Excellent in IR, Satisfactory/Excellent in IC, and Excellent in PS to move forward in the process at the associate rank); and (2) The clinical faculty member under review has a record of performance warranting promotion as an action that is consistent with the mission and in the best interest of the Engler College of Business.

Third Level Process (Dean): The dean will review clinical faculty and make a binary vote of *Meets*

Expectations or Does not Meet Expectations when reviewing a clinical faculty member. The two guiding considerations clinical faculty are subject to when it comes to promotion are as follows: (1) Clinical faculty must earn ratings consistent with the Engler COB Faculty Handbook for promotion (i.e., Excellent in IR, Satisfactory/Excellent in IC, and Excellent in PS to move forward in the process at the associate rank); and (2) The clinical faculty member under review has a record of performance warranting promotion as an action that is consistent with the mission and in the best interest of the Engler College of Business.

8.12 Evaluation of Part-time and Adjunct Faculty

EVALUATION OF PART-TIME INSTRUCTORS

Name:	Department:	Term/Year:
UIN:	College:	FTE:
Course(s) Taught:		

Instructional Responsibilities

Complete categories as appropriate:

Bases for Evaluation	Comments
CIEQs (current or previous, as appropriate) Semester: Course:	
Student Comments (Source)	
Faculty Comments (Source)	
Classroom/Field Experience/Clinical Observation Observer: Date:	
Adherence to Procedures (posting grades, syllabi, assessment, attendance, professional responsibilities, etc.)	

Recommendation: Acceptable for Re-hire: _____ Yes _____ No

Part-Time Instructor Signature

Date

Department Head and/or Associate Dean(s) Signature

Date

8.13 Tenure and Promotion Policies

The Engler College of Business will recommend for tenure and promotion those individuals whose career records and performance indicate that they are likely to make significant contributions to the life of the College and the University as determined by the department and College recommending those individuals for tenure and/or promotion. The College will recommend for tenure and/or promotion those individuals who satisfy the qualifications of their department, College, and University. Recommendations for promotion and/or the awarding of tenure should be based on reasonably objective criteria. The emphasis must be upon judging the overall quality of a candidate's performance.

Although they are closely related, tenure and promotion are formally, and by University policy, separate decisions. Candidates may elect to be considered for tenure and promotion in the same year and choose to submit a single portfolio in support of both decisions; however, department, College, and University evaluators will render separate decisions on the questions of tenure and promotion.

It should be emphasized that the *Engler College of Business Faculty Handbook* document provides guidance for faculty that is both specific and general. Although some target expectations for performance are provided, it should be understood that there is flexibility in how faculty demonstrate their readiness for promotion and/or tenure. As an example, a faculty member who has fallen short of a quantitative expectation may compensate by a demonstration of high quality in that same performance dimension (teaching, intellectual contributions, service), although productivity in one performance dimension area cannot compensate for a lack of productivity in another performance dimension area. It should be understood that the burden of proof that a faculty member is ready for tenure and/or promotion rests with the candidate. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to assemble a dossier of performance outcomes that is persuasive to all parties involved in the evaluation process.

Engler College of Business standards for Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly Activity (Intellectual Contributions), and Professional Service (Service) are provided in sections Evaluation Criteria for Teaching, Evaluation Criteria for Intellectual Contributions, Evaluation Criteria for Service, and Collegiality and Professionalism of this document. Candidates are expected to meet the University criteria for tenure and/or promotion at the specified College standards.

It is recognized that competence and extensive participation in each performance dimension (teaching, intellectual contribution, service, and collegiality) is required for tenure and promotion. Consideration of a candidate for tenure or promotion shall follow the timetable, operational policies, criteria, and documentation process established in the *Faculty Handbook* of West Texas A&M University and the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost. Faculty members are encouraged to reference the *Faculty Handbook* of West Texas A&M University for specific operational policies and related promotion and tenure considerations.

8.14 Nondisclosure and Confidentiality Statement Forms.

Each member of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee and each member of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee shall sign a nondisclosure and confidentiality statement.

1. Form for members of Department Promotion and Tenure Committee

WEST TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
Department Promotion and Tenure Committee
Non-Disclosure and Confidentiality Statement

As a member of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, I acknowledge that the tenure and promotion process require the full disclosure and review of personnel information including performance evaluation. I acknowledge the confidential nature of said information and all committee discussion and deliberation related thereto.

I agree to protect the confidential interests of the candidates for promotion and tenure. I acknowledge that all information related to any candidacy including discussions by the committee is confidential and proprietary. I agree not to disclose said information to any person or entity outside of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee membership.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

2. Form for members of College Promotion and Tenure Committee

WEST TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
College Promotion and Tenure Committee
Non-Disclosure and Confidentiality Statement

As a member of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, I acknowledge that the tenure and promotion process require the full disclosure and review of personnel information including performance evaluation. I acknowledge the confidential nature of said information and all committee discussion and deliberation related thereto.

I agree to protect the confidential interests of the candidates for promotion and tenure. I acknowledge that all information related to any candidacy including discussions by the committee is confidential and proprietary. I agree not to disclose said information to any person or entity outside of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee membership.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

3. The following form shall be used upon delivery and receipt of a faculty's promotion, tenure and third year review materials.

Acknowledgement of Receipt of Promotion, Tenure and Third Year Review Materials

This form acknowledges the receipt of promotion, tenure or third year review materials and includes the name of the faculty member submitting the materials, the direct supervisor or office personnel receiving the materials, and the date the materials are submitted. Once submitted, changes or additions to the materials may not occur.

Printed Name of Faculty Member

Signature of Faculty Member

Date

Printed Name of Person Receiving Submission

Signature of Person Receiving Submission

Date

8.15 Post-Tenure Review Policies

The College and University established a post-tenure review system to recognize faculty and foster excellence, to help good faculty become better, and to identify and help underachieving faculty fulfill the potential that was recognized upon the award of tenure. The process provides effective evaluation, useful feedback, appropriate intervention, and timely assistance to ensure that every faculty member establishes and maintains an acceptable record of professional development and accomplishment during the various phases of his or her career. The Engler College of Business policy follows the same process as established by the University.

8.16 Peer Review Process

The purpose of the Teaching Excellence Committee is to provide continuous improvement for instruction by creating an environment of exchange, support, and development in relation to teaching responsibilities. The peer-review process described below is the initial step toward continuous improvement for instruction. The Teaching Excellence Committee is a nine-person committee that is intended to offer the opportunity for multiple people to review one faculty member (e.g., four groups of two). All faculty teaching in the Engler College of Business can serve on the committee and are eligible for review (including administrators and part-time instructors), although committee members cannot be reviewed while serving on the committee. In a typical long semester (e.g., fall and spring), the nine-person committee is expected to conduct approximately two to four reviews.

The teaching excellence process includes, but is not limited to, peer-review of syllabus, evaluation of campus and/or online teaching, and a short interview exchange at the beginning and end of the process. The committee acknowledges that classroom performance is only one of many facets of a faculty member's total teaching system.

Results from the peer-review process are shared with the Associate Deans but will be viewed as one tool to be used in the process of faculty development and continuous improvement and not as an explicit metric of teaching performance. Reviewing and being reviewed are both actions that can be included as part of a continuous improvement effort and recognized for participation on the annual evaluation; however, the feedback generated through the peer-review process cannot be used in isolation for annual performance review, tenure and promotion review, reappointment of non-tenured faculty, annual merit increases in salary, post-tenure review, faculty awards, or professorships.

Additional guidelines for committee operations include the following:

- Faculty to be reviewed will be selected by a random process. The committee may adjust the schedule as needed for aberrations in the random selection process (e.g., ensure content expert, etc.) After being reviewed, faculty will be removed from the pool of possible selectees to ensure compliance with the other rules limiting the frequency of review.
- The committee chairperson provides oversight to the selection process and all reviews in coordination with four teams consisting of two committee members (e.g., much like an editor working with two reviewers). The committee chairperson can be part of a review team but may defer to the role as a central point of organization.
- Review teams should consist of two to three committee members per team. Faculty to be reviewed will have the option of requesting two members on the committee to serve on the review team, with the guarantee that at least one will serve.
- Ideally, a review team should include a member with an academic field closely related to the faculty member being reviewed to facilitate content perspective.

- Each review team will focus on reviewing one faculty member in the fall and a different faculty member in the spring.
- The schedule for the review will be determined by the faculty member and the review team.
- When possible, faculty reviews should look at more than one class and/or instruction modes (e.g., an ideal review would include a campus and an online course for faculty members teaching in both environments).
- Reviews should include, but are not limited to, the analysis of course syllabus, student rapport, organization, coverage of course and Engler College of Business learning objectives, and professionalism and ethics.
- The review process should normally start and conclude with a short meeting between the faculty member and the peer-review team (e.g., 15 to 30 minutes).
- The initial discussion before the observation might include the following question to enable the review team's observations and suggestions to be in alignment with the goals of the faculty member, thus increasing the value to the faculty member.
 - During the observation, is there anything to which you would like us to pay particular attention?
- All reviews should identify an area of strength or best practice employed by the faculty member.
- All reviews should offer a suggestion for continuous improvement for the faculty member.
- Reviewed faculty may submit an addendum to the peer-review observation form.
- Ideally, all faculty members teaching in the Engler College of Business will be reviewed at least once (and no more than twice) in a five-year period.

8.17 Peer Review Process Documents

The following documents used by the Teaching Excellence Committee to perform a peer review are located in the Engler College of Business online resource library.

- Peer-Review of Teaching Observation Form
- Course Syllabus Audit Form

9. Recognition and Development

9.1 Selection Process for Endowed Professorships

Appointments for Professorships in the Engler College of Business Administration are made for a three-year period, contingent upon satisfactory performance as evidenced in an annual report submitted to the Associate Deans or Dean. Appointments commence with the beginning of the applicable academic or calendar year. Each Professorship provides the recipient with a discretionary account of approximately \$5,000 to \$7,000 per year. The account can be used to