# 03.FAC.05 – Faculty Annual Evaluation

Revised and Approved by COB Faculty (January 8, 2024)
Non-substantive revisions approved by COB FHMC (April 4, 2024)

[Revision History](#)

This document outlines the process for evaluating full-time faculty in the College of Business. The annual evaluation of faculty is based on a calendar year.

## A. Overall Annual Evaluation

In general, faculty are evaluated on research, scholarship and creative activity (RSCA), teaching, and service performance.  The College weights each criterion to reflect the performance expectations for different classifications of faculty.  Tenured and Tenure-track faculty are typically assigned weights to each area of evaluation as follows:

- Tenured faculty: 40% RSCA, 40% teaching, and 20% service.
- Tenure-track faculty: 45% RSCA, 45% teaching, and 10% service. Weights for tenured faculty may be modified by the Dean and/or Department Chair to reflect different performance expectations associated with faculty development leave, administrative duties, and other forms of leave/reassignment.

Fixed-term faculty (i.e., Instructors, Clinical Professors, Professional Professors) will be evaluated on service performance and RSCA, teaching, or professional engagement in accordance with their letters of appointment and documented consultation with the Dean and/or Department Chair. Fixed-term faculty are typically assigned weights to each area of evaluation with one performance area emphasized as follows:

- 60% primary performance area; 30% secondary performance area; and 10% service (e.g., 60% teaching, 30% professional engagement, 10% service or 60% professional engagement, 30% teaching, 10% service).

Fixed-term faculty are expected to meet the same annual evaluation requirements in their primary area as tenured and tenure-track faculty. They will also be expected to meet the same requirements for service as tenure-track faculty. Fixed-term faculty may have reduced requirements to achieve higher ratings in their secondary performance area.

Faculty evaluations are based solely on activities documented in the faculty activity database (e.g., Interfolio).  Faculty are responsible for documenting RSCA, professional engagement, teaching, and service activities.  Faculty are also responsible for providing the following information in the activity database prior to the annual evaluation interview:

- Completing the Annual Report (under "Goals & Accomplishments" in Interfolio) for the evaluation period to summarize accomplishments in RSCA, teaching, and service activities.
- Completing and attaching a self-evaluation document to the Annual Report (under "Goals & Accomplishments" in Interfolio) for the evaluation period that specifies the ratings for RSCA, evaluation, and service (form to be provided).

- Creating an Annual Report (under "Goals & Accomplishments" in Interfolio) for the next evaluation period to specify RSCA, teaching, and service goals/objectives.

Once appropriate weightings on individual components have been assigned, the weighted total evaluation scores are translated into an overall annual evaluation outcome according to the following table:

| Weighted Total Score | Overall Annual Evaluation |
|---|---|
| 1.0 – 1.500 | Unsatisfactory |
| 1.501 – 2.000 | Meets Expectations |
| 2.001 – 3.000 | High |
| 3.001 – 4 | Excellent |

As stated in University Procedure 12.01.99.C0.06: Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members, eligibility for merit payment connected to the annual faculty evaluation requires faculty members to receive an overall rating of Meets Expectations or higher.

Pursuant to University Procedure 12.99.01.C0.01 – Faculty Development Leave, if a faculty member is awarded faculty development leave, the accomplishments will be included in the faculty member's annual review for the year in which the leave was taken. Accomplishments may be included in the COB Self-Evaluation Template, if appropriate, or provided as a separate document.

## B. RSCA Evaluation (Rating Scale 1-4)

The primary objective of the RSCA evaluation is to encourage faculty to contribute to the goals of the College of Business and maintain appropriate AACSB academic qualification status. The primary responsibility of maintaining appropriate status lies with the faculty. RSCA performance of faculty is viewed from a long-term perspective.  Any other circumstance not covered by the present document will be analyzed first by the faculty member's direct supervisor. If no agreement can be reached, then if deemed appropriate, the chair of the FQC can be invited to participate in the process. If no agreement is reached between the parties, the final decision will be made by the Dean.

### B1. AACSB Classification Maintained Through Scholarship Activities (SA/SP)

Scholarship activity evaluation will be according to the guidelines and list of journals adopted by the Faculty Qualifications Committee (FQC). Typically, this will include the list developed by the Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC), the list of the Association of Business Schools (CABS) commonly known as the International Guide to Academic Journal Quality list, and any other list provided by FQC as shown in Table B-1.

| Table B-1 COB Quality Rating | Criteria | Points Assigned |
|---|---|---|
| Elite (E) Articles | Journals in the ABDC list with a rating of A* <br> Journals in the CABS list with a rating of 4* or 4 <br> Journal rating by the Faculty Qualifications Committee (FQC) | 30 |

| Table B-1 COB Quality Rating | Criteria | Points Assigned |
|---|---|---|
| Very High Quality (VHQ) Articles | Journals in the ABDC list with a rating of A<br>Journals in the CABS list with a rating of 3<br>Journal rating by the FQC | 25 |
| High Quality (HQ) Articles | Journals in the ABDC list with a rating of B<br>Journals in the CABS list with a rating of 2<br>Journal rating by the FQC | 20 |
| Quality (Q) Articles | Journals in the ABDC list with a rating of C<br>Journals in the CABS list with a rating of 1<br>Journal rating by the FQC | 15 |
| Other intellectual contributions A (OIC-A) | Scholarly book or monograph published by a leading internationally recognized publisher, as agreed upon in consultation with the Department Chair. | 16-25 |
| Other intellectual contributions B (OIC-B) | Conference presentations or proceedings at international, national, or regional levels. Other output, including anthologies, book chapters, trade publications, magazines, newspaper articles, etc., as detailed in Table 1 in 03.FAC.04 Faculty Qualifications and Engagement Standards in consultation with the Department Chair | 1-15 |

*Predatory Journal Statement:* Scholarship activity in a predatory journal will not be included in a faculty member's evaluation. The ABDC and CABS lists exclude journals that are likely predatory. If a journal is not included in these lists, the journal must meet specific requirements before being added to the internal list of Accepted Journals maintained by the College. These requirements exclude predatory journals and can be found in "Request for Adding a Journal to the List of Accepted Journals" (05.FOR.03).

*Supervisor's Evaluation of Work in Progress:* Faculty should provide evidence of work under review to their supervisor. Total points for work in progress will range from 0 to 5 points.

*Rating for Annual Evaluation:* Scholarship activity rating would be based on -the most recent 3-year total points according to the following table:

| 3-Year Total Scholarship Activity Score | Scholarship Activity Rating | COB Performance Category |
|---|---|---|
| At least 30 total points:  must include at least one HQ or better publication* | 4.0 | Excellent |
| At least 22 total points: must include at least one Q or better publication* | 3.0 | High |

| 3-Year Total Scholarship Activity Score | Scholarship Activity Rating | COB Performance Category |
|---|---|---|
| At least 15 total points: must include at least one Q or better publication* | 2.0 | Meets Expectations |
| Below 15 total points recognizing that scholarship activities are in progress | 1.0 | Unsatisfactory |

* To receive a Scholarship Activity Rating of 2.0 or above, a faculty member must maintain AACSB Academic Qualification status (as Scholarly Academic (SA) or Scholarly Practitioner (SP)).

*New Faculty:* For annual evaluation purposes, newly hired faculty members will receive a minimum of 2.0 (Meets Expectations) for their first year. The Scholarship Activity performance for the second year will be evaluated by the direct supervisor.

*Fixed-term Faculty (Secondary Performance Area):* Fixed-term faculty may utilize the most recent 5-year point totals according to the table above.

*Articles Accepted for Publication:* Articles accepted for publication can be used, at faculty request, on the year the acceptance letter is received; however, those articles will only be considered for annual evaluations for a total of three years.

*Change of Ratings:* Journal lists are updated from time to time. Evaluation will be made using the journal ranking at the time of publication/acceptance.

*Other Circumstances:* The chair of the department, in consultation with the faculty member, will determine the quality rating of any books or scholarship activity reports that will substitute for a journal publication in accordance with the Faculty Qualifications and Engagement Standards document.

## B2 - AACSB Classification Maintained through Professional Engagement Activities (PA/IP)

The PA/IP faculty member must first meet the Initial Academic Preparation requirement, as stated in the College of Business Faculty Qualifications and Engagement Standards (see 03.FAC.04). Annual evaluation ratings for Professional Engagement are based on performance related to one or more of the activities listed in Table B-2.

| Table B-2 – Professional Engagement Activity Categories |
|---|
| Consulting activities that are material in terms of time and substance. |
| Relevant, active service on corporate or non-profit boards of directors. |
| Significant participation in business professional associations (leadership roles). |
| Documented continuing professional education experiences (includes the acquisition of and regular maintenance of professional certifications or licenses). |
| Faculty internships. |
| Professional work (employment). |
| Invited professional public speaking engagements to reputable business organizations and/or associations. |
| Production and delivery of substantial professional development activities. |
| Practice-oriented or scholarly intellectual contributions. |

| Table B-2 – Professional Engagement Activity Categories |
| --- |
| Manage a substantive College of Business program that directly engages with university stakeholders and/or the local community |
| Other appropriate professional activities as approved by the Faculty Qualifications Committee and the College of Business Chair's Council. |

*Minimum Expectations to be Rated Meets Expectations (2.0):* The minimum expectations for a PA/IP to be rated Meets Expectations (2.0) in Engagement Activities are *significant* contributions in one (1) Engagement Activity Category listed in Table B-2 during the most recent five-year period.

*Criteria to be Rated High (3.0):* The PA/IP faculty member rated "high" must have accomplished or demonstrated *significant* contributions in at least one (1) additional Engagement Activity Category listed in Table B-2, resulting in a total of two (2) separate Engagement Activity Categories during the most recent three-year period**.**

*Criteria to be Rated Excellent (4.0):* The PA/IP faculty member rated "excellent" must have accomplished or demonstrated either (a) during the evaluation year at least one (1) consulting or service activity in Table B-2 for a national or international level business or professional organization, such as a Fortune 500 company, or (b) *significant* contributions in at least three (3) separate Engagement Activity Categories during the most recent three-year period.

## Fixed-term Faculty (Secondary Performance Area)
*Criteria to be Rated High:* The PA/IP faculty member rated "high" must have accomplished or demonstrated *significant* contributions in at least one (1) Engagement Activity Category listed in Table B-2 each year during the most recent three-year period.

*Criteria to be Rated Excellent:* The PA/IP faculty member rated "excellent" must have accomplished or demonstrated *significant* contributions in at least one (1) additional Engagement Activity Category listed in Table B-2 each year during the most recent three-year period, and one (1) additional Engagement Activity Category that year.

## C. Teaching Evaluation (Rating Scale 1-4)
In addition to the TAMUCC guidelines for teaching as stated in University Procedure 12.01.99.C1.03 Responsibilities of Faculty Members, the College of Business developed a standard set of criteria for teaching evaluation. The primary objective of the teaching evaluation is to encourage faculty to contribute to the goals of the College to provide a high level of student learning and engagement.

## Minimum Expectations to be Rated Meets Expectations (2.0)
Faculty members are expected to satisfactorily perform **all** of the activities in Table C-1.

| Table C-1 - Minimum Expectations for Teaching |
| --- |
| Receive a minimum overall mean score of 3.0 or higher on student evaluations during the current year |
| Participation in accreditation assessment activities when requested and in a timely manner (i.e., AACSB, SACS) |
| Provide on a timely basis a complete syllabus for each course that includes appropriate course objectives and meets university requirements |

| Table C-1 - Minimum Expectations for Teaching |
| --- |
| Timely and accurate submission of textbook orders |
| Conduct class with course content representative of course description in the University catalog |
| Attend and hold scheduled class sessions except for extenuating circumstances |
| Arrange for appropriate notification and class coverage when an absence occurs |
| Administration of appropriate exams and other appropriate exercises |
| Publication and maintenance of appropriate office hours |
| Return of grades and other feedback on exams and assignments to students in a timely manner |
| Timely submission of copies of course exams as requested by the Dean's office |
| Timely submission of mid-term and final grades and other student-related reports required by the university and college |
| Utilization of appropriate technology |
| Maintain currency in course content and methods |
| Maintain a plan for the continuity of learning in all courses in the event of a natural disaster |
| Update faculty activity database (e.g., Interfolio) as needed for teaching-related activities |

(Note: failure to meet **any one** of the minimum standards will result in an "**unsatisfactory**" (1.0) rating)

## Additional Criteria to be Rated High (3.0)

In addition to the minimum expectations for a standard rating, faculty members rated "high" must have an overall mean score of 4.0 or higher for the current year on student evaluations and accomplish or demonstrate at least **two of the additional criteria listed in Table C-2**.

## Additional Criteria to be Rated Excellent (4.0)

In addition to the minimum for a Meets Expectations rating, faculty members rated "excellent" must have an overall mean score of 4.3 or higher for the current year on student evaluations and accomplish or demonstrate at least **three of the additional criteria listed in Table C-2**.

| Table C-2 - Additional Criteria Related to Teaching |
| --- |
| Receive a College of Business and/or University award or honor for teaching excellence |
| Nominated for an external agency award or honor for teaching excellence (e.g., TAMU System, Case, Minnie Piper, TSCPA) |
| Received, within the last three years, an external agency award or honor for teaching excellence (e.g., TAMU System, Case, Minnie Piper, TSCPA) |
| Participate in specific and significant professional development activities designed to improve teaching effectiveness |
| Engage in additional activities outside of normal class periods and office hours to ensure students master the subject matter (e.g., tutorials, labs, review sessions, case consultation) |
| Supervise directed individual studies |
| Supervise internships |

| Table C-2 - Additional Criteria Related to Teaching |
| --- |
| Teach at least one large class of at least 80 students or teach at least 150 students total in either semester |
| Teach four (4) or more course preparations in the nine (9) month academic year (fall and spring) |
| Coordinate student service-learning projects, as part of a class |
| Develop a new course or new program |
| Significantly modify course materials or delivery methods (e.g., converting a face-to-face course to either a hybrid or fully online course) |
| Receive at least one peer observation for an assigned course |
| Develop and/or deliver at least one high impact practice (as described in a college or university document) |
| Complete a teaching certification or training program (e.g., DLAI, ACUE) |
| Develop and/or deliver a teaching-related conference presentation or workshop (if not counted as a research activity) |
| Teaching a learning community or university honors course |
| Teach at least one stacked undergraduate/graduate course |
| Other teaching accomplishments or recognition |

## Teaching Performance Rating for Annual Evaluation

Teaching performance ratings are determined according to the following table:

| Current Year Teaching Accomplishments | Performance Rating for Teaching | COB Performance Category |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Meet all minimum expectations in Table C-1 and three or more criteria from Table C-2 with an overall mean score of at least 4.3 on student evaluations | 4.0 | Excellent |
| Meet all minimum expectations in Table C-1 and two or more criteria from Table C-2 with an overall mean score of at least 4.0 on student evaluations | 3.0 | High |
| Meet all minimum expectations in Table C-1 | 2.0 | Meets Expectations |
| Failure to meet **any one** of the minimum expectations detailed in Table C-1 | 1.0 | Unsatisfactory* |

*Faculty with an Unsatisfactory rating will be required to meet with supervisor to discuss methods for improvement.

## Student Evaluation of Teaching

The average score across all questions in the student evaluation will be calculated using all the student evaluations received during the fall and spring semester within the calendar year.

## D. Service Evaluation (Rating Scale 1-4)

University Procedure 12.01.99.C0.03, *Responsibilities of Faculty Members*, specifies the general expectations for service by faculty members at TAMUCC. The College of Business implements this procedure by specifying the following activities as required for a performance ranking of Meets Expectations or higher for all full-time faculty members with service responsibilities:

A.   Serve as an advisor/mentor to undergraduate or graduate students as assigned.
B.   Participate in assessment activities related to assigned courses.
C.   Attend fall or spring commencement ceremony.
D.   Attend college and department faculty meetings (except as excused by a chair for schedule conflicts, illness, or other reasons).
E.   Attend at least one college/department ceremony or event honoring students per academic year.
F.   Complete all required University and Texas A&M System training as specified through TrainTraq.

A deficiency in one or more of the minimum service activities above may be sufficient to justify an Unsatisfactory rating for service.

## College of Business Expectations for Service

Beyond the minimum expectations above, University Procedure 12.01.99.C0.06, *Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members*, requires each college to specify the general expectations for service by full-time faculty members consistent with college and/or department goals and objectives.    The College of Business recognizes that faculty perform a variety of service activities and that such activities vary in terms of time commitment, effort required, and impact.

To address variations in workload and impact associated with specific service activities, the College classifies each service activity as follows:

1.   *Accepted* (weight = 1) – activities involving a limited workload and/or a one-time commitment.
2.   *Significant* (weight = 2) – activities involving a regular commitment of time and/or a significant workload. Most college and university committees fall into this category.
3.   *Exceptional* – 3 points – activities involving an exceptional time commitment and/or designated as high impact or high importance.

Chairing a university or college/department committee, council, task force or working group increases the standard weight by one. For example, serving as chair of a university or college/department committee with a standard weight of "*Significant*" (2) increases the weight to "*Exceptional*" (3). Standard weights for activities involving extraordinary tasks may be increased to a higher weight at the discretion of the Department Chair and/or Dean.

The College of Business recognizes five categories of service activities: (1) Service to Students, (2) Service to the University (3) Service to the College/Department, (4) Service to the Profession/Professional Organizations, and (5) Service to the Community. Tables D-1 through D-5 at the end of this document identify the activities and standard weight for each activity in each category.

The College of Business expects all full-time faculty members with service responsibilities to engage in service activities in more than one category.

## College of Business Minimum Service Requirements

To receive a rating of Meets Expectations or higher, all full-time faculty members with service responsibilities must satisfy the following minimum College requirements:

A. Meet all the University minimum requirements for service specified above, AND
B. Document at least six different service activities from Tables D-1 through D-5 during the evaluation period to include both of the following:
   1. At least one service activity in two different service categories.
   2. At least one service activity from Table D-2 (Service to the University) or Table D-3 (Service to the College/Department) with a weight of 2 (*Significant*) or 3 (*Exceptional*).  Non-tenured faculty may instead document three separate activities from Tables D-2 or D3 with a weight of 1 (*Accepted*) to satisfy this requirement.

## College of Business Performance Ratings for Service

Each faculty member receives a rating for service on a scale of 1 to 4 as follows: (1) Unsatisfactory, (2) Meets Expectations, (3) High, and (4) Excellent.  The college defines each performance rating for service as follows:

A. <u>Unsatisfactory</u> (1.0) – A deficiency in any of the College of Business Minimum Service Requirements above.
B. <u>Meets Expectations</u> (2.0) – Meets all the College of Business Minimum Service Requirements above.
C. <u>High</u> (3.0) – Meets the College of Business Minimum Service Requirements above plus both of the following additional requirements for tenured faculty:
   1. Document at least one additional service activity from Tables 1 through 5 (seven or more activities in total).
   2. Document at least one activity from Tables D-1 through D-5 with a weight of 3 (*Exceptional*); OR document at least three activities from Tables D-1 through D-5 with a weight of 2 (*Significant*).  Activities used to satisfy requirements for Meets Expectations performance are included in this count.
   3. Non-tenured faculty may instead document eight different activities from Tables D-1 through D-5 with a weight of 1 (*Accepted*) or higher for both requirements above. Activities used to satisfy requirements for Meets Expectations performance are included in this activity count.
D. <u>Excellent</u> (4.0) – Meets the College of Business Minimum Service Requirements above plus both of the following additional requirements for tenured faculty:
   1. Document at least two activities from Tables D-1 through D-5 with a weight of 3 (*Exceptional*); OR document at least four activities from Tables D-1 through D-5 with a weight of *Significant* (2) or higher. Activities used to satisfy requirements for Meets Expectations performance are included in this count.

2. Document at least one activity in three different categories (Tables D-1 through D-5). Activities used to satisfy requirements for Meets Expectations performance and requirement C.2 above are included in this count.
3. Non-tenured faculty may instead document ten different activities from Tables D-1 through D-5 with a weight of 1 (*Accepted*) or higher for both requirements above.  Activities used to satisfy the requirements for Meets Expectations performance are included in this activity count.

The Faculty Self-Evaluation Template, available through the Faculty Resources page on the College website, provides additional guidance for calculating the service rating.

## Service Activities and Weights

Tables D-1 to D-5 list the specific activities associated with each service category and identify the standard/ordinary weight for each activity.  The College acknowledges that the workload of a participant in any of these activities might be extraordinary during a particular evaluation period.   It is the responsibility of the faculty member to explain these exceptional circumstances in their Interfolio report and to negotiate adjustments to the standard weight with their department chair during the annual review process.

### Table D-1 – Service to Students

| D-1 Activities | Weight |
|---|---|
| Faculty advisor to active student organization | 3 |
| Attend additional college or department event honoring students[1] | 1 |
| Attend additional commencement ceremonies[1] | 1 |
| Mentor for University honors project[2] | 3 |
| Attend meetings of professional organization associated with a student organization[3] | 1 |
| Attend student-focused activities (e.g., Aloha Days, Trunk-or-Treat, Island Lights, Late-Night Breakfast)[3] | 1 |
| Attend university events for students (e.g., freshman/new student orientation, Island Waves, convocation, award ceremonies)[3] | 1 |
| Participate in student field experience (does not plan/sponsor activity)[3] | 1 |
| Sponsoring/supervising internships[2] | 1 |
| Substantial one-time service to a student group on campus (e.g., invited talk, panelist, discussion leader)[3] | 1 |
| Advisor/mentor to a substantial number of undergraduate and/or graduate students[1] | 1 to 2 |
| Advisor and/or sponsor of students in paper or project competitions | 1 to 2 |
| Member of graduate or doctoral thesis/dissertation committee[2] | 2 to 3 |
| Other Service to Students | 1 to 3 |

[1]Credit for activities in excess of university minimum requirements for service. [2]Each student paper/project counts as a separate activity. [3]Each event counts as a separate activity.

*Table D-2 – Service to the University*

| D-2 Activities | Weight |
|---|---|
| Faculty Senate (including sub-committees) | 3 |
| Senate executive committee member | 3 |
| Senate speaker | 3 |
| University Promotion & Tenure Committee | 3 |
| Faculty Athletic Representative | 3 |
| Graduate Council | 3 |
| Institutional Review Board | 3 |
| Center for Faculty Excellence (CFE) Committee | 2 |
| Core Curriculum Committee | 2 |
| Council of Principal Investigators and Research Administrators (CPIRA) | 3 |
| Faculty Hearing Committee/Advisory Committee | 2 |
| Intercollegiate Athletics Committee | 2 |
| Research Enhancement Committee | 2 |
| Scholarship Committee | 2 |
| Undergraduate Admissions Committee | 2 |
| Undergraduate Council | 2 |
| University Search Committee | 2 |
| Peer-evaluator for distance education courses evaluated through DLAI[1] | 1 |
| Academic Integrity Committee | 1 to 2 |
| Student Hearing & Appellate Board Panel Member | 1 to 2 |
| Other Standing University Committees and Councils[2] | 1 to 3 |
| Other University Working Groups, Task Forces, and Special Projects[2] | 1 to 3 |

[1]Each course counts as a separate activity [2]Each group, committee, task force or project counts as a separate activity.

*Table D-3 – Service to the College/Department*

| D-3 Activities | Weight |
|---|---|
| Faculty Qualifications Committee | 3 |
| Program or Course Coordinator | 2 to 3 |
| Curricula Management Committee | 2 to 3 |
| College Promotion and Tenure Committee[1] | 0 to 3 |
| Post-Tenure Review Committee[1] | 0 to 3 |
| Academic Scholarship Committee | 2 |
| Faculty Search Committee Member | 2 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Library Committee | 2 |
| Research Enhancement and Faculty Development Committee | 2 |
| Department Promotion and Tenure Committee[1] | 0 to 2 |
| Strategic Planning Committee | 1 to 2 |
| Leading Study Abroad Program | 1 to 2 |
| Participating in Accreditation-Related Assessment of Other Classes | 1 to 2 |
| Student Grade Appeal Committee | 1 to 2 |
| Assigned Faculty Mentoring | 1 |
| Attend Faculty Research Seminars[4] | 1 to 3 |
| Attend College-Sponsored Events (e.g., Kirkland)[2] | 1 |
| Attend Faculty Candidate Presentations and Related Events[3] | 1 |
| Participate in alumni events or activities[2] | 1 |
| Participation in Faculty Exchange Program | 1 |
| Completing a peer observation of teaching for another COB instructor | 1 |
| Other College/Department Activities and Events | 1 |
| Other College/Department Committees, Working Groups, Task Forces and Special Projects | 2 to 3 |

[1]Worth 0 points if no one in the College/department is being reviewed that year. [2]Each event counts as a separate activity. [3]Each candidate counts as a separate activity. [4]Attending 1-2 research seminars = 1, attending 3-5 seminars = 2, attending 6 or more seminars = 3.

*Table D-4: Service to the Profession/Professional Organizations[1]*

| D-4 Activities[2] | Weight |
|---|---|
| Conference Program Chair for Tier 1 conference | 3 |
| Conference Track Chair for Discipline/Topic for Tier 1 conference | 3 |
| Editor/Assoc. Editor of a Refereed Journal | 2 to 3 |
| Conference Program Chair or Track Chair for Discipline/Topic for other conference | 2 |
| Session Chair/Discussant for Tier 1 academic conference | 2 |
| Serving as external reviewer for Ph.D. candidates at another college/university | 2 |
| Review textbook or supplement package for recognized publisher | 1 |
| Serving as external reviewer for promotion/tenure candidates at another institution | 1 |
| Paper reviewer for Tier 1 academic conference | 1 to 2 |
| Review of articles for A/A+ journals | 1 to 2 |
| Discussant/session chair for other academic conference | 1 to 2 |
| Editorial Board membership for refereed journal | 1 to 2 |
| Membership/participation in professional organizations related to teaching discipline(s) | 1 to 2 |

| D-4 Activities[2] | Weight |
|---|---|
| Paper reviewer for other academic conference | 1 to 2 |
| Review of articles for other refereed journals or edited volumes | 1 to 2 |
| Serving local, state, regional or national professional organizations as elected or appointed officer | 1 to 3 |
| Other discipline-specific service to professional organizations | 1 to 3 |

[1]Some activities in this table may be counted as scholarship/creative activities, teaching activities, or as service activities. Individual activities may only be counted toward one evaluation criterion (no double counting). [2]Each event/conference/journal/candidate counts as a separate activity.

*Table D-5 – Service to the Community[1]*

| D-5 Activities[2] | Weight |
|---|---|
| Consulting associated with Coastal Bend Business Development Center projects | 2 |
| Elected officer or unpaid member of the board of directors of a community service organization | 2 |
| Serving on city or county advisory board | 2 |
| Participating in media interviews related to institution, discipline, or teaching area | 1 |
| Public speaking at community organizations (e.g., Chamber of Commerce) | 1 |
| Representing university/college at community events | 1 |
| Provide significant business or economic information to community (e.g., *Economic Pulse* publication) | 1 to 3 |
| Publish professionally-relevant article in community magazine/newspaper/e-zine/blog | 1 to 3 |
| Discipline-specific consulting /project work for community organization | 1 to 3 |
| Other discipline-specific service to community | 1 to 3 |

[1]Community refers to all communities external to the university including local, regional, state, national, and international entities. [2]Some activities in this table may be counted as scholarship/creative activities or as service activities but not as both.

## Related Policies & Information

For more information about faculty evaluations, please visit the following:

University Procedure 12.01.99.C0.06 - Performance Reviews of Full-Time Faculty Members
University Procedure 12.99.01.C0.01 - Faculty Development Leave
University Procedure 12.01.99.C0.03 - Responsibilities of Faculty Members
COB 03.FAC.04 - Faculty Qualifications and Engagement Standards
COB 06.DOC.03 - Faculty Self-Evaluation Template

## Revision History

- Approved by COB Faculty, April 22, 2016
- Section A. Amended by email approval of COB Faculty, October 4, 2016
- Revised and Approved by COB Faculty, March 9, 2018
- Revised and Approved by COB Faculty April 22, 2020

- Revised and Approved by COB Faculty May 18, 2021
- Revised and Approved by COB Faculty, January 12, 2023