

**Department of Management
Performance Evaluation (Annual
Evaluation) Policy**

**MGT/PPS No. 05.01
Issue No. 1
Effective Date: January 1, 2025
Next Review Date: September 1, 2029 (E5Y)
Sr. Reviewer: Department Chair**

Related Academic Affairs Policies:

AA/PPS 04.02.10 (Performance Evaluation of Continuing Faculty and Post-Tenure Review)

AA/PPS 04.02.11 (Performance Evaluation of Non-Continuing Non-tenure Line Faculty)

Related McCoy College of Business Policies:

CBAPPS 5.01 (Faculty Evaluation)

CBAPPS 5.02 (Evaluation Non-Tenure Track Faculty for Reappointment)

CBAPPS 5.03 (Evaluation Tenure-Track Faculty for Reappointment)

01. POLICY STATEMENT

This policy describes the procedures used to evaluate faculty performance in the Department of Management.

02. ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCESS

1. Faculty members will upload their Annual Activity Report, Activity Plan, and Texas State Vita to Digital Measures along with supporting documentation, when appropriate, by February 1. This will include a self-evaluation of the faculty member's merit classification based on the points described in this document. Documentation and description should address the minimum areas as noted in CBAPPS 5.01 and must note any desired changes to weights assigned to teaching, scholarship, and service/professional activity categories for the coming evaluation cycle.

2. The annual evaluation of faculty is a duty shared by the Department Chair ("Chair") and the Personnel Committee ("PC"), yet the evaluations by each are independent. (See AAPPS 04.02.10; CBAPPS 5.01.)
3. The Chair will complete their initial annual evaluation no later than March 1. A copy of the Chair's evaluation and comments will be provided to the faculty member being evaluated.
4. By December 11, the Personnel Committee will appoint a subset of members to conduct a performance evaluation based on the information provided by the faculty member. This subset of Personnel Committee members must be comprised of faculty who hold an equal or higher rank to the faculty member being evaluated.
5. Using the details provided in this document, the subset of personnel committee members will evaluate the faculty member in the areas of research, teaching, and service based on a rolling average of their most recent three years performance. This evaluation will result in a score for each dimension, where appropriate, of a 5 (Exceeds Expectations), 4 (Above Expectations), 3 (Meets Expectations), 2 (Below Expectations), or 1 (Fails to Meet Expectations). It should be noted that as of the time that this is being written (mid-November, 2024) CBAC is developing a college-wide policy whereby a subset of the PC will simply evaluate the faculty member as either meeting or failing to meet expectations in four areas: research, teaching, service, and collegiality. If this comes to fruition, Point 5 will conform to the college policy.
6. By February 14 the Personnel Committee will submit their evaluation to the Chair. Based on the Personnel Committee's recommendations, the Chair may make adjustments to a faculty member's evaluation as the Chair deems appropriate. Per CBAPPS 5.01. 2.B., the Department Chair makes the final decision in case of any disagreements
7. The Chair will review the documents and information uploaded to Digital Measures by the faculty member, to evaluate and rate the faculty member from 5 (Exceeds Expectations) to 1 (Fails to Meet Expectations) on the teaching,

research, and service criteria specified in this policy. An overall score for each faculty member will be computed.

8. The overall score for tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure line faculty is calculated using the Chair's ratings along with the assigned weights for teaching, scholarship, and service/ professional activity.
9. The evaluation of performance across teaching, scholarship, and service/professional activity will be based on pre-assigned weights to each category. The weights assigned to teaching, scholarship, and service/professional activity are, respectively, 40%, 40%, and 20% for tenured faculty, 40%, 50%, and 10% for tenure-track faculty, and 80% (teaching) and 20% (service) for full-time non-tenure line faculty. Tenured and continuing percentage-contract faculty may request different weights for the subsequent year during the evaluation process (per CBAPPS 5.01). The acceptable ranges for the weights, the sum of which must be 100, for tenured faculty are 30-50% (teaching), 30-50% (research) and 10-30% (service). The acceptable ranges for the weights, the sum of which must be 100, for continuing percentage-contract faculty are 60-80% (teaching), 0-20% (research), and 20-40% (service).
10. The Chair will review the Annual Activity Plan for purposes of future faculty development and not to make performance or merit decisions.
11. In alignment with [AA/PPS 04.02.10 § 03.02.d](#), faculty members have one week to review and add written comments to their own annual evaluations before they are finalized in the Faculty Qualifications system, or sent forward for performance and merit considerations or other actions. The only exception is for faculty members in their first year who are not reappointed.
12. This document cannot capture all possible activities engaged in by faculty actively pursuing their university-prescribed duties. As such, it is meant to be modified over time as experience is gained, lessons are learned, and new activities performed. The Department Chair has the power to grant faculty credit for activities not listed in this document as long as equitable consideration is also given to other faculty performing similar activities. This document can also be

modified anytime with the approval of both the Department Chair and Personnel Committee.

03. PERFORMANCE AND MERIT EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. In alignment with CBA/PPS 05.01 §2(A), faculty members will submit annually an Activity Plan and Activity Report as described in CBAPPS 5.06, “Workload Policy,” and a current vita detailing activities in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, and service/professional activities. When evaluating an individual faculty member’s performance, the Chair and the Personnel Committee (or its designated members) will rely on information provided by the faculty member in their Faculty Activity Report (in Digital Measures) and any other documentation (such as peer reviews of teaching) available.
2. The documentation available via the Faculty Activity Report will be compared to the guidelines below to rate faculty members.

a. TEACHING

- i. Expected Criteria. All faculty are expected to:
 - Strive for continuous improvement of courses taught,
 - Prepare thorough and challenging course syllabi, course material and graded work,
 - Integrate current examples and materials into classroom instruction,
 - Be available to students during required office hours or by appointment,
 - Interact effectively with students, and
 - Meet required contact hours.
- ii. For faculty evaluation purposes, numerical scores from student evaluations will be considered.

Teaching performance is evaluated on a point-based system. The maximum number of points possible to earn is 5. Points for teaching-

related performance are based on the average of the latest three-years of student teaching evaluations (including any summer teaching) and adjusted by any “contextual considerations” listed below

- **5 points.** A faculty member whose teaching performance exceeds expectations. A faculty member receives a quantitative rating at or above 4.50 on the average of items 1-16 on the student evaluations of instructor.
- **4 points.** A faculty member whose teaching performance is above expectations. A faculty member receives a quantitative rating equal to or between 4.0-4.49 on the average of items 1-16 on the student evaluations of instructor.
- **3 points.** A faculty member whose teaching performance meets expectations. A faculty member receives a quantitative rating equal to or between 3.50-3.99 on the average of items 1-16 on the student evaluations of instructor.
- **2 points.** A faculty member whose teaching performance is below expectations. A faculty member receives a quantitative rating equal to or between 3.00–3.49 on the average of items 1-16 on the student evaluations of instructor.
- **1 point.** A faculty member whose teaching performance fails to meet expectations. A faculty member in this category receives a quantitative rating below 3.00 on the average of items 1-16 on the student evaluations of instructor.

- **Contextual Considerations**

The Department Chair may make minor adjustments to the teaching evaluation average based on prior discussions with the faculty member of contextual considerations and special circumstances.

b. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

The College and department encourage and support scholarly activities and other intellectual contributions (IC's) by the faculty. The outputs of scholarly activities take a variety of forms and are publicly disseminated. While all forms of IC's are encouraged, peer-reviewed journal (PRJ) publications produced by a substantial cross-section of the faculty are particularly important.

For purposes of Maintenance of Status and Faculty Annual Review, for each PRJ article, the article is counted from the date of acceptance.

Where there is a question as to whether a faculty member's output meets the IC standard to remain qualified, the appropriate department chair, with the concurrence of the department personnel committee and the dean of the college, shall exercise their best professional judgment based on the documentation provided by the faculty member.

Faculty members are encouraged to publish in high-quality journals as categorized by ABDC or CABS rankings, whichever one is higher. As noted below, publications in higher-quality journals earn higher performance scores than publications in lower-quality journals.

Quality Rating	Criteria	Points
Premiere Publications*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Journals in the ABDC list with a rating of A* Journals in the CABS list with a rating of 4* or 4 	8
Very High-Quality Publications*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Journals in the ABDC list with a rating of A Journals in the CABS list with a rating of 3 	6
High-Quality Publications*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Journals in the ABDC list with a rating of B Journals in the CABS list with a rating of 2 	3
Quality Publications*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Journals in the ABDC list with a rating of C Journals in the CABS list with a rating of 1 	2
Published Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any Peer-Reviewed Journal not meeting the above criteria, such as a non-ABDC or CABS PRJ Editor-Reviewed book chapters Maintenance of Scholarly Academic status during the year This list is not all-inclusive and faculty can petition for other items. 	1
Intellectual Contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Popular press articles – newspaper, magazines Research Grants Textbook authorship Research monographs Peer-reviewed case publications with instructional materials (not in peer-reviewed journals) Peer-reviewed cases with instructional materials Invited scholarly presentations Non-peer-reviewed journal articles This list is not all-inclusive and faculty can petition for other items. 	0.75
Conferences (max: 3 points per 3-yr window)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research paper presentation or proceedings Invited and contributed presentations at professional meetings, conferences, and seminars Organizer/Panelist on PDW, Symposium This list is not all-inclusive and faculty can petition for other items. 	0.75

Other Significant Research Activities (with Points Earned)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Author or editor of an academic/theory-based book (4 points) Author or editor of textbook (3 points) Research Grant ≥ \$300K/YR (4 points) Research Grant ≥ \$75K/YR < \$300K/YR (3 points) Research Grant ≥ \$15K/YR < \$75K/YR (2 points) Research Grant <\$15K/YR (1 point) This list is not all-inclusive and faculty can petition for other items.

*Additional consideration for peer-reviewed journal articles published in non-business journals can be provided based on justification provided by faculty. Justification for inclusion will required substantive, objective measures of journal quality, such how they are classified by another department at Texas State University.

	Scholarly Activities Total	
Category 5	10+	Exceeds Expectations
Category 4	8	Above Expectations
Category 3	5	Meets Expectations
Category 2	3	Below Expectations
Category 1	2 or less	Fails to Meet Expectations

- This table is based on **TOTAL POINTS** of the most recent three years (unlike Service and Teaching, which are based on the average score across three years).
- As long as a faculty member maintains “Scholarly Academic” status, they **CANNOT** be subject to post-tenure review based on intellectual contributions regardless of their merit category.

C. SERVICE

General Policy Guidelines:

1. Faculty must discuss with chair before reporting an unlisted activity as supporting their maintenance of status. The burden of proof resides with the faculty member. The faculty member must document any activities supporting their professional engagement. Undocumented activities will not be considered as supporting a qualification status. The chair will determine the activity's categorization, if any, as long as equitable consideration is also given to other faculty performing similar activities.
2. With the exceptions of consulting activities, continuing professional education, and full-time employment, each activity listed below may be repeated for additional points within a given year.

3. Untenured tenure-track faculty are expected to maintain a lighter service load than other full-time faculty and, thus, have a lower threshold for each service rating.
4. Service must be based on a faculty member's position at the university or professional expertise in order to count.

Annual Evaluation Ratings (3-year rolling average):

5 Rating: A faculty member whose service performance **exceeds expectations**.

- Average faculty service value of 10.0 + points per year over the past three years for tenured and instructional faculty.
- Average faculty service value of 5.0 + points per year over the past three years for untenured tenure-track faculty.

4 Rating. A faculty member whose service performance is **above expectations**.

- Average faculty service value of 7.0 - 9.9 points per year over the past three years for tenured and instructional faculty.
- Average faculty service value of 3.5 – 4.9 points per year over the past three years for untenured tenure-track faculty.

3 Rating. A faculty member whose service performance is **meets expectations**.

- Average faculty service value of 4.0 – 6.9 points per year over the past three years for tenured and instructional faculty.
- Average faculty service value of 2.0 – 3.4 points per year over the past three years for untenured tenure-track faculty.

2 Rating. A faculty member whose service performance is **below expectations**.

- Average faculty service value of 2.0 – 3.9 points per year over the past three years for tenured and instructional faculty.
- Average faculty service value of 1.0 – 1.9 points per year over the past three years for untenured tenure-track faculty.

1 Rating. A faculty member whose service performance **fails to meet expectations**.

- Average faculty service value of less than 2.0 points per year over the past three years for tenured and instructional faculty.
- Average faculty service value of less than 1.0 points per year over the past three years for untenured tenure-track faculty.

10 Points Each (this is not all-inclusive and faculty can petition for additional items to count)

(Generally, these are ongoing activities, that require an overwhelmingly large amount of time to the extent that they may impede on other work functions)

Public and Professional Service

- Obtaining a new and relevant professional certification as may be required in the profession.
- Relevant faculty internship of two or more months during the previous year.
- Editor or Assistant Editor of an A or B level Peer Reviewed Journal

5 Points Each (this is not all-inclusive and faculty can petition for additional items to count)

(Generally, these are ongoing activities, that require a substantial amount of time and energy)

University/College/Department Committee or Task Force Service

- Chairing a university/college/department committee or task force
- Being a college or department course coordinator

Service to Discipline

- Administering or reviewing a major grant
- Completion of academic courses for faculty development
- Leadership positions and participation in recognized academic associations (e.g., trach chair, etc.)
- Member of an editorial board for a peer-reviewed journal

Public and Professional Service

- Sufficient continuing professional education credits or hours to maintain professional certification.
- Creation of courses or programs requiring significant interaction with external constituents.
- Editorship of a practitioner periodical where the faculty member holds major editorial responsibilities, in accordance with the College policies on impact.
- First-time development and delivery of workshops to practitioners.
- First-time development and presentation of executive education programs.
- Leadership position in a business professional association.
- Relevant, active, and significant service on boards of directors.
- Service on a commission or task force in area related to teaching assignment.

2 Points Each (this is not all-inclusive and faculty can petition for additional items to count)

(Generally, these are ongoing activities, that require some, but not an overwhelming large amount of time)

University/College/Department Committee Service

- Being a participating member of any university, college, or department committee or task force.
- Serving as an official faculty mentor
- Serving as a faculty advisor to a student organization

1 Point Each (this is not all-inclusive and faculty can petition for additional items to count)

(Generally, these are one-time activities that are not overly time consuming)

University/College/Department Committee Service

- Participating in any “one-shot” university, college, or department event, such as Bobcat Days or “Pack It Up and Pass It On”

Public Service

- Expert witness testimony.
- Presentation to the public on topics relevant to area of teaching or research.

Service to Discipline

- Ad hoc reviewer for a journal or conference in the area of specialization.

Public and Professional Service

- Invited panelist at a professional conference.
- Sponsoring students in an academic competition that requires significant interaction with business.
- Second-time and subsequent delivery of workshops to practitioners.
- Second-time and subsequent presentation of executive education programs.
- Using professional expertise in the service of some community activity.

04. POST-TENURE REVIEW

- Per AA/PPS 04.02.10, if the Chair finds that a tenured faculty member Fails to Meet Expectations in any of the three areas of teaching, research or service based on this annual performance review (which is measured using the most recent three-years' performance), then the faculty member enters the post tenure review process. See AA/PPS 04.02.10 for the detail of how that process is to be conducted.
- Any tenured faculty who maintains Scholarly Academic status cannot be subject to post-tenure review based on research contributions regardless of their merit category.

05. POLICY REVIEW AND IMPLEMENTATION

1. This document cannot capture all possible activities engaged in by faculty actively pursuing their university-prescribed duties. As such, it is meant to be modified over time as experience is gained, lessons are learned, and new activities performed. The Department Chair has the power to grant faculty credit for activities not listed in this document as long as the same credit is also offered to other faculty performing the same or similar activities. This document can also be modified anytime with the approval of both the Department Chair and Personnel Committee.
2. This policy must be reviewed at least every five years. The review of this policy will be undertaken by a committee including representatives from the faculty groups that developed the policy and those groups that are directly affected by the policy. If a revision of this policy is deemed necessary, it will undergo the same process that was taken in its development.

3. Once this policy has been approved, all faculty in the Department of Management must receive a copy of the policy. The Personnel Committee and Department Chair are responsible for the full implementation of this policy.
4. For the purposes of this policy, any specific deadline stated that is on a non-business date (i.e., a date when classes are not held) should be moved to the next closest business date (i.e., a date when classes are held).

06. CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

This MGT/PPS has been approved by the Personnel Committee members of the Department of Management, the Chair, the McCoy College Dean, and the Provost's Office. A compliance certification form has been completed and filed in the Dean's Office. This policy is in effect from the effective date.

Review Cycle: Every five years.

Last Update: Fall 2025

Effective Date: Spring 2025

Next Review Date: Spring 2029

○ **REAPPOINTMENT PROCESS OF NON-TENURE LINE FACULTY (NTL)**

1. The Department of Management considers faculty reappointment votes to be the culmination of the annual performance evaluation process. Decisions by the PC (collectively or individually) to participate in the annual performance evaluation process in any year do not carry over to the next year.
2. Should any NTL faculty member fail to achieve an overall annual performance evaluation score of 'meets expectations,' the PC and Chair (independently) may consider whether a recommendation for reappointment is warranted.
3. By April 1, the Chair will call a meeting of the PC to vote on the reappointment of the NTL faculty. At that time, the PC may choose to discuss and vote on the reappointment of each NTL faculty, or they may defer the decision to the Chair.
4. If the PC chooses to vote on the reappointment of the NTL faculty, the PC will choose between the following outcomes for each NTL faculty member:
 - Recommend not to reappoint.
 - Recommend reappointment with performance improvement plan.
 - Recommend reappointment.
5. The Chair may take the PC's vote into consideration when determining whether a recommendation for reappointment is warranted.
6. Should the Chair choose to recommend an NTL faculty member not be reappointed, they must notify the affected faculty member within seven days of the decision.

- **POLICY REVIEW AND IMPLEMENTATION**

1. This policy must be reviewed every five years. The review of this policy will be undertaken by a committee including representatives from the faculty groups that developed the policy and those groups that are directly affected by the policy. If a revision of this policy is deemed necessary, it will undergo the same process that was taken in its development.
2. Once this policy has been approved, all faculty in the Department of Management must receive a copy of the policy. The Personnel Committee and Chair are responsible for the full implementation of this policy.
3. For the purposes of this policy, any specific deadline stated that is on a non-business date (i.e., a date when classes are not held) should be moved to the next closest business date (i.e., a date when classes are held).

- **CERTIFICATION STATEMENT**

This MGT/PPS has been approved by the Personnel Committee members of the Department of Management, the Chair, the McCoy College Dean, and the Provost's Office. A compliance certification form has been completed and filed in the Dean's Office. This policy is in effect from the effective date.

Review Cycle: Every five years.

Last Update: Fall 2025

Effective Date: Spring 2025

Next Review Date: Spring 2029

MGTPPS 04.01.50

Merit Policy

Related Academic Affairs Policies:

AA/PPS No. 04.01.50 (Faculty Merit and Retention Salary Adjustments)

Related College of Business Policies:

CBAPPS 5.04 (Merit/Performance Policy)

Purpose

This policy describes the procedures used to award merit in the Department of Management.

Merit Process

1. Unless otherwise mandated by the Texas Legislature or the Texas State Board of Regents, faculty salary raises at Texas State will be based on performance and merit and will not be based on an “across-the-board” or “cost-of-living” basis.
2. Faculty members are eligible for a merit raise if their performance in teaching, scholarly activity, and/or service results in an overall computed score of at least 2 on a 5-point scale earned over the relevant time-period. Merit raises may be determined for qualified faculty (see “Faculty Expectations” in CBAPPS 5.01) using natural breaks/cutoffs in the computed scores earned during the relevant time-period. The chair will share the natural breaks/cutoffs that distinguish between various levels of merit (e.g., High, Medium, Low). Merit raises will be determined as and when the University makes such raises available. Percentage raises will be based on the merit pool money available.
3. According to AAPPS 04.01.50, in determining merit raises, the personnel committee, Chair, and the Dean will consider faculty performance over the cycle

period as determined by the University. Faculty who wish to be excluded from merit considerations should notify their Chair in writing before the process starts.

4. Faculty merit raises will be determined on the basis of clear criteria, documented performance, and accomplishments at Texas State during the evaluation period. Please see MGTPPS 05.01, which describes performance evaluation.
5. After the university determines the availability of merit raises, the Chair will share with the personnel committee a matrix showing the overall scores of each faculty member for the relevant time-period.
6. Merit awards will be based on the faculty member's performance, appointment type, duties, and assigned workload.
7. In developing merit award recommendations to the Dean, the chair will convene the personnel committee to review the annual evaluations of eligible faculty for the relevant time period to secure their advice.
8. The Chair will share preliminary merit recommendations, with each full-time faculty member before making final merit raise recommendations to the Dean. Faculty members may appeal their performance evaluation and/or merit raise recommendation through the merit raise appeal (see AAPPS 04.01.50) and grievance (see AAPPS 04.02.32) procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook. To initiate this process, faculty members who believe their accomplishments have been overlooked or undervalued may, within five working days of receiving the preliminary recommendation, request a meeting with the Chair to ask for reconsideration. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the Chair's final merit recommendation, he/she can appeal to the Dean. The decision of the Dean regarding merit raises is final and not subject to grievance (See AAPPS 04.01.50).
9. Merit is evaluated on a three-year rolling window. The rolling window allows faculty who have stellar accomplishments in one or two years, but fewer in others, to qualify for an averaged degree of merit.

Policy Review and Implementation

This policy must be reviewed every five years. Once this policy has been approved, all faculty in the Department of Management must receive a copy of the policy. The personnel committee and Department Chair are responsible for the full implementation of this policy.

Certification Statement

This MGTPPS has been approved by the personnel committee members of the Department of Management, the Department Chair, and the McCoy College Dean.

Review Cycle: Every five years.

Effective date: Spring 2025

Last Update: Spring 2025

Next Review Date: Spring 2029