

Annual Review Guidelines

College of Business

University of South Florida St. Petersburg

Drafted by the COB Tenure & Promotion Committee and Annual Review & Award Committee

November 2, 2010

Amended by COB College of Business Council

November 12, 2010

Passed by the College Faculty on December 13, 2010

Introduction:

The following serve as general ranges for ranking teaching, research, and service performance for the annual review process. It is important to note that in each area (teaching, research, and service) review ratings are dependent on multiple factors in addition to the scales provided in each section. It is the responsibility of the individual to provide all the required data and any additional information he/she feels should be considered in the evaluation process. While the scales serve as guidelines for rating performance in a given area of assigned duties, the final rating for purposes of the annual review may fall in one or more categories outside of the guideline range (up or down) depending on the qualitative data included in the annual review packet. It is the responsibility of those evaluating the faculty member to justify ratings in the evaluation narrative if the rating falls outside of the rating guideline provided.

The guidelines outlined in this document are an integral part of the tenure and promotion process. However, pursuant to Article 14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) on Promotion and Article 15 of the CBA on Tenure, decisions on tenure and promotion are not based solely on a faculty member's annual performance evaluations. A faculty member's potential for growth, scholarly contributions, and contributions to the college and university are, as well as past performance, all taken into account.

For purposes of this document visiting faculty with the rank of Assistant Professor or above shall be evaluated in the same manner as tenure-earning faculty, and visiting faculty with the rank of Instructor shall be evaluated in the same manner as permanent instructors.

Teaching:

The following is a general range for ranking teaching performance for the annual review process. The average overall rating of instructor (question 8) from all sections taught in the year from student evaluation forms will be used in conjunction with the scale below. It is important to note that review ratings are dependent on multiple factors in addition to the overall rating of the instructor. These factors may include but are not limited to the level of courses taught, course content, syllabi compliance, grade point average and distribution, student written comments, administrative or peer course attendance and evaluation, percentage of students completing the rating of instructor, number of preps, number of new preps, number of students, online course delivery, average ratings of faculty in similar teaching areas, and other data regarding quality and quantity of instruction. It is the responsibility of the individual to provide all the required data and any additional information he/she feels should be considered in the evaluation process.

While the below scale serves as a guideline for rating instruction, the final rating for purposes of the annual review may reside in a category outside of the guideline range (for example 4.30 could be moved from outstanding/strong to outstanding or to strong). In certain cases the final rating could be moved more than one category (for example faculty member has high ratings from students but significant evidence exists that the faculty member neglected his/her teaching responsibilities and simply gave out high grades). It is the responsibility of those evaluating the faculty member to justify ratings in the evaluation narrative if the rating falls outside of the rating guideline below.

Overall Rating of Instructor	Rating
4.50 - 5.00	Outstanding
4.25 - 4.49	Outstanding/Strong
4.00 - 4.24	Strong
3.50 - 3.99	Strong/Satisfactory
3.00 - 3.49	Satisfactory
2.75 - 2.99	Satisfactory/Weak
2.25 - 2.74	Weak
Less than 2.25	Unsatisfactory

Research:

It is the faculty member's responsibility to list each research activity accomplished during the academic year under review. Each journal publication must include evidence of journal quality. At a minimum, Web of Science ISI ratings (if available) and acceptance rates are to be reported. Faculty may also report evidence of journal quality from refereed journal articles that rank journals, from other journals rankings (e.g., ABDC, ABS, Vienna, etc.) and other available sources. Journal publications can be counted in one and only one year. Faculty can choose to count a publication when it is accepted for publication OR when it is published but not both. Please note that the annual review committee may consider evidence of journal quality not provided by a faculty member in his/her annual review packet.

Paper and Journal	ISI	Acceptance Rate	Other	Other	Other

The listing of other research activities (grants, conference papers, research in progress, etc.) is also required and should include supporting evidence of the amount or level of work completed. The following table provides guidelines for rating each research activity for the annual review process.

Level	Quality Points
Top Quality Journal Publication (A*, A+, A journal)	12
High Quality Journal Publication (B journal)	8
Quality Journal Publication (C journal)	4
Acceptable Quality Journal Publication (D journal)	2
Other Research Activities (i.e., Research Grant, Conference Presentation, Invited Papers, Evidence of research in progress)	1-2

It should be noted that the above assigned quality points are suggested and that the final rating for a research activity may deviate positively or negatively by one or more rating categories from these guidelines. Other documented factors may affect the journal's level and/or quality evaluation. The value of published papers may also be amended by factors such as:

- Authorship (sole authorship, lead author, number of authors on paper, etc.)
- Awards
- Contribution to the stream of research
- Contributions outside of one's discipline
- Non-academic recognition (e.g., popular print, TV, radio)
- Percentage of assigned duties
- Short term citations (number and quality)
- Other documented evidence of quality

Final research ratings for the annual review process will be based on the following guidelines:

Annual Review Rating	Tenured/Tenure-track Faculty	Permanent Instructors
Outstanding	8+ points*	4 points*
Strong	4-7 points*	3 points
Satisfactory	2-3 points	1-2 points
Weak	1 points	0-1 points
Unsatisfactory	0 points	0 points

*Must have direct evidence of journal quality to receive this rating.

Examples for Annual Review Evaluation Guidelines		
Rating	Tenure/Tenure Seeking	Instructor
Outstanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 High Quality or Top Quality Publication • 2 Quality Publications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Quality, High Quality, or Top Quality Publication
Strong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Quality Publication • 2 Acceptable Quality Publications • 1 Acceptable Quality Publication + Other Research Activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Acceptable Quality Publication + Other Research Activities • 2 or more Other Research Activities
Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Acceptable Quality Publication • 1 or more Other Research Activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 or more Other Research Activities
Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Other Research Activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 or 1 Other Research Activities
Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 research activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 research activities

Faculty must have a publication in the Top Quality, High Quality, or Quality categories to receive a rating of Outstanding. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to provide all required data as listed above and any additional information they feel should be considered in the evaluation process. It is the responsibility of the Annual Review Committee to justify ratings in the evaluation narrative if the rating falls outside of the rating guidelines.

Journal Rankings Resources:

- Journal Quality List
(Contains various rankings including ABS and ABDC. Also, links to related resources.)
<http://www.harzing.com/jql.htm>
- ABS Academic Journal Quality Guide, Version 4 (2010)
[http://www.the-abs.org.uk/files//combined_apha_1.4.10\[1\].pdf](http://www.the-abs.org.uk/files//combined_apha_1.4.10[1].pdf)
- ABDC Journal List 2010
<http://www.abdc.edu.au/3.43.0.0.1.0.htm>
- Business Journal Rankings Misc Information and Links
<http://www.library.auckland.ac.nz/subjects/bus/topicguides/busjnrankings.htm>
- German Academic Association for Business Research
<http://www.business-research.org/2009/2/01jourqual2/2166>
- Vienna University of Economics & Business Rankings (not yet found)
- Cabell's Directory (For acceptance rates)
Online at USFSP Library Databases
- CEFAGE (Links to Journal Rating Resources – Not All Journals Included)
Includes Impact Factor and Total Cites
http://www.cefage.uevora.pt/en/apontadores/revistas_cientificas_rankings
- SCImago (Journal Rank and Other Indicators)
<http://www.scimagojr.com/>
- Journal Ranking Articles Published 1990-2009, by Discipline
<http://www.aacsb.edu/resources/research/publications/ranking-articles.pdf>
- Accounting and Business Information Systems Journal Rankings
<http://www.afaanz.org/Journal%20Ranking%20List/ANU%20Journal%20Rankings%20-%20Acctg.pdf>
- Web of Science ISI Ratings
Online at USFSP Library Databases
Tutorial on ISI Web of Science Index of Citations
<http://scientific.thomson.com/tutorials/wos8/wos8tut1.html>

Service:

Suggested # of Committee Assignments / Service Activities*			
Rating	Tenured Faculty	Tenure-track Faculty	Permanent Instructors
Outstanding	4 or 3 chairing 1	1+	3 or 2 chairing 1
Strong	3 or 2 chairing 1	1	2
Satisfactory	2	1	1
Weak	1	1	1
Unsatisfactory	1	1	1

* Tenure-track faculty are restricted to 1 internal committee assignment.

These scales serve as guidelines for rating service activities. It should be noted that the above number of committee assignments / service activities are suggested and that a faculty member should not expect a certain rating based simply on the number of committees served on. The final rating for purposes of the annual review may deviate positively or negatively from these guidelines depending on the following unranked factors:

- Active participation on the committee (e.g. makes positive contribution towards committee objectives)
- Attendance at meetings
- In-house faculty research presentations
- Committee workload (amount of work the committee has performed/accomplished, number of committee meetings, etc.)
- Committees chaired (serving as an area coordinator will count as chairing a committee)
- External service activities (external service activities may count as 1 or more committee assignments / service activities)
- Length of service on committee – 1 or 2 semesters (serving on a committee for 1 semester will count as ½ of a committee assignment)
- Percentage of assigned duties

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to provide all the required data as listed above and any additional information he/she feels should be considered in the evaluation process. It is the responsibility of the Annual Review Committee to justify ratings in the evaluation narrative if the rating falls outside of the rating guidelines.

Progress toward Tenure and Promotion:

After completion of the annual review process, the ARAC will provide feedback to all untenured faculty regarding their progress toward tenure and promotion. In addition, at the request of the tenured faculty member, the committee of full professors will provide feedback regarding his or her progress toward promotion to full professor.