

Creighton
UNIVERSITY

Heider
College of Business

PERFORMANCE POLICIES & STANDARDS

Rev. October, 2015

INTRODUCTION

Creighton is a Catholic and Jesuit comprehensive university committed to excellence in its undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs.

Heider College of Business shares Creighton University's Jesuit and Catholic tradition, and its commitment to excellence. The world-view at the heart of that tradition sees all created reality as a gift from God to humankind. It also sees human activity in the midst of that gift — in the world - as the primary place for living out our individual and collective relationship with the Creator. Thus the study of business activity – a dominant force for good as well as ill – at the local, national, and global level fits at the heart of what Catholic and Jesuit education is about. This requires a faculty who share this world-view, who are dedicated to searching for the truth about local, national, and global business activity and to discerning what is life-giving from what is life-threatening in that activity, and who are highly skilled in passing on the best of that knowledge to their students.

Jesuit and catholic – humanistic and universal – this tradition welcomes and encourages dialogue with all persons and belief systems in searching to understand the truth about our world and human activity in it. This tradition is also a communal one that values each individual as well as the common work of many individuals to build up a body of knowledge, instruct others in its ways, and use that knowledge for others. This describes the traditional faculty activities of scholarship, teaching, and service. Even though Creighton has put its primary emphasis on teaching, all three activities build on and support one another to such an extent that each faculty member must be active in all three areas to be fully effective in any one of them.

Within a community of teacher-scholars, collegial activity is valued and rewarded for what it adds to the common work and to the individuals involved. So that students may find a place in this community, faculty members interact with them in a variety of ways, both in the classroom and beyond it. Student advising and mentoring is especially important and an essential part of what faculty members do. Faculty members also serve as role models for their students. To extend this community beyond the campus, faculty learn from and offer their expertise to business, government, and non-profit organizations in various forms of consulting and service.

Since the success of the College depends on the work of the whole faculty, it is appropriate that the contribution of each faculty member to the success of the common work be the basis for regular and ongoing evaluation. This evaluation will determine not only the level of compensation for the faculty member's past contributions, but also what steps the College and the faculty member can take together for the faculty member's fuller professional development and personal growth in the future.

OVERALL PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

Creighton University “exists for students and learning.” It expects its faculty members to be superior teachers and to conduct research to enhance teaching, to contribute to the betterment of society, and to contribute to the fund of knowledge. Creighton also advocates service to others. Accordingly, the three areas of activity -- teaching, scholarship, and service -- are not mutually exclusive, but overlapping. Moreover, there are synergies that take place across the three realms of activity. It is the view of the college that the mission is best achieved with a community of “teacher-scholars,” a group not only committed to their work with students in the classroom, but one that recognizes how teaching, scholarship, and service are overlapping and cross-fertilizing. Teaching, scholarship, and service are taken to be complementary activities and faculty are expected to be active in each realm. Outstanding activity in one area cannot justify inactivity in another. Yet each member of the faculty has talents and interests which call him or her to devote efforts in varying degrees to teaching, scholarship and service. These differences in individuals are valued out of respect for the unique expression of humanity found in each person, and the stimulus to collective creativity provided by diversity. Thus, the annual review process is designed to provide the individual faculty member flexibility in selecting the weightings assigned to teaching, scholarship, and service while assigning weights that reflect the importance of all three activities.

Relative emphases on teaching, scholarship, and service may vary from these norms over the life of the individual’s career. Acceptable variances are determined in the planning phase of the annual evaluation by the individual and his/her chair and the dean of Heider College. The faculty member and the department chair will identify the individual’s activity mix for the coming year by specifying percentages for each activity. The chairs and the dean will seek to provide support that aligns with the weights assigned to each type of activity.

Assistant, Associate and Full Professors of Practice (non-tenure track terminally qualified faculty) may engage in scholarly activity, as well. Chairs are encouraged to provide developmental feedback on scholarship to these “of Practice” faculty. Each faculty member is encouraged to develop that mix of teaching, scholarship and service that best utilizes his/her abilities.

The normal activity mix for tenure track faculty in Heider College of Business is as follows:

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| Teaching | |
| With a teaching assignment equivalent to 18 contact hours per year | ...45 to 55 percent |
| Scholarly Activity |25 to 45 percent |
| Service |10 to 25 percent |

The normal activity mix for non-tenure track faculty in Heider College of Business is as follows:

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| Teaching | |
| With a teaching assignment equivalent to 24 contact hours per year | ...60 to 80 percent |
| Scholarly Activity |0 to 20 percent |
| Service |20 to 40 percent |

EXPECTATIONS ACROSS ACADEMIC RANK

As a faculty member advances in rank in Heider College of Business his/her relative emphasis in teaching, scholarship, and service may change as noted above to meet the needs and demands placed on the faculty and the college in light of the University's mission. Moreover, as faculty members advance in rank, an increasing role for faculty self-management in leveraging their intellectual capital for the benefit of the college is recognized in the following guidelines.

Note that this document outlines the activities of faculty at each rank. Expectations for the attainment of each rank may be found in the College's Rank and Tenure Statement.

a. Non-Tenure Track Instructors & Professors of Practice:

High quality teaching is a requirement for all faculty at Creighton. Instructors and Professors of Practice must also perform service as assigned by their department chairs. Non-tenure track faculty are not expected to engage in scholarly activity, although they are certainly welcome to do so if they wish. Non-tenure track faculty may be classified, for AACSB accreditation purposes as Scholarly Practitioners (SP), Instructional Practitioners (IP), Scholarly Academics (SA), or Practice Academics (PA), depending upon their academic qualifications and mix of activities.

Teaching efforts should be concentrated in the preparation and effective delivery of formal classroom presentations and the management of class-related student activities. The bulk of service activity will likely be in the form of Heider College committees, student organization advising, and academic advising of first year through fourth year students, including leading a section of the first year student orientation course.

b. Tenured or Tenure-Track Assistant Professors:

As stated above, high quality teaching is a requirement of all faculty at Creighton. In the tradition of the teacher-scholar model, research emphasis for Assistant Professors should be placed on developing a record of quality, peer-reviewed, scholarly outputs that will lead to tenure at Creighton. While the need for service must be recognized, emphasis should be on teaching and scholarship. Assistant Professors enter Heider College as Scholarly Academics (SA), in AACSB "qualifications and engagement" parlance, and are expected to remain so throughout their careers.

Activities of faculty at this rank are directed toward building a solid foundation for growth as a teacher-scholar and building a record of accomplishment that demonstrates real potential for achieving excellence as a teacher-scholar. Both global exposure and relevant practical experience may assist the faculty member in achieving these aims. Faculty time should be concentrated in knowledge acquisition and its dissemination through teaching and scholarly activities. Less time and energy should be allocated to service activities. Teaching time should be concentrated in the preparation and effective delivery of formal classroom presentations and the management of class-related student activities. The bulk of the scholarly activity should result in publications in refereed journals. Through the mechanism of

peer review, such publications are an important means of assessing the competence of a faculty member and his or her potential as a teacher-scholar. Some of this work should include sole or first authorship of articles.

c. Tenured or Tenure-Track Associate Professors:

Associate Professors will remain committed to quality teaching and will seek to extend their scholarship to clearly establish themselves as widely known and respected members of their disciplines. Associate Professors are, through their mix of activities, expected to be classified as Scholarly Academics (SA) in the AACSB “qualifications and engagement” scheme.

Activities of faculty at this rank should be directed toward extending the record of accomplishment as a teacher-scholar to a degree that clearly demonstrates excellence in both teaching and scholarship. Both global exposure and relevant practical experience are highly desirable in this stage. Activity should deepen and broaden the record of teaching and scholarship. In addition, increased faculty time should be devoted to service activities. Teaching activities may evolve to include involvement in student-directed activities outside of the classroom, executive seminars, writings for the popular press and other outreach activities. Scholarly activity should be directed toward establishing the faculty member as a respected member of the discipline. In addition to an on-going record of basic scholarship, outputs related to applied scholarship and instructional development may also become part of the scholarship portfolio.

d. Tenured or Tenure-Track Full Professors:

Faculty at this rank should serve as models of the accomplished teacher-scholar. The relative emphasis on teaching, scholarship and service *may vary significantly* in light of the institutional mission and individual faculty interests *over the life of their career*. Continued high quality teaching and research is expected. *In general*, professors should accept a larger role in service to their colleagues, institution, profession, and the broader community. Consultative activities with various organizations are normal at this stage and some global exposure is expected. Increased time should be directed to mentoring colleagues and students, participating in the effective governance of the institution, and serving as a community resource. Full professors may be, in terms of their sustained engagement and scholarly activities, be classified as Scholarly Academics (SA) or Practice Academics (PA), in AACSB terms.

Scholarly activity may come to be concentrated in one of the three areas of basic, applied, or instructional scholarship. Scholarly output should be of *continued* high quality with measurable impact on the intended audience. Increased efforts should be made toward collaborative scholarly activities with colleagues and students. In their internal and external service activities, faculty at this rank will be assuming a leadership role.

e. Endowed Chairholders:

Endowed chairs are hallmarks of a strong College and a great University. Endowed chairholders are well along their way in establishing distinguished academic careers and care must be exercised to respect their diverse interests and skills and avoid creating a template for all chairs. Endowed financial support for these chairs enables Heider College to reward and/or

attract faculty of national and international repute and to support them as part of the College's normal operation.

Chairholders have unique opportunities and responsibilities. The financial support, reduced teaching load, and stature accorded chairholders should leverage their academic skill to benefit students, colleagues, the College, and the University. Because of their enhanced freedom and support, chairholders are expected to pursue significant scholarly goals and to provide distinguished service to their profession. Chairholders are expected to be authentic scholars who are prominent in their respective disciplines. They should challenge and inspire students, and, through synergistic and supportive relationships with colleagues, chairholders are expected to help shape the academic climate of the College and promote a positive academic image for the University.

The relative emphasis of teaching, research, and service for an endowed chairholder will be agreed upon as part of the appointment process. Chairholders may be categorized as Scholarly Academics (SA) or Practice Academics (PA) for AACSB accreditation.

Heider College of Business seeks an environment of high performance as teacher/scholars and continued improvement and development for its faculty in teaching, scholarship, and service. By providing specific standards of performance linked to outcomes and expectations the College seeks to provide the benchmarks against which performance will be measured and improvement determined.

All faculty members should achieve at least the "Successful" level of accomplishment in each area. In each area, individual development plans should strive for the achievement of excellence.

The college and university seeks excellence in those it tenures and promotes; thus the attainment of "successful" performance is not sufficient for tenure or promotion to the next rank.

A. TEACHING PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

Creighton exists for students and learning. A personalized, state of the art education begins with excellence in the classroom and high academic standards. Teaching is the cornerstone of faculty activity and faculty must continually strive for high performance. Collaborative work in teaching, including mentoring and team-teaching activities, is highly desirable. Successful student outcomes are not only the result of work in the classroom, but also result from student-faculty interaction outside of class. Faculty are expected to interact with students in a variety of ways. Student advising and mentoring is especially important and expected of all faculty. Advising entails the effective sharing of knowledge of college curriculum, career opportunities for students, and university resources available to meet student needs.

Faculty also serve as role models for their students, both in their professional and personal lives. In all cases their relationships with students and colleagues should be marked by respect, cooperation and integrity. Their interactions with students should promote service to others, the importance of family life, the inalienable worth of each individual and an appreciation of ethnic and cultural diversity.

Thus, faculty have an obligation to be accessible to their students outside of class through office hours, voice mail, electronic mail and other media. Accessibility through various media does not diminish the importance of regularly scheduled office hours. These other means of student contact should serve to complement the physical availability of the faculty member. It is expected that faculty will have regularly scheduled office hours each week that are equal to or exceed the equivalent of .5 hour for each 1.0 hour of class time. These weekly office hours are to be scheduled at times convenient for students. Regularly scheduled office hours do not preclude the need for additional student contact hours arranged on an as needed basis.

It must be recognized that a broad array of activities constitute teaching and support thereof, including, but not limited to:

- classroom teaching
- online teaching
- directing internships
- collaborating with students on research
- student advising
- curricular innovation (courses, materials, software)
- development or restructuring of programs
- development of new instructional techniques or pedagogies
- development of syllabi and bibliographies

i. Teaching Effectiveness Criteria

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be made with respect to a number of criteria, which may include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

1. Classroom evaluation instrument (Classroom evaluations may account for up to sixty-five percent of a faculty member's overall teaching performance)
2. Student exit interviews
3. Peer review of teaching (texts, syllabi, Pedagogies, technologies, classroom delivery)
4. Observations from alumni and employers
5. Awards for teaching
6. Peer recognition of teaching, as manifested, for example, in such ways as directing students to faculty member's courses, consulting with faculty member on teaching issues, and adopting a faculty member's teaching techniques and strategies
7. Ability to handle a broad range of courses in one's area of competence, from introductory to graduate courses
8. Initiative and effectiveness in new course design and old course revision
9. Involvement in and contribution to course and curriculum design and revision
10. Student rapport and respect that has not been gained by compromising high academic standards
11. Student outcomes, as manifested, for example, by employer satisfaction with students, or by success of students in obtaining desirable post-graduate study or employment positions
12. Activities to keep current in the discipline, such as post-graduate work, consulting engagements, attending academic meetings, and participating in conferences on pedagogy

13. Efforts to establish expertise, experience, and relationships that contribute to the globalization of the College's programs and of its students' experience
14. Conformity of class syllabi to course content outlines adopted by each department and the college.

Because of the nature of some teaching activities, teaching should be evaluated over a three-year horizon; however, each year's merit evaluation will be primarily drawn from that year's performance.

ii. Teaching Performance Categories

As noted above, classroom teaching is one of a broad array of activities that constitute effective teaching. Faculty must strive for a quality classroom experience while embracing innovative approaches to learning both in and outside the classroom.

In interpreting the classroom evaluations, consideration should be given to the level and number of preparations, number of courses, class size and range of courses taught.

The characteristics listed in each of the following categories are not meant to be comprehensive or all-inclusive, but rather are suggestive and illustrative.

1. **Outstanding:** this faculty member exhibits the characteristics describing a successful teacher, is rated very highly by peers and students and, in addition, also displays most of the following attributes:
 - demonstrates enthusiasm for the subject matter;
 - stimulates students of varying abilities and is responsive to individual differences;
 - encourages student participation;
 - tries new pedagogical methods and technologies in the classroom;
 - shares successful techniques with colleagues;
 - willingly and effectively teaches a range of courses, both graduate and undergraduate; effectively collaborates with peers in team-teaching and other cooperative activities;
 - Participates in teaching activity other than that of classroom teaching.
 - Generally scores below 1.75 in questions 1-15 and 1.5 or below on question 19 of the course evaluation instrument.
 - Typically, over 90% of students will rate this member's teaching as high or above average.

2. **Very Good:** this faculty member exhibits the characteristics describing a successful teacher, is rated highly by peers and students, and, in addition, also displays some of the characteristics of an outstanding teacher.
 - Generally scores between 1.75 and 2.25 in questions 1-15 and between 1.5 and 2.0 on question 19 of the course evaluation instrument.
 - Typically, from 75 to 90% of students will rate this person's teaching as high or above average.

3. **Successful:** in general, this faculty member
 - addresses learning goals established in College approved course descriptions and outlines
 - prepares thorough and challenging course materials and examinations;
 - is prepared, organized, and clearly communicates subject matter;
 - is patient and helpful with students;
 - returns examinations and assignments with comments in a timely manner ;
 - integrates current discipline thinking and issues for classroom instruction;
 - attends seminars and colloquia for improvement; and is readily available to students outside of class time.
 - Faculty members in this category generally score between 2.25 and 2.75 in questions 1-15 and between 2.0 and 2.5 on question 19 of the course evaluation instrument.

- Typically, 55 to 75% of students will rate this person's teaching as high or above average.

- 4. Needs Improvement:** Student assessments and peer evaluations may indicate some of the following performance problems: not prepared for class; not current on the subject matter; shows little enthusiasm for the subject matter or the classroom; is impatient and not helpful; does not return examinations and assignments in a timely manner; does not manage the classroom well; is not available to students.

This level of performance occasionally leads to student complaints. Faculty members in this category generally score between 2.75 and 3.25 in questions 1-15 and between 2.5 and 3.0 on question 19 of the course evaluation instrument.

Typically, only 40 to 55% of students will rate this member's teaching as high or above average.

- 5. Unacceptable:** Consistently exhibits many of the problems described the "the needs improvement" category.

Faculty members in this category generally score above 3.25 in questions 1-15 and 3.0 or above on question 19 of the course evaluation instrument.

Typically, less than 40% of students will rate this member's teaching as high or above average.

B. SCHOLARSHIP PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

i. Scholarly Activity Defined

AACSB International – The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business defines intellectual contributions and further classifies them as shown below.

Intellectual contributions are original works intended to advance the theory, practice, and/or teaching of business and management. They are scholarly in the sense that they are based on generally accepted research principles, are validated by peers and disseminated to appropriate audiences. Intellectual contributions are a foundation for innovation. Validation of the quality of intellectual contributions includes the traditional academic or professional pre-publication peer review, but may encompass other forms of validation, such as online post-publication peer review, ratings, surveys of users, etc. Intellectual contributions may fall into any of the following categories:

Basic or Discovery Scholarship generates and communicates new knowledge and understanding and/or development of new methods. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the theory, knowledge, and/or practice of business and management.

Applied or Integration/application Scholarship synthesizes new understandings or interpretations of knowledge or technology; develops new technologies, processes, tools, or uses; and/or refines, develops, or advances new methods based on existing knowledge. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the practice of business and management.

Teaching and learning scholarship develops and advances new understandings, insights, and teaching content and methods that impact learning behavior. Intellectual contributions in this category are normally intended to impact the teaching of business and management.

Creighton University expects its faculty members to conduct research (intellectual contributions) to enhance teaching, to contribute to the betterment of society, and to contribute to the fund of knowledge. This range of research activities transcends the three categories of intellectual contributions as defined in the AACSB standards.

All faculty are expected to make a continuing intellectual contributions to scholarship beyond that made in their dissertation over the course of their career. Beyond this, the categories are defined broadly enough for us to embrace and value all three categories as they relate to Creighton's mission and educational objectives as long as the resultant product contains the following six characteristics:

1. Demonstrates a high level of discipline-related experience.
2. Breaks new ground or is innovative.
3. Can be documented.
4. Can be replicated.
5. Can be peer-reviewed.
6. Has impact on the discipline or intended community.

Scholarship does not include the activity of faculty members in continuing their own professional or educational development or keeping abreast of their own or related fields. These quite appropriate activities are required of any good teacher and are specifically to be evaluated in connection with the judgment of teaching performance. Scholarly work with peers is encouraged, especially colleagues in the college. This allows faculty to leverage their talents and should result in a higher quality outcome. It should be noted that written material that is proprietary, such as some consulting reports, would not meet the tests for scholarship. Such material would lack the necessary peer review and public character of scholarly products. However, consulting activities can provide opportunities upon which applied scholarly outputs can be based.

In assessing scholarship performance, it is important to weigh the quality of outcomes. Indicators of quality include the reputation of journals published in, serving as referee or editor in a recognized, scholarly journal, the number of citations of faculty member's publications by peers in their own scholarly work, requests for reprints, the award of external research funding, and regional or national awards for scholarly accomplishment. Scholarly work addressing global issues and embracing global perspectives is encouraged.

Opportunity to do scholarly work will be taken into consideration so that faculty who have more time available for such activity will be expected to have exhibited greater scholarly productivity than those whose teaching responsibilities allow less time for such activity.

Because of the long gestation time for many scholarly works, scholarship should be evaluated over a three-year horizon. All tenured and tenure-track faculty members, however, are expected to maintain an ongoing program of scholarship, and each year's merit evaluation will be primarily drawn from that year's performance.

Required Documentation

To properly evaluate research performance, the evaluation process requires pertinent documentation. Any accomplishments not supported by documentation will not be considered. Documentation may include letters of acceptance and actual copies of all materials including (a) work in progress, submitted research, published research; (b) conference paper submissions or acceptances; (c) research grant applications; (d) scholarly books (not included in the teaching category). For research publications, credit will be based on the date of acceptance or publication, but not both. Thus, a letter of acceptance could be used as documentation.

ii. Scholarship Performance Categories

In all cases the College seeks to reward the continuing intellectual contribution of the faculty and will evaluate quality as well as quantity when considering the specific contribution and the vehicles through which the contribution is made available for "public scrutiny by academic peers or practitioners."

The intellectual contribution of scholarship and research is initially validated through publication in academic journals or professional (practitioner) journals that are available for peer review. Thus, the standards for scholarship call for publication that is disseminated for

public review and that has been through a rigorous “refereeing” process prior to publication as indicants of external validation of quality.

Journal publications may be “refereed” through blind review by peer reviewers and editorial review by respected editors. In examining issues of quality and the appropriateness of this refereeing process the norms each discipline and the reputation of the publication with academic peers and the professional community will be considered.

Scholarly performance will be evaluated over a three-year period for a continuing program of research and scholarship in the year of evaluation. Each faculty member should demonstrate an ongoing program of scholarship and research designed to make an intellectual contribution to the discipline during the most recent year of the evaluation.

1. Outstanding: this faculty member’s activities expand upon those activities listed for a very good member.

These additional activities include:

a. Scholarly accomplishments in publication in either the year evaluated or sumatively over the last three years.

- **Five** or more of the following:
 - refereed publications in professional or academic journals (at least one of which is in an academic journal)
 - chapters in a scholarly book
 - scholarly books or textbooks published by a respected publisher over the last three years
- Or each year of contribution to especially significant or noteworthy scholarly activity (for example serving as editor of a highly respected journal) that clearly affects the discipline can be equivalent to a publication

b. The faculty member’s performance should also include other scholarly work such as papers presented at scholarly meetings, serving as referee for a scholarly journal, and other professional involvement that is beyond that of the very good classification

c. The faculty member must have maintained a continuing program of scholarly activities and accomplishment in the year evaluated.

2. Very Good: this faculty member’s activities expand upon those activities listed for a successful member.

These additional activities include:

a. Scholarly accomplishments in publication in either the year evaluated or sumatively over the last three years.

- **Three or four** of the following:

- refereed publications in professional or academic journals (at least one of which is in an academic journal)
 - chapters in a scholarly book
 - scholarly books or textbooks published by a respected publisher over the last three years
- Or each year of contribution to especially significant or noteworthy scholarly activity (for example serving as editor of a highly respected journal) that clearly affects the discipline can be equivalent to a publication
- b. The faculty member's performance should also include other scholarly work such as papers presented at scholarly meetings, serving as referee for a scholarly journal, and other professional involvement that is clearly beyond that of the successful classification
- c. The faculty member must have maintained a continuing program of scholarly activities and accomplishment in the year evaluated.
- 3. Successful:** this faculty member's performance and scholarly accomplishments expand in scope and quality upon those activities listed for a faculty member who needs improvement.

These additional scholarly outcomes include:

a. Scholarly accomplishments in publication in either the year evaluated or sumatively over the last three years.

- **At least two** of the following:
 - refereed publications in professional or academic journals (at least one of which is in an academic journal)
 - chapters in a scholarly book
 - scholarly books or textbooks published by a respected publisher over the last three years
- b. The faculty member's performance should also include other significant professional involvement such as papers presented at scholarly meetings or serving as referee for a scholarly journal that is beyond that of the "needs improvement" classification
- c. The faculty member must have maintained a continuing program of scholarly activities and accomplishment in the year evaluated.

4. Needs Improvement: this faculty member exhibits an ongoing commitment to scholarly activities the outputs of which are available for public scrutiny by academic peers or practitioners. The faculty member must produce evidence of continuing contribution to the discipline over the period examined producing significant intellectual "work product" in each year evaluated with emphasis given to current year efforts.

This evidence of performance may include:

- At least **one (refereed)** publication, book chapter or book over the prior three years as a minimum requirement.
- Evidence of other continuing scholarly activity that may include:
 - proceeding publications,
 - published book reviews,
 - in-house publications and working papers,
 - published case studies with teaching notes,
 - creation of commercially available textbook supplements
 - other peer-reviewed works.
 - applied scholarship in non-refereed publications in professional and trade journals available for public scrutiny
- Active participation in his/her academic association's professional activities and meetings, presentation of papers at scholarly meetings and other professional academic involvement.

5. Unacceptable: this faculty member exhibits a minimal commitment to scholarly activities. This faculty member's output would be limited to conference or professional presentations, serving as a conference panelist or discussant, and unpublished manuscripts.

4. SERVICE PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

i. The Scope of Service

Pursuit of the college mission requires service to the university, the community and the profession. There are two types of service activity, University Service and Community Service. University service refers to work on department, college, and university activities not related to a faculty member's teaching and research assignments. It includes committee work, work with student organizations, and work in student recruitment and retention. It also includes work with colleagues on service projects. Community service relates to the faculty member's work in his or her own disciplinary community and in the Omaha regional community. It includes service on committees and in offices of professional and discipline-related societies, active involvement on boards and committees of non-profit organizations, service on for-profit boards, and active involvement in the liturgy or social action committees of religious organizations. In all cases, professional service must be discipline based and rooted in the university and college mission. Consulting activities are deemed as appropriate service activities and are encouraged. Service activities that involve direct compensation to the faculty for services rendered may account for up to 20% of a faculty member's service component.

Service activities include, but are not limited to:

- * participation at college and department meetings
- * department, college, and university committee work in standing, ad hoc, or other committees
- * student organization advising
- * advisory committees
- * professional service, including editing newsletters, organizing conferences, and positions of leadership in disciplinary and professional organizations
- * teaching workshops and peer review of colleague teaching
- * service on governmental commissions and committees
- * service on parish councils, liturgy committees, or human needs committees
- * service on the board of a privately held or publicly traded company
- * service on the board of a non-profit organization
- * consulting services (or the supervision of student consulting teams) that lend current business expertise to organizations in need
- * activities that enhance the global aspects of the college
- * participation in admissions office activities directed at recruiting students
- * serving as reviewer of textbooks or other teaching materials
- * creation of public programs and issues seminars
- * providing commentary to the newsmedia
- * presentation of educational programs to non-traditional audiences (executive education, etc.)

Evaluation of service activities should take into account academic rank and should carefully consider both the quality of service activities as well as the time commitment involved. Because most service activities extend beyond one year, service should be evaluated over a three-year horizon.

ii. Service Performance Categories

1. Outstanding: this faculty member's activities expand upon those listed for a very good member. This faculty member makes significant contributions to the university, college, department, profession, or community. These contributions are distinguished by high quality and impact, and this person frequently assumes a leadership role.

2. Very good: this faculty member's activities expand upon those listed for a successful member. This faculty member demonstrates some initiative and usually does more than what is defined as adequate. This member sometimes assumes a leadership role in service activities. This service ordinarily goes beyond service to the college and department to include the university and the community.

3. Successful: this faculty member exhibits an ongoing record of service. This faculty member attends meetings, presentations, open houses, etc. as requested and provides some service to college and department. Honors commitments and is a dependable participant.

4. Needs Improvement: this faculty member is reluctant to contribute or does so only when monetary incentives are offered. This member's participation in service activities lacks energy, enthusiasm, or creativity.

5. Unacceptable: this faculty member regularly refuses requests, and cannot be depended on to put forth effort. The lack of involvement by this individual causes additional service burden to be placed on other colleagues.

5. PERFORMANCE RATINGS

An overall performance rating is derived from the above performance categories for the faculty activities of teaching, scholarship, and service. This overall performance rating will be derived annually, but will consider a faculty member's activities during a three-year window of activity. The following point allocation scheme will be applied to each category to develop an overall performance rating:

| Individual Area | <u>Performance Category</u> | <u>Point Allocation</u> |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Outstanding | 3.50 - 4.00 |
| | Very Good | 3.49 - 2.50 |
| | Successful | 2.49 - 1.50 |
| | Needs Improvemen | 1.49 - 0.50 |
| | Unacceptable | 0.49 - 0.00 |

A point allocation is assigned to each category and multiplied by the relative weight (in percent) placed on that category by the individual faculty member. The three numeric scores are added together to arrive at an overall performance score. This score is then used in merit pay determination. Faculty, however, with "unacceptable ratings" in any of the three areas may receive significantly reduced merit increases regardless of the overall score.

Annual Faculty Evaluation Process - Merit

The articulation of standards for faculty performance and the implementation of individual development plans are links in the annual performance evaluation of each faculty member and to salary determination. This evaluation is a key annual process for the College and its effective operation.

The process is designed to identify and reward faculty members who have made significant contributions to the continued development of the College. To maximize input in the process, multiple measures of the items being evaluated are desired. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide the necessary information for his/her evaluation. Accuracy and responsiveness are vital. The process allows for feed back and comment between the faculty member being evaluated and each level of the evaluation.

In early summer, each faculty member will prepare a **Faculty Activity Report** for the preceding academic year to provide the information needed for our faculty evaluation process, various dean's office reports, and AACSB reports. A standard college format will be followed. A current vita is also requested as our scholarship evaluation extends back three years and we are continuously preparing for AACSB reaccreditation. This material is due to the Chair and Dean's office by about August 1 of each year.

The department Chair will review the materials presented using the standards outlined in the Annual Faculty Performance "Standards". The Chair must discriminate between high and low performance when rating faculty in each category. The overall performance rating will be determined by multiplying the rating in each category by the relative weight assigned each category based on the faculty member's activities for the year as described in this document. During the month of August, department chairs will hold an individual meeting with each faculty member to discuss evaluation results. The evaluation will also be provided to the faculty member in writing by the chair.

Should the faculty member disagree with the evaluation presented by the Chair he/she may ask for clarification, provide additional supporting materials and provide a rejoinder in writing as part of the evaluation process.

Very early in September, the Dean, Associate Dean, and department chairs will reconcile faculty evaluations to achieve equity across the departments.

Following this reconciliation meeting, the Dean will rank faculty into several merit equivalency groups. These rankings will be used to determine salary recommendations to the University for the coming year. The faculty member will be informed in writing of this action. Compensation adjustments will be reported no later than October 1st, taking effect in November 1st pay.