Faculty Qualifications
The College of Business at Southern Miss is committed to maintaining and strategically deploying faculty who collectively and individually demonstrate academic and professional engagement that sustains the intellectual capital necessary to support high-quality outcomes consistent with its mission and strategies. Because of this commitment, part of the annual evaluation process involves examination of each faculty member’s qualifications during the evaluation year (looking back) and an evaluation of what will be required during the current year to maintain qualification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Qualification</th>
<th>During Evaluation Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Academic (SA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Academic (PA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Practitioner (SP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Practitioner IP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Required action to maintain qualification:
Click here to enter text.

Teaching Performance
Evaluate each criterion and assign the appropriate rating using this scale:

3 = Exceeds expectations   2 = Meets expectations   1 = Does not meet expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professionalism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adheres to university/college/department policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Ex: Submits gradebook to chair at conclusion of semester; Submits interim grades on time and as specified; Submits final grades on time and as specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains professional relationships with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Ex: Adheres to policies stated in course syllabi; Posts and maintains office hours as stated in Faculty Handbook; Meets classes on time and for entire period; Maintains gradebooks; Evaluates assignments and exams in a timely manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains professional relationships with staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Ex: Treats staff with courtesy and respect at all times; Does not make excessive or unreasonable demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maintains professional relationships with other faculty members
- Ex: Cooperates with other instructors of same or related courses; Shares and
develops successful instructional techniques with colleagues

Maintains professional relationships with administrators
- Ex: Communicates frequently with department Chair, including notification of
absences; Provides syllabi to department chair before classes begin each semester;
Participates in AACSB or SACS assessment processes (if applicable); If applicable,
works cooperatively in planning, assessment, and improvement of core curriculum
course(s)

Course Organization

Develops and uses acceptable syllabus
- Ex: Provides syllabi that include list of topics to be covered during the semester,
specific course objectives, types of activities for the course, grading procedures, and
required reading assignments; Syllabus lists types of activities in which students will
engage; Syllabus provides clear and reasonable explanation of grading procedures;
Syllabus provides schedule for assignments and/or exams

Teaching Effectiveness

Demonstrates and maintains topic knowledge
- Ex: Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter; Remains abreast of the subject
matter in the course and current developments in the discipline; Participates in
trade or professional associations related to course content; Works in a business
with job responsibilities that are directly related to teaching assignment

Provides effective instruction
- Ex: Works to incorporate integrative experiences and examples into class
presentations and assignments; Incorporates current business practices and
thinking into classroom instruction; Utilizes appropriate testing procedures; Covers
relevant material planned for the course; Responds to student
needs/requests/questions regarding subject matter taught

Develops instructional skills
- Ex: Uses results of assessment and student course evaluations to improve
instruction; Uses appropriate materials to aid effective instruction; Attends
seminars or workshops on instructional development

Demonstrates innovative approaches to instruction
- Ex: Promotes student engagement through active learning techniques and/or use
of technology; Presents course information in multiple ways; Uses available
technology appropriately in delivering course material

Total

Overall, the performance of this faculty member is:
- Exceptional (surpasses expectations on all performance indicators, i.e., >= 95% of possible points)
- Meritorious (meets or exceeds expectations on most criteria, i.e., >= 80% of possible points)
- Good (meets expectations on most of the criteria, i.e., >= 65% of possible points)
- Satisfactory (needs to improve on a few criteria, i.e., >= 50% of possible points)
- Unsatisfactory (does not meet expectations, i.e., < 50% of possible points)
I have received a copy of the evaluation report.

______________________________  _________________
Faculty Member  Date
Teaching evaluation criteria for full-time faculty are found in the *College of Business Faculty Handbook* available at [https://www.usm.edu/sites/default/files/groups/college-business/images/usmcobfacultyhandbook4102015.pdf](https://www.usm.edu/sites/default/files/groups/college-business/images/usmcobfacultyhandbook4102015.pdf)

Relevant pages follow on next page
Article VII. Defining and Assessing Faculty Productivity

Faculty productivity is traditionally defined as encompassing contributions in the areas of instruction (teaching), intellectual contributions (research), and service. We seek a relative balance among these activities with a typical College of Business faculty member (tenure-track) having a commitment of 40% in instruction, 40% in intellectual contributions and 20% in service activities. Non-tenure track faculty members have a commitment of 65% instruction and 35% in combined scholarly activity and service/professional activities. The Dean may alter these percentages in particular cases where merited. Following is a discussion of how the College’s annual evaluation process assigns a performance rating to each faculty member/administrator in the areas of instruction, intellectual contributions, and service activities. An overall weighted rating, using the weights above, is also assigned.

Administrators are evaluated in accordance with the University Faculty Handbook with personnel committees consulting with supervising administrative officers to produce a single, unified annual evaluation. Department chairs, school director, and assistant/associate deans are considered to be faculty members with additional service responsibilities in their administrative duties, having a commitment of 20% in instruction, 20% in intellectual contributions and 60% in service activities. Release time (three or six hours during semesters and no teaching responsibilities during summers) compensates for the demanding administrative duties in order for these individuals to maintain active teaching skills and research agendas. While the Dean may alter them, typically, administrators will be evaluated with the percentages in the paragraph above. Staff members have a commitment of 100% in job description performance.

Annual evaluations cover the performance of a faculty member over a three-year period. The three-year period is on a calendar year basis. A scale from one to five will be used in evaluations. The meaning of the numbers is given below:

5 - Exceptional
4 - Meritorious
3 - Good
2 - Satisfactory
1 - Unsatisfactory.

(a) Instruction

Instructional performance is probably best measured as the amount of incremental learning that occurs under the guidance of a faculty member. The College is committed to developing and improving processes to assess whether learning is consistent with program and course objectives, as well as to assess whether students are obtaining the foundation for career and personal development. However, it is common to use proxies for student learning, such as student perceptions of an instructor's effectiveness and style, course syllabi and tests, subject-matter
coverage, and assigned student workload. In evaluating instructional performance, the following scale is used:

**Rating of 4.0 to 5.0:** Faculty member is clearly superior in the classroom, relative to his/her colleagues. This person exhibits many of the traits in the following list.

(i) **Course Development and Teaching Effectiveness**

- Is evaluated as outstanding by students in a majority of documented evaluations of classroom performance,
- Demonstrates that learning outcomes are consistent with stated course objectives,
- Works to incorporate integrative experiences and examples into class presentations and assignments,
- Develops measures of effectiveness which are utilized to refine instructional methods and procedures,
- Develops and improves course materials and assignments, including syllabi, required readings, term papers, problems, practice sets, case analyses, test banks, student guides, instructor’s manuals, computer-related activities, library work, and off-campus student consulting projects,
- Incorporates current business practices and thinking into classroom instruction,
- Invites guest speakers and professionals to class to enhance course material,
- Uses grading procedures that are clear, reasonable, thorough, and well-documented,
- Provides evidence that courses are demanding and rigorous,
- Teaching awards received (internal and external),
- Development and participation in overseas assignments,
-Spends time with students outside of class in such activities as tutoring, test reviews, and field trips,
- Application of time-intensive testing procedures (e.g., essay exams, research papers).

(ii) **Innovative Approaches to Instruction**

- Develops and uses innovative pedagogical methods and technologies in the classroom,
- Develops innovative instruction-related materials, including on-line courses and the maintenance of web sites related to pedagogy,
- Enhances curriculum through major course redesign.

(iii) **Teaching and Instructional Development**

- Attends seminars or workshops on instructional development,
- Shares and develops successful instructional techniques with colleagues,
- Participates in instruction-related grant writing,
- Participates in pedagogical-related conferences,
- Development and publication of textbooks,
- Development and publication of instruction manuals,
- Development and publication of instructional presentations and publications.

**Rating of 3.0 to 3.9:** A faculty member in this category is recognized by students as a very competent teacher. This professor may not attract the same attention as the highest rated
teacher, but is recognized as having high proficiency and exhibits several of the traits of the teacher described above.

**Rating of 2.0 to 2.9:** A faculty member in this category receives student evaluations that are neither extremely good nor extremely poor. Students learn from this professor, but might benefit from a wider variety of instructional methods. This faculty member would benefit by developing more behaviors such as those described in the first rating category.

**Rating of 1.0 to 1.9:** A faculty member in this category needs improvement and observation. Student evaluations may indicate some of the following performance problems: the faculty member does not seem prepared for classroom activities, does not seem current on the subject matter, shows little enthusiasm for the subject matter or classroom interaction, does not return examinations and assignments in a timely manner, does not manage the classroom well, is not available to students, etc. In addition, the faculty member demonstrates few of the behaviors and traits detailed in the previous rating categories. A person who consistently suffers from the problems mentioned in this section would receive a rating of one (1).

**(b) Intellectual Contributions**

The College is committed to engaging in and supporting a spectrum of intellectual contributions. We seek a relative balance among the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of education. Tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to maintain a presence in the literature of their disciplinary field. The following guidelines are used in evaluating intellectual contributions:

**Rating of 4.0 to 5.0:** This faculty member demonstrates clear evidence of intensive, high-quality, and on-going intellectual contributions. The faculty member will have produced an accumulation of items during the evaluation period in one or more of the following categories:

- Publications in refereed journals,
- External funding received for research projects,
- Publications of scholarly books or textbooks,
- Published business cases,
- Published software programs,
- Other publications such as monographs, proceedings, articles in non-refereed journals, working papers, and book chapters,
- Paper presentations,
- Research grant proposals.

The person receiving a rating of from 4 to 5 will normally have had published one or more A-level journal articles and/or have received highly regarded external funding. However, other combinations of intellectual contributions can result in a rating of from 4 to 5. The overall rating depends upon the rigor of the scholarly activities, the recognized quality of outlets, and the number of intellectual contributions during the evaluation period. Faculty members should refer to Appendix 8-2, in which the College of Business Journal Rankings Committee details the ranking and weighting system for intellectual contributions at varying levels of rigor, quality and quantity.