

Evaluation and Performance Reporting

Criteria for teaching evaluations

1. Student evaluations
2. Currency & aptness of course content
3. Content & mode(s) of exams
4. Content & mode(s) of student projects
5. Overall judgment of rigor
6. New materials

The purpose of criteria 2-6 is to provide a broader examination of teaching performance. In particular, we recognize that some of these dimensions will not apply to all classes (e.g., project based courses may have not exams). Further, our expectation is that most faculty members will be quite good on criteria 2-6 (i.e., minimal variance). As such, the consideration of these criteria should help to identify outliers (e.g., very good or very bad classes). Departments are to include these criteria as part of their overall evaluation of each faculty member's teaching performance. At our annual evaluation meetings, each department chair will convey their faculty's judgments (as well as their own separate assessment) on each faculty member's teaching performance. For most faculty members, who are good teachers, these evaluations should be quite short (e.g., one sentence per criterion). For the outliers, however, some additional explanation will be required. (It is anticipated that Departments will distribute the "lead role" in evaluating junior faculty to senior faculty.)

Direct observation of an assistant professor's class room performance

- a. In year 1, the department chair visits one or more class sessions to observe teaching. Feedback from this visit (or visits) should focus on mentoring. These visits may be unannounced.
- b. In year 3, the department chair visits one or more class sessions to observe teaching. Feedback from this visit (or visits) should focus on both mentoring and evaluation. These visits may be unannounced.
- c. In year 5, the department chair and a program associate dean visit one or more sessions to observe teaching. Feedback from this visit (or visits) should focus on evaluation for tenure. These visits may be unannounced.

Evaluation of Research

Guidelines for scores in the evaluation of research on our 1-9 scale

1. Two A publications: 9
2. One A and one B publication: 8
3. One A publication: 7
4. One A- or two B publications: 6
5. One B : 5
6. One or more C publications: 4 or 5
7. Something: 2 or 3
8. Nothing: 1

Journals (disciplinary based journals are not listed below and the journals listed below are subject to change)

1. Accounting

Accounting Review
 Journal of Accounting Research
 Contemporary Accounting Research
 Journal of Accounting & Economics
 Accounting, Organization & Society (A-)
 Review of Accounting Studies (A-)

2. Finance

Journal of Finance
 Journal of Financial Economics
 Review of Financial Studies
 Journal of Finance & Quantitative Analysis

3. M&O

Academy of Management Journal
 Academy of Management Review
 Administrative Science Quarterly
 Strategic Management Journal
 Organization Science (A-)
 Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes (A-)
 Personnel Psychology (A-)

4. Marketing

Journal of Marketing Research
 Journal of Marketing
 Journal of Consumer Research
 Marketing Science
 Journal of Consumer Psychology (A-)

5. Information Systems and Operations Management

a. Information Technology

Management Science,
 Information Systems Research
 Management Information Systems Quarterly
 Informs Journal of Computing (A-)
 Journal of Management Information Systems (A-)

b. Operations Management/Quantitative Methods

Management Science
 Manufacturing and Service Operations Management
 Operations Research
 IIE (A-)
 European Journal Operations Research (A-)

Performance feedback to faculty (i.e., meetings with faculty)

- a. All full time, senior and principal lecturers, assistant professors and associate professors must receive performance feedback this year (06-07).
- b. The content of these meetings must be summarized in a letter that is sent to the individual faculty member and associate dean for academic & faculty affairs.
- c. Each faculty member has 10 days in which to disagree with the letter. If no comment is received by the faculty member within these 10 days, the UW assumes that the faculty member agrees and accepts the contents.
- d. These letters should discuss the faculty member's performance on research, teaching and service. For assistant professors, these letters should offer a realistic assessment of their progress toward promotion to associate and tenure. For associate professors, these letters should offer a realistic assessment of their progress toward promotion to full.