

# **FACULTY PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PLAN**

**KENNETH G. DIXON  
SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTING  
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION  
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA**

INITIAL VERSION APPROVED BY TENURED FACULTY DECEMBER 2, 2005  
REVISION DATED NOVEMBER 22, 2006  
APPROVED BY TENURED FACULTY NOVEMBER 30, 2006

# FACULTY PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PLAN

Kenneth G. Dixon School of Accounting  
College of Business Administration  
University of Central Florida

The Kenneth G. Dixon School of Accounting Faculty Performance Assessment Plan is a work assignment and evaluation system designed for faculty performance appraisal and merit distribution *within* the Dixon School of Accounting. The Plan has six work assignment tracks. The tracks are listed in Table 1.

**Table 1**

## **Workload Assignment Tracks**

<b>Track</b>	<b>Academic Year Teaching Assignment</b>
A	8 courses or equivalents
B	7 courses or equivalents
C	6 courses or equivalents
D	5 courses or equivalents
E	4 courses or equivalents
F	3 courses or equivalents

Objectives of the Plan:

- Provide a range of work assignments that permit faculty members, in consultation with their Director, to assess the choice of the track that best matches their teaching and research capabilities, professional goals, and interests to the mission of the Dixon School and the College.
- Allow faculty members to capitalize on their professional strengths and be evaluated and rewarded relative to those strengths.
- Promote high quality research, teaching and service by accounting faculty members.

## **PART I - WORKLOAD TRACKS**

### **Allocation of Faculty Effort by Track**

Each year, the Director will assess each faculty member's performance based on teaching, research and service. Overall evaluations will be determined by weighting performance on each of the components (teaching, research, service). The faculty member's formal academic assignment for each of these activities will be determined on the basis of the respective target weights for each faculty member's assigned track. Table 2, presented below, contains the targeted assignment weights for teaching, research and service for each assignment track.

**Table 2**

<b>Professional Activity</b>	<b>Track A 8-Courses per year</b>	<b>Track B 7-Courses per year</b>	<b>Track C 6-courses per year</b>	<b>Track D 5-Courses per year</b>	<b>Track E 4-Courses per year</b>	<b>Track F 3-Courses per year</b>
Teaching Activities	80%	70%	60%	50%	40%	30%
Research Activities	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%
Service Activities	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%

### **Workload Assignment and Change Procedures**

1. Upon hire, a faculty member will request a track assignment in consultation with the Director. The Director and Dean will make the final decision on the initial track assignment. Faculty members on staff at the time of plan implementation will begin on their current track.
2. During the annual evaluation process, the Director, in consultation with the Dean, will review the faculty member's performance relative to the track. Based upon this review, the Director may propose reassignment. Any proposed change in workload assignment initiated by the Director will be based on demonstrated performance over a three-year period. Normally, a faculty member will remain on his/her current track assignment if s/he maintains at least a satisfactory rating in each of the assessment components and an overall average rating of AS- over the previous three-year period.
3. A faculty member may request a reassignment to a different workload track. This request must be expressed to the Director by May 1 of the year that precedes the calendar year in which the proposed new workload assignment would begin. The Dean must approve all changes in workload assignments.
4. Faculty may appeal a change in workload assignments in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

## **Assessment of Overall Performance**

Each faculty member will be given an overall performance assessment based on the ratings earned in teaching, research, and service activities. The overall rating will be determined using the percentages specified in the target assignment weights table (Table 2). While input may be solicited from a faculty advisory committee in each dimension of the evaluation (teaching, research, and service) the ultimate performance appraisal is the sole responsibility of the Director.

The overall evaluation rating and the rating for each of the three areas of professional activity will be based on the following 11 categories:

- 0.00-1.00 = U (Unsatisfactory)
- 1.01-2.00 = C (Conditional)
- 2.01-2.33 = S- (Satisfactory minus)
- 2.34-2.66 = S (Satisfactory)
- 2.67-3.00 = S+ (Satisfactory plus)
- 3.01-3.33 = AS- (Above Satisfactory minus)
- 3.34-3.66 = AS (Above Satisfactory)
- 3.67-4.00 = AS+ (Above Satisfactory plus)
- 4.01-4.33 = O- (Outstanding minus)
- 4.34-4.66 = O (Outstanding)
- 4.67-5.00 = O+ (Outstanding plus)

The weighted average of the points earned across teaching, research, and service activities will be used to determine an overall rating. The Director will use the maximum score in the rating range when assigning points to each activity. For example, the overall evaluation rating for a faculty member in Track C who has received a rating of 3.0 points (S+) in teaching, 4.00 points (AS+) in research, and 4.33 points (O-) in service is calculated as follows:  $.60 (3.00) + .30 (4.00) + .10 (4.33)$ , which equals 3.43 points. This number translates into an overall evaluation rating of AS (above satisfactory).

## **Modifications of the Faculty Performance Assessment Plan**

The Dixon School of Accounting Performance Assessment Plan must be dynamic. The plan may require periodic changes and will be revised in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement and changes in the Dixon School and College missions and objectives.

## **PART II – ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING, RESEARCH AND SERVICE**

Kenneth G. Dixon School of Accounting faculty members will be evaluated using performance criteria specified for all relevant performance dimensions (teaching, research, service, and other activities). Generally, for a faculty member to achieve an outstanding rating on any performance dimension, it is expected that s/he would have excelled in each of the primary performance criteria and demonstrated excellence in a number of applicable secondary criteria, consistent with unit and college goals (see listings of criteria for each dimension). Performance ratings standards are determined by the range or relative performance of Dixon School faculty members on each performance dimension, with individual performance ratings assigned relative to other Dixon School faculty to ensure fair and equitable treatment. Once the Director has completed the

evaluations for faculty in the Dixon School, a secondary screening and evaluation process will occur at the College level.

### **Assessment of Teaching Performance**

Each faculty member's annual teaching performance assessment will be based on his/her teaching accomplishments in the current evaluation year. The evaluation will be based primarily on the information the faculty member provides through completion of a teaching portfolio that follows the guidelines outlined in the *College of Business Teaching Portfolio Contents for Teaching Effectiveness*. While input may be solicited from a faculty advisory committee, the ultimate performance appraisal is the sole responsibility of the Director.

The Director shall consider the full range of teaching productivity and the contribution of this productivity to each faculty member's teaching program and the mission and goals of the Dixon School and College. Expectations of classroom teaching effectiveness will be the same for all faculty members.

#### *Factors in Assessing Teaching Performance*

Primary performance factors are:

- Achievement of course learning objectives consistent with Dixon School expectations.
- Adherence to accepted standards of professional behavior in meeting responsibilities to students.
- Course requirements and level of rigor.
- Student evaluation of instruction (required for every course taught).
- Timeliness and appropriateness of course content and teaching pedagogy.

Secondary performance factors may include:

- Appropriate use of technology.
- Development of new courses or innovations introduced into courses.
- Development of new or revised teaching pedagogy.
- Exit surveys and interviews of graduating students (conducted by College).
- Grade distributions.
- Level and type of courses taught.
- Number of students enrolled in the course.
- Observation by the Director.
- Originality of course materials.
- Participation in required accreditation and assessment activities.
- Peer evaluations by faculty colleagues.
- PhD student training/mentoring activities.
- Supervision of independent studies/internships.
- Surveys of alumni and/or business executives (conducted by College).
- Teaching awards.
- Teaching-related publications and conference presentations.
- Testing techniques.
- Textbooks and/or course supplements published.
- Unsolicited letters of testimonial from students, graduates and alumni.

- Working with honors-in-the-major students.

### **Assessment of Research Performance**

Each faculty member's annual research performance assessment will be based on his/her research accomplishments over the most recent three-year period. While input may be solicited from a faculty advisory committee, the ultimate performance appraisal is the sole responsibility of the Director.

Scholarship is expected of all faculty members whose assignment includes a research dimension. The Director shall consider the full range of research productivity and the contribution of this productivity to each faculty member's research program and the mission and goals of the Dixon School and College. This assessment includes the quantity and quality of publications in scholarly journals and other academic outlets, research contracts and grants, and other contributions to the research productivity of the Dixon School. Appendix A provides additional guidance both to faculty members and to the Director regarding the development and evaluation of a faculty member's research program.

While our primary research focus is on discipline-based scholarship, research publications in related disciplines and other types of academic and professional scholarship that are relevant to a faculty member's research program are also encouraged.

Within the research performance evaluation period, a faculty member must, at minimum, produce the level of scholarship needed to maintain masters' level academic qualification as defined by SACS, AACSB, and College Bylaws in order to receive an S- performance rating in research.

Newly hired assistant professors with no credit towards tenure will have their research in the first two years evaluated on the basis of identifiable research activities (e.g. publications, journal submissions, revise and resubmits, working papers, etc.) at UCF. New hires that receive credit towards tenure may include their publications during the period for which they were given credit.

#### *Factors in Assessing Research Performance*

The primary performance factor is:

- The quality and quantity of journal publications.

Secondary performance factors may include:

- Citations of research.
- Editor of conference proceedings.
- Editor of national or regional publications.
- Editorship of international, national or regional journal.
- External research grants.
- Guest lecturing at other colleges, universities, institutes.
- International, national or regional research awards.
- Membership on thesis/dissertation committees.
- Membership on advisory research councils.

- Membership on editorial boards.
- Participation in professional development seminars.
- Presentations at international, national or regional conferences.
- Reviewer for international, national or regional journals.
- Research books and research monographs published.
- Research communications to the business community.
- Research mentor to other faculty members and/or doctoral students.
- Reviews of research of colleagues at this or other universities.
- Seminars, presentations, and conferences conducted for faculty and the community.
- Significance to long-term theory development (expanding frontiers of knowledge).
- Significance to managerial/industry practice.
- Single authored paper.
- Track or session chair, discussant or reviewer for professional conferences.

### **Assessment of Service Performance**

Each faculty member's annual service performance assessment will be based on his/her service accomplishments in the current evaluation year. While input may be solicited from a faculty advisory committee, the ultimate performance appraisal is the sole responsibility of the Director. The Director shall consider the full range of service productivity and the contribution of this productivity to each faculty member's service responsibilities and the mission and goals of the Dixon School and College.

Service is expected of all faculty members. However, the type and amount of service activity can be expected to vary based on the professional focus of a given individual. It is expected that all faculty will perform service activities primarily associated with their chosen option, and that individual ratings are associated with a record of consistent effort and quality contributions. This does not preclude performing service activities that are assigned to an option different from the one selected. For instance, all faculty members could be expected to participate to some degree in general service activities. The College of Business Teaching Effectiveness document lists the type of service activities that are typically associated with the teaching function. The service activities that are typically associated with the research function are listed above in the discussion of the research assessment. Other general service activities are listed below.

#### *Factors in Assessing Service Performance*

The primary performance factor is:

- Active involvement in Dixon School, college, or university committees (including ad hoc assignments).

Secondary performance factors include:

- Active involvement in international, national or regional academic or professional associations.
- Activities designed to produce external support (financial/non-financial) for the College and/or the Dixon School.
- Attendance at graduation ceremonies.
- Book reviews.

- Presentations to community groups and organizations.
- Pro bono consulting activities with local organizations/groups.
- Public service activity with civic or social organizations in the community.
- Writing or editing newspaper and magazine articles, newsletters, etc.

### **Assessment of Other Performance**

A faculty member's assignment may include other activities. These activities and expectations of performance will be a function of the type and extent of these activities. Performance assessment of other activities will be determined by the Director.

### **Relationship between Annual Evaluation and Tenure/Promotion**

The result of a faculty member's annual evaluation in the College of Business Administration is just one of numerous components that are examined in the University tenure and/or promotion process. Therefore, it should NOT be construed that achieving a satisfactory or above rating in any or all annual evaluations will automatically result in a positive tenure or promotion decision.

## Appendix A to FPAP

Each faculty member's research evaluation is to be based on the criteria set forth in the Assessment of Research performance section of the Dixon School of Accounting Faculty Performance Assessment Plan. The purpose of this appendix is to provide additional guidance both to faculty members and to the Director regarding the development and evaluation of a faculty member's research program.

This guidance recognizes that the Dixon School's primary research focus is on the publication of discipline-based scholarship that is consistent with the mission of the Dixon School and College, while also acknowledging the relevance and value of other types of academic and professional scholarship. For faculty guidance regarding the continuing development of a research program and for purposes of evaluation of a faculty member's research performance, the following criteria should be taken into consideration:

- the reputation of the publication outlets for research. In making this determination, published studies regarding journal rankings (e.g. Brown and Huefner (1994); Ballas and Theoharakis (2003)) and the advice of senior researchers who are experts in a faculty member's research specialization should be consulted. The following definitions will be used to guide the assessment of the academic reputation of journals:
  - Premier—Generalist Journals. This category consists of the five internationally recognized academic peer-reviewed journals (*Accounting, Organizations and Society, Contemporary Accounting Research, Journal of Accounting and Economics, Journal of Accounting Research, and The Accounting Review*).
  - Premier—Specialist Journals. This category consists of academic peer-reviewed journals internationally recognized as being of very high quality. This category includes all AAA section journals and those journals meeting an elite quality threshold based on the results of published journal ranking studies and/or the consensus of senior researchers who are recognized experts in the area of research specialization.
  - Other high-quality research journals. This consists of an additional limited set of academic peer-reviewed journals internationally recognized as quality research outlets. This includes several important national and international journals. In most cases, these journals are the major secondary outlets for academic work in specialty areas.
- the substantive characteristics of research. In making this determination, the length of the manuscript, the number of coauthors, and the theoretical and/or methodological rigor employed should be considered.
- the potential impact of research. In making this determination, the readership and forum for the research and the citations generated from the research should be considered.

## Appendix B to FPAP Work Load Tracks for Non-Tenure Positions

This addendum to the FPAP recognizes the role of faculty with non-tenure appointments. As listed in Table 4, the plan has three work assignment tracks for non-tenure earning instructor and lecturer positions.

**Table 4**

### Workload Assignment Tracks

Track	Academic Year Teaching Assignment (or equivalent)
A	8 courses
B	7 courses
C	6 courses

Table 5 contains the target weights for teaching, research and service for the non-tenure track instructor and lecturer FPAP options.

**Table 5  
Evaluation Weights by Workload Assignment for Instructor and Lecturer Positions**

Professional Activity	Track A 8-Courses	Track B 7-Courses	Track C 6-Courses
Teaching	90%	70-80%	60-70%
Research	0%	10%	10-20%
Service	10%	10-20%	10-30%

### Workload Assignment and Evaluation Procedures

1. Upon hire, faculty members appointed to instructor or lecturer positions will request a track assignment in consultation with the Chair. It is normally expected that Instructors will be assigned to Track A. Lecturers will normally be assigned to Tracks B or C. Faculty requesting Tracks B or C will also request target weights for teaching, research, and service within the ranges specified. The Chair and Dean will make the final decision on the initial track assignments and target weights.
2. All other aspects of work assignments, change procedures, and assessment of performance will be made using the policies and procedures outlined in Part I of the FPAP.
3. Evaluation of teaching, research, service, and other activities will be made as outlined in Part II of the FPAP.