

# FACULTY PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PLAN

*DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT  
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION  
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA*

Initially Approved by Management Department Faculty on 02/26/1999

Revision approved by Management FPAP Committee on 02/03/2006

Approved by Management tenured faculty on 10/23/2006

# FACULTY PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PLAN

*Management Department  
College of Business Administration  
University of Central Florida*

## Introduction

The Management Department Faculty Performance Assessment Plan (FPAP) is a work assignment and evaluation system designed for faculty performance appraisal and merit distribution within the Management Department. The Plan has six work assignment tracks, as listed in Table 1.

**Table 1  
Workload Assignment Tracks**

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

Objectives of the Plan:

- Provide a range of work assignments that permit faculty members, in consultation with the chair, to be placed on the track that best matches their teaching and research capabilities, professional goals, and interests, with the mission of the department.
- Align the performance appraisal system with the promotion and tenure process.
- Promote high quality research and teaching by Management faculty members.

## ***PART I - WORKLOAD TRACKS***

### ***Evaluation Weights by Assignment Track***

Each year, the Department Chair will assess each faculty member's performance based on teaching, research, and service activities. Overall evaluations will be determined by weighting performance on each of the components by the faculty member's formal FTE assignment on each. Table 2 contains the target weights for teaching, research and service for each FWAP option.

**Table 2**  
**Evaluation Weights by Workload Assignment**

<b>Professional Activity</b>	<b>Track A 8-Courses</b>	<b>Track B 7-Courses</b>	<b>Track C 6-courses</b>	<b>Track D 5-Courses</b>	<b>Track E 4-Courses</b>	<b>Track F 3-Courses</b>
Teaching	85%	75%	65%	50%	30%	25%
Research	5%	15%	25%	40%	60%	65%
Service	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%

Although expectations are that most faculty members' time will be allocated in the proportions given above, it is recognized that circumstances may arise which warrant variations in the percentages under each option. Each faculty member's annual performance evaluation will be based upon the actual workload for that evaluation period.

In those cases where other duties are a significant part of evaluating a faculty member's performance, the faculty member, in consultation with the Chair, will determine alternate weights and include them on the faculty member's assignment form for all categories at the beginning of each academic year.

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

1. Upon hire, a faculty member will request a track assignment in consultation with the Chair. The Chair and Dean will make the final decision on the initial track assignment.
2. A faculty member may request a reassignment to a different workload track. This request must be expressed to the Chair prior to May 1 of the year preceding the evaluation year in which the proposed new workload assignment would begin. The Dean must approve all changes in workload assignments.
3. During the annual evaluation process, the Chair, in consultation with the Dean, will review the faculty member's performance relative to the track. Based upon this review, the Chair may propose reassignment. Any proposed change in workload assignment initiated by the Chair will be based on demonstrated performance over a three-year period.

4. Faculty members may appeal changes 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 assigned to each activity as outlined in Table 2.

**Table 3  
Evaluation Scale**

<b>Evaluation Label</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Mid-Point of Range</b>
Unsatisfactory	0.00-1.00	.50
Conditional	1.01-2.00	1.50
Satisfactory-	2.01-2.33	2.17
Satisfactory	2.34-2.66	2.50
Satisfactory+	2.67-3.00	2.84
Above Satisfactory-	3.01-3.33	3.17
Above Satisfactory	3.34-3.66	3.50
Above Satisfactory+	3.67-4.00	3.84
Outstanding-	4.01-4.33	4.17
Outstanding	4.34-4.66	4.50
Outstanding+	4.67-5.00	4.84

The weighted average of the points earned across teaching, research, and service activities will be used to determine an overall rating. For purposes of calculating the overall evaluation score, the Chair has the discretion of using any point value within the rating range on each performance dimension. While recognizing the central importance of research to our mission, it is still expected that faculty will meet their professional obligations in teaching and service as well. Therefore, the following qualification will apply to the determination of a faculty member's overall evaluating rating: if a faculty member receives a rating below Above Satisfactory Minus in teaching, research, or service, that faculty member's overall evaluation score may be reduced by up to one full point at the discretion of the Chair if the faculty member received an initial overall rating of Outstanding.

Modifications of the Faculty Performance Assessment Plan

The Management Department 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 Department and College missions and objectives.

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

College of Business faculty 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 a majority of the applicable performance criteria, consistent with unit and college goals (see activity listings for each dimension). To ensure fair and equitable treatment, an individual faculty member's performance ratings will be compared to the range of unit faculty members' performance on the dimensions. Once the chair/director has completed the evaluations for faculty in their Department/School, a secondary screening and evaluation process will occur at the College level.

### *Evaluation of Teaching Performance*

The Department Chair will evaluate the teaching component of each faculty member's assignment and rate this performance using the evaluation scale shown in Table 3. The teaching evaluation will be based only on teaching activities during the current evaluation year. Expectations of classroom teaching effectiveness will be the same for all faculty members, irrespective of their assigned workload tracks. Although the evaluation of the teaching component of a faculty member's workload will be based primarily on classroom performance, faculty members will be expected to perform teaching-related activities such as development of new courses and/or development of innovative teaching methods.

The Chair's evaluation of teaching performance will be based on many factors, including those listed below. In January of each year faculty members will submit a teaching portfolio to the Chair for review and evaluation. Faculty members are encouraged to document as thoroughly as possible use of these assessment factors in order to detail classroom effectiveness and to seek means by which teaching effectiveness can be improved.

#### Teaching Performance Criteria:

- Developing course content that is at the leading edge
- Demonstrating extraordinary innovation in course design/delivery
- Maintaining course pedagogy at the leading edge
- Maintaining content, materials, pedagogy appropriate to the level of the course
- Preparing new courses

- Revising previously-taught courses significantly
- Holding sufficient office hours and meeting all professional obligations to students
- Grading rigorously
- Using higher-order learning activities in courses, e.g.,
  - Essay exams
  - Individual projects/cases
  - Writing and/or speaking assignments
  - Overseeing student projects with company sponsors
  - Assignments requiring computer skills
  - Assignments requiring quantitative analyses
  - Developing a guest speaker series
- Providing timely and quality feedback to students
- Using technology to enhance course delivery
- Publishing teaching-related manuscripts/textbooks/cases
- Working with honors-in-the-major students (theses, etc.)
- Supervising independent studies/directed research
- Winning TIP, excellence in teaching, and/or other awards
- Meeting extraordinary travel requirements associated with teaching assignment
- Achieving positive evaluations/feedback from students
- Participating in the preparation, publication, measurement, and achievement of assessment-related learning outcomes
- Winning internal or external competitive instructional grants
- Maintaining a high rate of student retention in assigned classes
- Participating in PhD student training (dissertation chair, committee member, mentor, etc.)
- Teaching large numbers of students

### Evaluation of Research Performance

The research component of each faculty member's assignment will be evaluated based on research accomplishments over the most recent three-year period. Expectations of quality and quantity of research productivity needed to achieve a specific level of performance evaluation will be the same for all faculty members, irrespective of assigned workload track. Research accomplishments will be rated using the scale shown in Table 3.

The Chair shall consider the research productivity and the contribution of this productivity to each faculty member's research program and to the mission and goals of the Department and College. This assessment includes the quantity and quality of publications in scholarly journals and other academic outlets, research contracts and grants, and other activities listed below.

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) while at UCF. New hires who receive credit towards tenure may include their publications during the period for which they were given credit. Faculty who are hired with tenure will be evaluated on the most recent three-year period.

#### Research Performance Criteria:

- Publishing in the top journals in the discipline
- Publishing research monographs/books
- Publishing research of significance to the discipline
- Publishing research with an impact on managerial/industry practice
- Maintaining academic currency for AACSB/SACS accreditation
- Winning external competitive research grants
- Participating in top national/international research conferences as a presenter and/or discussant
- Maintaining a strong research program/pipeline
- Developing and moving forward a focused program of research
- Achieving a national/international reputation in research
- Consistency in publishing at or above previously-achieved levels

- Winning RIP, excellence in research, or other awards
- Serving as editor, associate editor, or special issue editor of a top journal in the discipline
- Serving on the editorial review board of top journals in the discipline
- Conducting research seminars/workshops (internal and external)
- Publishing sole-authored research in the top journals in the discipline

### Evaluation of Service Performance

The service component of each faculty member's assignment will be evaluated for the current evaluation year by the Chair and rated using the scale in Table 3. Service is expected of all faculty members. However, the type 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 assigned workload option, and that individual ratings are associated with a record of consistent effort and quality contributions. Types of service activities are listed below.

#### Service Performance Criteria:

- Performing department service (number of activities and hours per semester invested). Note: these would typically be elected or appointed seats on department committees or serving as faculty adviser to student organizations, etc.
- Performing college service (number of activities and hours per semester invested). Note: these would typically be elected or appointed seats on college committees.
- Performing university service (number of activities and hours per semester invested). Note: these would typically be elected or appointed seats on university committees.
- Performing professional service (number of activities and hours per semester invested)
  - Performing ad hoc reviews for journals
  - Performing reviews for conference proceedings
  - Performing book reviews for journals
  - Conducting conference workshops
  - Holding office in associations relevant to the discipline
  - Acting as conference proceedings editor
  - Conducting guest lectures/workshops/seminars at other universities

- Performing relevant community service (number of activities and hours per semester invested), e.g., K-12 activities
- Winning excellence in service awards
- Working cooperatively with colleagues
- Meeting service obligations, e.g., attending committee meetings, commencement, etc.

#### *Evaluation of Other University Duties*

Other university duties are occasionally assigned for special activities such as administrative duties or other special projects. Since the nature of these assignments is variable, no attempt is made to specify evaluation in proportion to the total amount of time the assignment is weighted in the annual assignment form.

#### *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 higher rating in any or all annual evaluations will automatically result in a positive tenure or promotion decision.

## Addendum 1 – Work Load Tracks for Non-Tenure Positions

Addendum 1 of the Plan 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**

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

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

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

<b>Professional Activity</b>	<b>Track A 8-Courses</b>	<b>Track B 7-Courses</b>	<b>Track C 6-Courses</b>
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 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 1 of the Plan.
3. Evaluation of teaching, research, service, and other activities will be made as outlined in Part II of the Plan.

Effective date of implementation: January, 2007