

FACULTY PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PLAN

***DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT
INFORMATION SYSTEMS (MIS)
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA***

*Initially Adopted by Department of Management Information Systems
March 23, 2000
Revised September 28, 2005
Revised March 1, 2006
Revised November 21, 2006*

FACULTY PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PLAN

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

Introduction

The Department of Management Information Systems Faculty Performance Assessment Plan (FPAP) is a work assignment and evaluation system designed for faculty performance appraisal and merit distribution *within* the Department. The plan has six work assignment tracks; see Table 1 below.

Table 1. Workload Assignment Tracks

Track	Annual Teaching Assignment
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 permits faculty members, in consultation with their Chair, to choose the track that best matches their teaching and research capabilities, professional goals, and interests.
- Allow faculty members to capitalize on their professional strengths and be evaluated and rewarded relative to those strengths.

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 (teaching, research, and service) by the faculty member's formal FTE assignment on each. Table 2 contains the target FTE weights for teaching, research and service for each workload assignment track.

Table 2. Evaluation Weights by Workload Assignment

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

While it is expected that most faculty members' time will be allocated to academic activities 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 on the actual workload for that year. That is, it will be based on the actual number of courses taught, the actual research assignment, etc. Therefore, overall evaluations will be determined by weighting performance on each of the components (teaching, research and service) by the faculty member's formal FTE assignment on each. Workload tracks for non-tenured earning positions are presented in Appendix B.

Workload Assignment and Change Procedures

1. Every third year each faculty member will request a track assignment (number of courses within the track range) that will last for a period of three years. This request must be made in writing by May 1st of the year preceding the spring semester in which the new workload assignment is to begin. There is no default track. If a faculty member does not request a track assignment, State policy on workload assignments will be followed by assigning the faculty member to an 8-course track. Requests for an assignment should be made by submitting the *Faculty Workload Assignment Application*. Faculty will be notified of the approved workload assignment within 45 days of the application's receipt by the Chair and Dean.
2. After a comprehensive review of the application, the Chair, in consultation with the Dean, will make the final decision on the track assignment. The Chair will notify the faculty member of the assignment prior to making the final written assignment. If a faculty member is assigned to a track other than the track for which application was made, upon receiving that faculty member's written request, the chair will have a conference with the faculty member regarding the approved assignment.

3. The department chair, in consultation with the faculty member, will decide on the distribution of courses between the fall and spring semesters. For example, a faculty member assigned to the “F” track (3 courses per year) could teach a 1-2 load, a 2-1 load, a 0-3 load or a 3-0 load. In making this allocation the chair will balance the faculty member’s research and teaching goals with department teaching needs and objectives.
4. A faculty member may request reassignment to a different workload track during the course of a three-year assignment period. This request can be made by submitting a new *Faculty Workload Assignment Application* to the Chair by May 1st of the year proceeding the spring semester in which the proposed new workload assignment would begin. The process for reviewing and responding to the application will be the same as the process described in item 2 above. Any change in workload assignment that is initiated by the Chair will be based on demonstrated performance and department needs and objectives. The Dean must approve all changes in workload assignments.
5. Upon written request, faculty may appeal workload assignments to the Dean.

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. The overall evaluation rating and the rating for each of the three areas of professional activity will be based on the scale in Table 3 below:

Table 3. Evaluation Scale

<u>Evaluation Label</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mid-Point of Range</u>
Outstanding Plus	3.67 – 4.00	3.835
Outstanding	3.34 – 3.66	3.50
Outstanding Minus	3.01 – 3.33	3.17
Above Satisfactory Plus	2.67 – 3.00	2.835
Above Satisfactory	2.34 – 2.66	2.50
Above Satisfactory Minus	2.01 – 2.33	2.17
Satisfactory Plus	1.67 – 2.00	1.835
Satisfactory	1.34 – 1.66	1.50
Satisfactory Minus	1.01 – 1.33	1.17
Conditional	0.01 – 1.00	0.50
Unsatisfactory	0.00 – 0.00	0.00

The weighted average of the points earned across teaching, research, and service activities will be used to determine an overall performance 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. For example, the overall evaluation rating for a faculty member in Track D who is S + in teaching, AS in research, and O + in service might be calculated as follows: .50 (1.835) + .40 (2.50) + .10 (4.00), which equals 2.32. This number equates to an overall evaluation rating of Above Satisfactory Minus.

To encourage faculty members to fulfill their professional obligations in all three dimensions of academic activities, the following qualification will apply to the determination of a faculty member's overall evaluation rating: if a faculty member receives a rating of unsatisfactory or conditional in one or more of the teaching, research, or service categories, then that faculty member's overall evaluation score may be reduced by up to one full point. For example, assume that a faculty member receives scores in teaching, research and service that produce an overall rating of 3.17. This score would yield an initial overall evaluation of Outstanding Minus. However, if this faculty member's evaluation on the service dimension is unsatisfactory, the faculty member's overall evaluation could be reduced to 2.17, which equates to a rating of Above Satisfactory Minus. The MIS Department Chair must consult with the tenured faculty in the MIS Department prior to reducing a faculty member's overall rating.

Other assigned 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.

When calculating raises, the overall performance evaluation using the plus/minus system above will be truncated to one of five outcomes (outstanding, above satisfactory, satisfactory, conditional, unsatisfactory). For example, an O- becomes "outstanding," an S+ becomes "satisfactory," etc. Point values will be assigned as follows: outstanding, 4; above satisfactory, 3; satisfactory, 2; conditional, 1; and unsatisfactory, 0. In the event that two or more faculty members have the same performance ratings on teaching, research and service, but the computations are such that the faculty members are not in the same category for computing raises, then the Department Chair may increase the overall evaluations of those with lower overall performance scores.

Modifications to the Faculty Performance Assessment Plan

The Department of Management Information Systems Faculty Performance Assessment Plan must be dynamic. The plan may require periodic changes as a result of changes in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, faculty governance, and changes in Department and College missions and goals. With this in mind, the plan will be reviewed at least every three years by an ad hoc faculty committee. To be consistent with AACSB standards, continuous improvement will occur regularly. Hence, a committee of departmental faculty may re-evaluate portions of the plan annually. Suggested revisions to the Faculty Performance Assessment Plan will be developed in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

PART II – EVALUATION OF TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE

Annual Evaluation Implementation Policy Comparative Analysis of Faculty

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). Performance ratings standards are determined by the range or relative performance of unit faculty on each performance dimension. Individual performance ratings are reviewed by the chair/director relative to other unit faculty to ensure fair and equitable treatment. Once the chair/director has completed the evaluations for faculty in their Department/School a review 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 4. The teaching evaluation will be based only on teaching activities during the current evaluation year. The Chair may choose to request input from a faculty advisory committee regarding faculty teaching evaluations, but the ultimate performance evaluation is the sole responsibility of the Chair. Expectations of classroom teaching effectiveness will be the same for all faculty members, irrespective of their assigned workload tracks. While 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 in Table 4 below. In the fall 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.

The guidelines and procedures outlined in the College of Business Teaching Effectiveness Document should be used in preparing the faculty teaching portfolios.

Table 4. Factors in Evaluating Teaching Performance

-
- 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 analysis
- 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, excellent 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 a large number 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. However productivity in the current year will be weighted more heavily than prior years. 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 except as noted below in general guidelines one and two. Research accomplishments will be rated using the scale shown in Table 5. The Chair may choose to request input from a faculty advisory committee regarding faculty research evaluations, but the ultimate performance evaluation is the sole responsibility of the Chair.

The Chair 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 University 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 Department. The Faculty of the Department shall maintain a list of journals in our field with the journals ranked by the tenured faculty of the Department based on the journal's perceived contribution to the field of MIS, Management Science, and Production & Operations Management. While the number of divisions in the ranking scheme and the assignment of journals to a division are subject to change the current divisions are Premier, Category A+, Category A, and Category B. Assignment of journals to either the Premier or A+ category shall be supported by recent published surveys of MIS faculty regarding the impact, importance etc., of the journal. Appendix A provides an indication of relative quality of Management Information Systems journals. Table 5 lists factors that may be considered in the evaluation of research. Some general guidelines for the evaluation of research includes:

1. A faculty member will normally receive an evaluation of O- or higher in research if they have published at least one research paper in a premier journal during the current year's evaluation period.
2. Faculty members on track A or B will normally receive an evaluation of S- or higher in research if they have published or presented at least one peer reviewed paper during the most recent three year period.
3. The Chair may adjust evaluations for research based on the factors listed in Table 5.
4. The Chair may rate any faculty member at less than Satisfactory if they fail to maintain academic qualification as defined by either AASSB or SACS.

Table 5. Factors in Evaluating Research Performance

-
- 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 of \$30,000 or more
 - 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 RIA, 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 on an annual basis by the Chair and rated using the scale in Table 6. 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 assigned workload 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 associated with an option different from the one selected. For example, all faculty members could be expected to participate to some degree in general service activities, but expectations are higher for tenured faculty. The College of Business Teaching Effectiveness document lists the type of service activities typically associated with the teaching function. The service activities

generally associated with the research function are listed above in the discussion of the research evaluation. Other general service activities are listed in Table 6.

Table 6. Factors in Evaluating Service Performance

-
- 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 advisor 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 the 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 association 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.

Relationship between Annual Evaluations and Tenure/Promotion

The results of a faculty member's annual evaluations in the College of Business Administration represent 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. Newly-hired assistant professors with no credit towards tenure will have their research in the first two years evaluated for the purpose of performance assessment on the basis of identifiable research activities (e.g., publications, journal submissions, revise and resubmits, etc.) at the University of Central Florida. New hires who receive credit towards tenure may include their publications during the period for which they were given credit.

Appraisal of Progress towards Promotion and Tenure

Untenured faculty members in the Department of Management Information Systems will be independently reviewed each year by the Department Promotion & Tenure committee and the Department Chair. Each untenured faculty member will submit for review a comprehensive dossier of research publications and work in process, in addition to his/her annual performance report. Promotion and tenure appraisals are based on cumulative performance, including the current year. The criteria for the evaluation are described in the Department's promotion and tenure policy.

Implementation

This revised version of the Faculty Performance Assessment Plan is effective for the 2006 evaluation year, i.e. for evaluations performed in Spring 2007.

Appendix A

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS

JOURNAL CLASSIFICATION LIST

Fall 2005

Category Premier

- 1 Communications of the ACM (**Research articles only**)
- 2 Decision Sciences
- 3 Information System Research
- 4 Journal of Management Information System
- 5 *Journal of Operations Management*
- 6 Management Science
- 7 MIS Quarterly

Category A+

- 1 Decision Support Systems
- 2 European Journal of Information Systems
- 3 IEEE Transactions (family of journals)
- 4 IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering
- 4 Information and Management
- 5 *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*
- 6 International Journal of Electronic Commerce
- 7 International Journal of Human Computer Studies
- 8 Journal of the AIS
- 9 *Operations Research*
- 10 *Production and Inventory Management Journal*
- 11 Data Base

Category A

- 1 ACM Transactions (the family of journals)
- 2 Communications Research
- 3 *European Journal of Operational Research*
- 4 Information Resource Management Journal
- 5 Information Systems Frontiers
- 6 Information Systems Journal
- 7 *International Journal of Applied Quality Management*
- 8 *International Journal of Operations and Quantitative Management*
- 9 *International Journal of Quality and Productivity*
- 10 *International Journal of Quality Science*
- 11 Internet Research
- 12 Journal of Database Management
- 13 Journal of End User Computing
- 14 *Journal of Manufacturing and Operations Management*
- 15 *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*
- 16 Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce

- 17 *Journal of Purchasing and Materials Management*
- 18 Journal of Strategic Information Systems
- 19 Journal of Systems and Software
- 20 *Journal of the Operational Research Society*
- 21 *Naval Research Logistics*
- 22 *OMEGA – International Journal of Management Science*
- 23 *Quality Management Journal*

Category B

- 1 *Benchmarking for Quality Management and Technology*
- 2 Communications of the ACM (Other than Research articles)
- 3 Communications of the AIS
- 4 Computers in Human Behavior
- 5 eServices Journal
- 6 IBM Journal of Research
- 7 IBM Systems Journal
- 8 *Industrial Engineering*
- 9 Information Systems
- 10 INFORMS Journal of Information Systems
- 11 *International Journal of Logistics Management*
- 12 *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management*
- 13 International Journal of Project Management
- 14 *International Journal of Purchasing and Materials Management*
- 15 *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*
- 16 Journal of AI Research
- 17 Journal of Computer Information Systems
- 18 Journal of Computer Science and Information Systems
- 19 Journal of Global Information Management
- 20 Journal of Global Information Systems
- 21 *Journal of Industrial Engineering*
- 22 Journal of Information Technology
- 23 Journal of Information Technology Management
- 24 *Journal of Intelligent Control and Systems*
- 25 Journal of Intelligent Information Systems
- 26 *Manufacturing Review*
- 27 *Production and Operations Management Journal*
- 28 Telecommunication Systems
- 29 *Transportation Journal*

Appendix B

Management Information Systems Department 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.