

ANNUAL EVALUATION STANDARDS & PROCEDURES

*DEVOS SPORT BUSINESS MANAGEMENT
PROGRAM*

*COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA*

Approved by Procedures Committee: 9/30/05

Approved by Department: 10/05/05

Revised and Approved: 9/28/06

Revised and Approved: 11/12/07

Revised and Approved: 12/8/08

Revised and Approved: 02/11/09

Revised and Approved: 07/30/09

Revised and Approved: 11/15/10

Approved by Academic Affairs 12/21/10

Introduction

The Annual Evaluation Standards & Procedures for the DeVos Sport Business Management Program Faculty is a work assignment and evaluation system designed for faculty *within* the Sport Business Management Program. The Plan has six work assignment tracks. Each track has a different annual teaching assignment and a different set of research and service expectations. The tracks are listed in Table 1.

Objectives of the Plan:

- Provide a range of work assignments that permit faculty members, in consultation with their Program Director, 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.
- Increase the quality and quantity of basic research output by DeVos Sport Business Management Program faculty members.

PART I - WORKLOAD TRACKS

Evaluation Weights by Assignment Track

Each year, the Program Director 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 assignment of effort on each. Table 1 contains the target weights for teaching, research and service for each AESP option.

“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 target evaluation weights in the table below.

Table 1
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 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 year. That is, it will be based upon the actual number of course equivalents, 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 assignments of effort on each. For tenure earning faculty only, they will have a 4 course teaching load with the weight being 40% for teaching, 50% for research, and 10% for service.

The workload tracks for faculty with non-tenure appointments are outlined in Addendum 1.

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 by May 1 of the academic year preceding the Spring semester in which the new workload assignment is to begin. 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. Faculty will be notified of the approved workload assignment within 45 days of the application's receipt by the Program Director and Dean.

If the assignment is not approved, it would revert back to the previous workload assignment.

2. After a comprehensive review of the application, the Program Director, in consultation with the Dean, will make the final decision on the track assignment. The Program Director 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, and upon that faculty member's written request, the Program Director will have a conference with the faculty regarding the approved assignment.
3. The Program Director, in consultation with the faculty member, will decide on the distribution of courses between the semesters. For example, a faculty member who is 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 Program Director will balance the faculty member's research and teaching goals with the overall Program teaching needs and objectives.
4. A faculty member may request a 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 Program Director by May 1 of the year preceding 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. The Program Director will work to accommodate faculty members who have grants and therefore are unable to meet the May 1 change date. Any change in workload assignment that is initiated by the Program Director will be based on the failure to meet satisfactory performance. The Dean must approve all changes in workload assignments.
5. Upon written request, faculty may appeal workload assignments to the Dean.

Assessment of Overall Professional Performance

Each faculty member will be given an overall professional performance assessment based on the ratings earned in teaching, research, service activities and other assigned duties. The overall rating will be determined using the percentages assigned to each activity as outlined in Table 1. The overall evaluation rating and the rating for each of the three areas of professional activity will be based on the scale in the following table:

Table 2. Evaluation Scale

Evaluation	Point Values	Rating Scale Points
Outstanding	4	3.01--4.00
Above Satisfactory	3	2.01--3.00
Satisfactory	2	1.01--2.00
Conditional	1	0.50--1.00
Unsatisfactory	0	0.00—0.49

The weighted average of the points earned across teaching, research, and service activities will be used to determine an overall professional performance rating.

Per the tenets of the UCF Faculty Evaluation Regulation and the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the overall performance evaluation will use one of the five outcomes in Table 3 (outstanding, above satisfactory, satisfactory, conditional, unsatisfactory).

Annual Evaluation Implementation Policy

College of Business faculty will be evaluated using performance standards 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 standards 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, with individual performance ratings assigned relative to other unit faculty to ensure fair and equitable treatment. Evaluating faculty members in relation to a range of relative performance is a secondary step that will not override the specific, fixed standards later articulated. The Director cannot assign a rating lower than what the standards specify based on relative performance.

Modifications of the Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures

The DeVos Sport Business Management Program Performance Assessment Plan must be dynamic. The plan may require periodic changes as a result of changes in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and changes in the Program and College missions and objectives. With this in mind, the Plan will be reviewed at least every five years. To be consistent with AACSB standards, continuous improvement will occur. Hence, a committee of Program faculty may re-evaluate portions of the plan annually.

Proposed changes to the document will be considered by an evaluation standards and procedures committee in the department, submitted to the Dean’s Office where they will be reviewed and either sent back for further work or sent on the Faculty Relations, where they

are reviewed and after communication with the college and department, as needed, receive approval.

PART II – EVALUATION OF TEACHING RESEARCH AND SERVICE

Evaluation of Teaching Performance

The Program Director will evaluate the teaching component of each faculty member's assignment and rate this performance using the evaluation scale shown in Table 2. 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. 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 Program director's evaluation of teaching performance will be based on many factors, including those in Table 3 below. Early each year faculty members will submit a teaching portfolio to the Program director 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.

A basic core value of the DeVos Sport Business Management Program is instilling the value of community service in its students. Therefore, the Program Director may consider the use of students to provide service to sports organizations as part of the classroom experience as both a teaching and service experience.

Table 3 Factors in Evaluation Teaching Performance

Primary Performance Factors achieved during the evaluation period

A. Course syllabi:

- University/College/Department guidelines for syllabi construction are followed.
- Course objectives are clearly stated.
- Assessment/evaluation procedures are clearly stated.

B. Course content:

- Course content is based on current research and practice in the field.

C. Course structure and design:

- Teaching/learning methods, technological tools, and course materials appropriate to each course are used to facilitate communication and active learning.
- Demonstrate the infusion of practical applications into course materials and pedagogy.
- Course web site facilitates instructor/student communication.
- Final exam (or appropriate final project/exercise) is held per University calendar and policy unless exemption is granted by the Department Chair.

D. Assessment of student performance:

- Assessment/evaluation procedures are clearly stated in the syllabus.
- Course contains multiple, timely, and appropriate methods of measuring student performance.
- Course objectives and performance measurement are in alignment.
- Quality and timely feedback is provided to students about their performance.

E. Assessment of Learning Outcomes

- Learning outcomes are clearly stated on course syllabus.
- Instructor collects assessment data in a timely and appropriate manner according to schedule supplied by the Department Chair.
- Instructor participates and contributes to the Department's review and refinement of the assessment process and outcomes.

F. Student Evaluation of Instruction

- Student evaluations will average 50 percent or more at the "good" or above level and 85 percent or more at the "fair" or above level of the following:
 - Instructor provides performance feedback
 - Instructor interest in student learning
 - Instructor communication of ideas and information
 - Instructor communication of performance expectations in course
 - Instructor availability to assist students outside the classroom
 - Instructor respect and concern for students
 - Instructor stimulation of interest in the subject
 - Instructor facilitation of learning

G. Curriculum development

- Actively participates in department and/or Program curriculum review and development process when asked/elected to do.

H. Advising

- Advises students when called upon to do so.

I. Punctuality

- Classes meet when scheduled.
- Responds to student email messages in a timely fashion.

J. Office Hours

- Office hours are posted, are adequate in number, and are held when scheduled.

Secondary Performance Factors achieved during the evaluation period

1. Course content is judged as “leading edge” in nature
2. Course pedagogy is judged as “leading edge in nature
3. Student ratings of instruction are in top quartile or top half of department
4. Won teaching award (s) from external organizations, e.g., from North American Society of Sport Management or the North American Society for the Sociology of Sport.*
5. Won University level teaching excellence award*
6. Won College level teaching award *
7. Won TIP award*
8. Supervised one or more independent studies
9. Undertook a major course revision-must be documented in portfolio
10. Undertook one or more new course preparations (first time taught)
11. Supervised one or more Honors-in-Major thesis(es)
12. Taught multiple course preparations (GT 2) during a term
13. Delivered streamed video class(es)
14. Course GPA is indicative of the ability to discriminate among student performance levels
15. Class schedule demanded extraordinary travel; taught at multiple locations (GT 2)
16. Taught large numbers of students (Equal to or GT one standard deviation above department average SCHs (not including the core class(es)).
17. Involvement with mentoring/advising student organizations, groups, competitions, etc.
18. Textbook (or revision) published
19. Published refereed journal article on education issue
20. Published proceedings article on education issue
21. Chaired/participated on conference panel on teaching-related issues
22. Published course supplements, templates, workbooks, software for classroom use (can be associated with a textbook or sold alone)
23. Student comments are significantly laudatory about quality/timeliness of performance feedback
24. Exhibiting extraordinary innovation in course design/delivery
25. Use of higher-order learning activities in courses, e.g., essay exams, individual projects/cases, writing and/or speaking assignments, student projects with companies, assignments requiring computer skills beyond word processing
26. Develop and implement a guest speaker series for courses
27. Develop significant relationship/involvement with industry that benefits teaching
28. Winning internal and/or external grants related to teaching
29. Maintaining a high rate of student retention in assigned classes
30. Participating in PhD student training (seminars, committee work, mentor, etc.)
31. Conducting seminars (internal/external) and/or making presentations on teaching
32. Attend two or more teaching workshops or training modules
33. Perform other activities as assigned by the chair during the evaluation period

Notes: The above list is not considered exhaustive; faculty members may bring to the attention of the chair and thoroughly document activities not included in the above list; those may be counted towards the teaching performance evaluation.

Evaluation of teaching will utilize the guidelines listed below:

- a. An “Outstanding” evaluation will be assigned if the faculty member has consistently exceeded expectations in all dimensions (Section A-J under Primary Performance as well as the Secondary Performance Factors) of teaching performance.
- b. An “Above Satisfactory” evaluation will be assigned if the faculty member has exceeded expectations in one or more of the dimensions described above in addition to meeting the requirements for “Satisfactory.”
- c. A “Satisfactory” evaluation will be assigned to teaching performance if the faculty member has documented meeting University, College, and Department policies and procedures and professional expectations for course delivery in all of the dimensions described above during the period of evaluation. [Note: the only reference to four dimensions that I can find refers to Teaching, Research, Service, Other, which does not make sense here.]
- d. A “Conditional” evaluation is assigned if a faculty member fails to meet University policies and procedures and professional expectations for course delivery in at least one of the dimensions described above during the period of evaluation.
- e. An “Unsatisfactory” evaluation is assigned if a faculty member fails to meet University policies and procedures and professional expectations for course delivery in two or more of the dimensions described above during the current period of evaluation.

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 as described in the annual report. The research accomplishments will be evaluated using the scale shown in Table 2. The Chair may choose to get input from a faculty advisory committee regarding the faculty's research evaluation, 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 of the Department. Faculty members should fully document their research productivity. In determining the relative importance of different indicators of research productivity, the Chair will give the highest importance to the following indicators:

- the quantity and quality of publications in peer-reviewed journals and other academic outlets,
- research contracts and grants,
- presenting papers at national and international conferences,
- internal and external awards recognizing published research,
- maintaining academic currency for AACSB/SACS accreditation,

- and other contributions to the research productivity of the Department.

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, etc.).

Evaluation of research will utilize the guidelines listed below:

- An “Outstanding” evaluation will be assigned if the faculty member has excelled in several or all of the indicators used to evaluate research performance, in addition to the criteria for “Above Satisfactory.”
- An “Above Satisfactory” evaluation will be assigned if the faculty member meets the criteria for ‘satisfactory’ and has significant contributions to two or more of the indicators.
- A “Satisfactory” evaluation will indicate the faculty member has published in high quality peer-reviewed journals or other academic outlets appropriate to the workload assignment and has made some additional contributions.
- A “Conditional” evaluation is assigned if a faculty member fails to meet Department expectations for publications in high quality peer-reviewed journals or other academic outlets appropriate to the workload assignment.
- An “Unsatisfactory” evaluation is assigned if a faculty member fails to meet Department expectations for publications in high quality peer-reviewed journals or other academic outlets appropriate to the workload assignment, and also fails to make contributions in a majority of the other indicator areas.

Evaluation of Service Performance

As stated above, a basic core value of the DeVos Sport Business Management Program is instilling the value of community service and philanthropy in its students. Thus, the modeling of that behavior by DeVos faculty is critically important.

The service component of each faculty member's assignment will be evaluated on an annual basis by the Program Director and rated on the scale in Table 2. 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 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 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 evaluation. Other general service activities are listed below.

There is no differentiation based upon a faculty member’s designated workload assignment because Service Activities are equally weighted at 10% across all workload tracks.

In order to be ranked as SATISFACTORY or above, the following standards must be met:

- Active participation on committees, councils, or senate at the University, college and department levels, at the departmental or college levels.
- Participation in departmental and college meetings.
- Attend college and departmental functions (e.g. DeVos Program Advisory Board Meetings and/or The College Graduation Ceremony) at least once a year.
- In addition, faculty must complete 2 of the standards below to be rated.

SATISFACTORY [Note: the standards are not necessarily in rank order.]

In addition to meeting the required Service standards above, faculty must attain the following for these given levels:

OUTSTANDING

In addition, faculty must complete 4 of the 6 standards below to be rated OUTSTANDING in Service. [Note: the standards are not necessarily in rank order.]

ABOVE SATISFACTORY

In addition, faculty must complete 3 of the 6 standards below to be rated ABOVE SATISFACTORY in Service. [Note: the standards are not necessarily in rank order.]

Additional Service Standards within UCF, the College of Business Administration and the DeVos Program

- a. Service as program coordinator.
- b. Engage in practitioner-related service in schools, agencies, or appropriate settings.
- c. Provide service to scholarly and professional organizations, governmental boards, agencies, and commissions at the state, regional, or national level.
- d. Participate in leadership related to accreditation activities.
- e. Participate in the governance processes of UCF.
- f. Serve as member of department, college, or university committee/task force.
- g. Chair a committee or task force at the department, college and/or university levels.
- h. Provide leadership to a university and/or community activity that impacts students, faculty, staff, and/or clients.
- i. Provide presentation/s and/or service to public schools or other higher education agencies.
- j. Provide professionally-related talks or speeches to local, regional, or national/international groups or organizations.
- k. Assume leadership role in professional and/or community organizations impacting the profession.
- l. Assume leadership role in community organizations impacting life in the community.
- m. Participate on accreditation site visit teams or review boards.
- n. Participate in external reviews for faculty promotion and tenure.
- o. Participate in program development activities and/or accreditation preparation activities.
- p. Engage in assigned mentoring activities.

- q. Complete other service activities as agreed upon by faculty member and chair during goal setting meeting.

CONDITIONAL

To achieve a **CONDITIONAL** in the area of Service, faculty have failed to meet the standards necessary to achieve a rating of **SATISFACTORY**, and have not successfully completed the usual service assignments made by the Chair of the DeVos Program during the evaluation period, and have not responded to the needs of the university, the profession, and the community by engaging in service activities.

UNSATISFACTORY

To achieve an **UNSATISFACTORY** in the area of the Service faculty fail to meet the standards necessary to achieve a rating of **SATISFACTORY**. They do not attend or participate in the usual service assignments that are made by the Chair of the DeVos Program across two or more evaluation periods, and do not respond to the needs of the university, the profession, and the community by engaging in service activities. Faculty who fail to perform, or repeatedly demonstrate poor performance throughout the year will receive an evaluation of **UNSATISFACTORY** regardless of the previous year's rating.

Evaluation of Performance on Other Activities

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 dimensions 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 results 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. New hires that receive credit toward tenure may include their publications during the period for which they were given credit.

Appraisal of Progress toward Promotion and Tenure

Tenure earning faculty members in the DeVos Sport Business Management Program will be independently reviewed each year by a Program committee comprised of all tenured faculty, the Program Director and the Dean. Each tenure earning faculty member will submit for review a comprehensive dossier of research publications and work in process, in addition to his/her annual performance report. Cumulative Progress Evaluations are based on cumulative performance, including the current year. The Program Director may consider appraisal outcomes when assessing annual performance.

With respect to expectations, the DeVos Sport Business Management Program places primary emphasis on publishing basic scholarship in top quality refereed journals in sport business and sport socio-cultural disciplines. In addition to an emphasis on targeting and placing scholarship in top quality outlets, consistency in producing scholarship over the years leading to application for promotion and/or tenure as well as a strong programmatic focus to the scholarship are of prime importance.

A successful applicant for promotion and/or tenure must demonstrate competence in scholarship and have made significant contributions(s) to the advancement of knowledge in a (some) well-defined area(s) of sport business and sport socio-cultural disciplines. Moreover, there is an assessment of the likelihood that research performance after achieving promotion and/or tenure will continue at, or exceed, current levels of performance. A major indicator of this proclivity is establishing oneself as the primary/lead researcher in a well-defined program of research focused on a specific area in the Sports Business discipline. Evidence of the contribution takes the form of an accumulated number of publications in top-quality, peer-reviewed journals, as well as a significant amount of quality research-in-process. It is expected that some number of refereed journal placements will be in the best outlets in sport business and/or sport socio-cultural areas.

In general, consistent achievement of outstanding yearly evaluations in progress toward promotion and tenure would be highly correlated with success in gaining promotion and tenure.

Implementation

This revised version of the Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures is effective for the 2011 evaluation year, i.e., for evaluations performed in Spring 2012.

Addendum 1 to AESP

Work Load Tracks for Non-Tenure Positions

This addendum to the AESP 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 5 contains the target weights for teaching, research and service for the non-tenure track instructor and lecturer AESP 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 AESP.
3. Evaluation of teaching, research, service, and other activities will be made as outlined in Part II of the AESP.

APPENDIX A

Each faculty member's research evaluation is to be based on the criteria set forth in the Assessment of Research performance section of the DeVos Sport Business Management Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures. 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 DeVos Sport Business Management Program's primary research focus is on the publication of discipline-based scholarship that is consistent with the mission of the DeVos Sport Business Management Program 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 in sport business management and sport and social issues.
 - Premier—Specialist Journals. This category consists of academic peer-reviewed journals internationally recognized as being of very high quality. This category includes all sport business management and sport and social issues 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.

Journal Rankings

Premier

Academy of Management Journal
 Basic and Applied Social Psychology
 Information System Research
 International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing
 Journal of Brand Management
 Journal of Finance
 Journal of Financial Economics
 Journal of Intercollegiate Sport
 Journal of Management
 Journal of Management Information System
 Journal of Marketing
 Journal of Marketing Research
 Journal of Sport and Social Issues
 Journal of Sport Management
 Journal of Sport Sociology
 Sociology of Sport Journal
 Sport Marketing Quarterly

Tier IA

American Journal of Economics and Sociology
 European Journal of Sport Management
 International Journal of Research in Marketing
 International Journal of Sport Management
 International Journal of Sport Communication
 Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics
 Journal of Sport and Administration and Supervision
 Journal of Sports Economics
 Journal of Sport Business
 Journal of Sport Management and Education
 Sport Management Review

Tier I

American Sociology Review

American Bar Association Journal
Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport
Marquette Sports Law Review
Northwestern Journal of Law and Social Policy
American Educational Research Journal
European Sport Management Quarterly
International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship
Seton Hall Journal of Sport Law

Tier IIA

Athletic Economic Journal
Culture, Sport and Society
International Sport Journal
Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education
Journal of the Quantitative Analysis of Sports
Journal of the Philosophy of Sport
Journal of Sport History
Journal of Sport Literature
Journal of Sport Psychology
International Review for the Sociology of Sport
Psychology and Sociology of Sport
Research Quarterly
Sports Business Journal
Sport, Education and Society

Tier II

Entertainment and Sport Lawyer (ABA)
European Sports History Review
Group and Organizational Studies
Journal of Applied Psychology
Journal of Applied Sport Psychology
Journal of Higher Education Administration
Sports History Review
Villanova Sport and Entertainment Law Journal

Tier III

Academic Athletic Journal
Athletic Administration
Athletic Management
Coach and Athletic Director
Entertainment and Sports Law Forum (ABA)
International Journal of Physical Education
Journal of Sport Behavior

