

# FACULTY PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PLAN

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

Initially Approved by Economics Department Faculty  
On February 26, 1999

First Revisions Approved by Faculty on April 11, 2003

Final Version accepted by CEC on 8/7/03

Second Revisions Approved by the Committee September 19, 2005

Second Revisions Approved by Faculty September 22, 2005

Third Revisions Approved by Procedures and Standards Committee October 5, 2006  
and by the Faculty October 6, 2006

# FACULTY PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PLAN

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

## Introduction

The Department of Economics Faculty Performance Assessment Plan (FPAP) is a work assignment and evaluation system designed for faculty performance appraisal and merit distribution *within* the Department of Economics. It applies to all tenured, tenure-earning, and non-tenure appointments. The Plan has six work assignment tracks listed in Table 1. Course equivalents will be determined by College of Business Administration policy and the Chair in consultation with the Dean.

**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 chair, to assess the choice of the track that best matches their teaching and research capabilities, professional goals, and interests to the mission of the Department.
- Allow faculty members to capitalize on their professional strengths and be evaluated and rewarded relative to those strengths.
- Promote high quality research and teaching by Economics 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 teaching, research, and service by the faculty member's FTE assignment on each component. Table 2 contains the weights for teaching, research and service components for each FPAP 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 – 90%	80%	60%	50%	40%	30%
Research	0 – 5%	10%	30%	40%	50%	60%
Service	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%

Faculty member's time will be allocated in the proportions given in Table 2 and will depend on their workload assignment. 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 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 FTE assignments on each.

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

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 1 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* that is provided in Appendix A of this document. Chair and Professorship holders will be evaluated in accordance with the College policy. The Chair will notify the faculty member of the assignment prior to making the final written assignment. Upon written request, faculty may appeal workload assignments to the Dean.

A faculty member may request a reassignment to a different workload track during the course of a three-year assignment period. The Chair can initiate a change in workload assignment based on demonstrated performance. The Dean must approve all changes in workload assignments.

The Department Chair, 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 chair will balance the faculty member’s research and teaching goals with the overall departmental teaching needs and objectives.

Assessment of Overall Performance

Consistent with University policy and time deadlines, at the beginning of each year faculty members will submit an annual report to the Chair for review and evaluation. The overall evaluation rating and the rating of each of the three areas of professional activities (teaching, research, and service) will be based on the scale given in Table 3. For purpose of calculating the overall evaluation score (using the weighted average of the points earned across teaching, research, and service activities), the mid-point of the range will be used.

**Table 3  
Evaluation Scale**

<b><u>Evaluation Label</u></b>	<b><u>Range</u></b>	<b><u>Mid-Point of Range</u></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

To encourage all faculty to fulfill their professional obligations in all three dimensions of professional activities, the following qualification will apply to the determination of a faculty member's overall evaluating rating: if a faculty member receives a rating of unsatisfactory or conditional in either the teaching, research, or service categories, that faculty member's overall evaluation score will be reduced by one full point. For example, assume that a faculty member receives scores in teaching, research and service that produce an overall rating of 4.17. This score would yield an initial overall evaluation of Outstanding-. However, if this faculty member’s evaluation in the service dimension is unsatisfactory, the faculty member’s overall evaluation would be reduced from Outstanding- to Above Satisfactory-.

Per UCF regulations, 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,” a S + becomes “satisfactory,” etc.

### 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, with individual performance ratings assigned 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 secondary screening and evaluation process will occur at the College level.

### Modifications of the Faculty Performance Assessment Plan

The Department of Economics Faculty 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 Department and College missions and objectives.

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

### Evaluation of Teaching Performance

The Chair will evaluate the teaching component of each faculty member's assignment and rate this performance using the evaluation scale shown in Table 3. As part of the annual report, faculty will submit a teaching portfolio for review and evaluation. The Chair's evaluation of teaching performance will be based on many factors including course syllabi, exams and other student assessment materials, student perception responses and other criteria listed below. Faculty members are encouraged to document as thoroughly as possible these assessment factors in order to fully describe their classroom effectiveness. The Chair will also consider information from peer evaluations of teaching, in addition to other sources of information.

The teaching evaluation will be based only on teaching activities in the current evaluation year. Expectations of classroom teaching effectiveness will be the same for all faculty, irrespective of their assigned workload track. While the evaluation of the teaching component of a faculty member's workload will be based primarily on the quality of the teaching materials developed and presented in the classroom, faculty members will be expected to perform teaching related activities such as:

- development of new courses,

- development of innovative teaching methods,
- participation in the development, administration, and evaluation of course learning outcomes, and
- work as a member of thesis/dissertation committees and supervision of independent studies.

### 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 rated using the scale shown in Table 3. The Chair may choose to get input from a faculty advisory committee regarding the faculty's 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 of the Department. This assessment includes:

- 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.

### Evaluation of Service Performance

The service component of each faculty member's assignment will be evaluated based on activities described in the annual report and rated by the Chair on 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. Individual ratings are associated with a record of consistent effort and quality contributions. Service activities include:

- participation on Department, College, and University committees,
- professional service in editorial duties and academic manuscript reviews,
- professional service in elected or appointed offices, and public service that extends professional or disciplinary contributions to the local, state, national, and international community.

### Evaluation of Performance for 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. 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.). New hires that receive credit towards tenure may include their publications during the period for which they were given credit.

### *Appraisal of Progress toward Promotion and Tenure*

Consistent with University policy and time deadlines, tenure-earning faculty members in the Department of Economics will be independently reviewed each year by a Department committee comprised of all tenured faculty. A separate review will be conducted by the Department Chair and the Dean. Each tenure-earning faculty member will submit for review a comprehensive dossier of research publications and work in progress, in addition to his/her annual performance report. Promotion and tenure appraisals are based on cumulative performance, including the current year. The Chair may consider appraisal outcomes when assessing annual performance.

### *Implementation*

The revised version of the Faculty Performance Assessment Plan is effective January 1, 2007.

**Appendix A**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS**  
**WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENT APPLICATION**

**Faculty Performance Assessment Plan**

**Date \_\_\_\_\_**

**Faculty Name \_\_\_\_\_ (PRINT)**

**Faculty Department or School \_\_\_\_\_**

**Current Workload Assignment \_\_\_\_\_ (No. of courses per academic year)**

**Proposed Workload Assignment \_\_\_\_\_ (No. of courses per academic year)**

**When Proposed Workload Assignment Would Begin \_\_\_\_\_ (Semester & year)**

**Summary Justification for Assignment (Use only the space below)**

**Required Attachments:**

**Current Vita**

**Summary of Research Activities**

## Summary of Research Activities

1. **Describe the research theme(s) that you will emphasize over the upcoming three years. Indicate why you believe this theme(s) is important.**
2. **Complete the following Faculty Research Summary for both current and proposed research.**
3. **Attach current vitae.**

---

*Faculty Signature*



The following decision has been reached regarding the proposed three-year workload assignment.

Faculty Name \_\_\_\_\_ (PRINT)

*Faculty Department or School* \_\_\_\_\_

**Approved as Proposed**

Workload Assignment \_\_\_\_\_ (No. of courses per academic year)

When Workload Assignment Will Begin \_\_\_\_\_  
(Semester & year)

**Approved as Modified Below**

Workload Assignment \_\_\_\_\_ (No. of courses per academic year)

When Workload Assignment Will Begin \_\_\_\_\_  
(Semester & year)

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Chair/Director Signature*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Dean Signature*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Date*

**Comments:**

**I acknowledge receiving my workload assignment**

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Faculty Signature*

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**