

FACULTY PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT PLAN

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

***Initially Adopted by Department of Marketing Faculty
On January 22, 1999***

First Revision Adopted Spring 2000

Second Revision Adopted May 26, 2004

Third Revision Adopted October 13, 2004; Approved by CEC December 16, 2004

***Fourth Revision Approved by Procedures Committee, August 30, 2005; Approved
by vote of Department tenured faculty, September 15, September 28***

***Amendments Approved by Procedures Committee and by vote of Department
tenured faculty, March 10, 2006***

***Addendum to FPAP Approved by vote of the Department of Marketing
tenured faculty, September 27, 2006***

**FACULTY PERFORMANCE
ASSESSMENT PLAN**
*Department of Marketing
College of Business Administration
University of Central Florida*

Introduction

The Department of Marketing 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.
- Increase the quality and quantity of basic research output by Department of Marketing 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, service, and possibly, other activities. Overall evaluations will be determined by weighting performance on each of the components (teaching, research, service, other) 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 for tenured/tenure-earning faculty members. See attached addendum that describes workload assignments for non tenure earning faculty members.

"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 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, service, other) by the faculty member's formal FTE assignment on each.

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 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. 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 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 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. Any change in workload assignment 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

Evaluation Label	Range	Mid-Point of Range
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, service, and possibly, other 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 teaching (or research or 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.

In recognition of the importance that professionalism plays in an academic environment in general, and the Department of Marketing, specifically, that dimension will also be evaluated by the Chair and can be factored into the faculty member's overall performance evaluation. In the Department of Marketing, the expectation is that faculty members will conduct themselves in a professional manner. Therefore, the Department Chair will have the discretion to decrease a faculty member's overall performance evaluation by up to one full point on the basis of a lack of professionalism.

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,” an S + becomes “satisfactory,” etc. Point values will be assigned as follows: outstanding, 4; above satisfactory, 3; satisfactory, 2; conditional, 1; unsatisfactory, 0.

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 to the Faculty Performance Assessment Plan

The Department of Marketing 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, changes in Department and College mission and goals, and accreditation standards.

*PART II – EVALUATION OF TEACHING,
RESEARCH, SERVICE, and OTHER*

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. 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 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.

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

Meeting classes as scheduled, and, unless prior arrangements are made with the chair, gives the final exam during the scheduled final exam period

Providing and following a syllabus that adheres to current university guidelines regarding syllabi and providing a copy of the syllabus to the department office for each class taught

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.

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 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.

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 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.

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 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 toward 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 who receive credit toward tenure may include their publications during the period for which they were given credit.

Appraisal of Progress toward Promotion and Tenure

Untenured faculty members in the Department of Marketing will be independently reviewed each year by a Department committee comprised of all tenured faculty, the Department Chair, and the Dean. 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 Chair may consider appraisal outcomes when assessing annual performance.

With respect to expectations, the Department places primary emphasis on publishing basic scholarship in top quality refereed journals in the marketing discipline. 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 contribution(s) to the advancement of knowledge in a (some) well-defined area(s) of the marketing discipline. 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 marketing 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 marketing.

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

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
DEPARTMENT OF MARKETING
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

Faculty Performance Assessment Plan Workload Assignment Procedures and Criteria

Criteria

1. Each faculty member's chair/director, in consultation with the Dean, will determine the appropriateness of the requested workload assignment. The determination will be based upon the relationship between the requested assignment and both the college's mission and goals and the needs and the professional development of the faculty member.
2. 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 courses taught, the actual research assignment, etc.

Procedures

1. There will no longer be a default option. Every third year, each faculty member will request a workload assignment (number of courses within the track range) that will last for a period of three years. If no assignment is requested, State policy on workload assignments will be followed by assigning the faculty member to an 8-course track.
2. Faculty requesting a workload assignment while employed at UCF must do so by May 1 of the year preceding the spring semester when the proposed workload assignment would begin. All workload assignment requests shall be made on the attached application form, which must be submitted to the faculty member's Chair/Director. Faculty will be notified of the approved workload assignment within 45 days of the application's receipt by the Chair/Director and Dean. The workload assignment of a person not yet employed by UCF must be determined prior to that person beginning such employment.
3. Each faculty member's chair/director will decide on the distribution of courses between the semesters. For example, a faculty on 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.
4. An approved workload assignment can be changed during its three-year term. Each faculty member wanting to change his/her workload assignment during its three-year term will submit the attached application form to his/her Chair/Director by May 1 of the year preceding the spring semester when the proposed changed workload assignment would begin. Any changes in assignment initiated by a Chair/Director will be based on demonstrated performance and department needs and objectives. The Dean must approve all changes in workload assignments.
5. Faculty may appeal workload assignment decisions to the Dean.

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

**UCFBusiness
Faculty Research Summary**

<i>Proposed Research: Project Title or Description</i>	<i>Target Publication</i>	<i>*Category</i>	<i>**Type</i>	<i>Proposed Submission Date</i>	<i>Co-author(s)</i>	<i>Funding Source</i>

Category:* A+, A, A-, B+, or B *Type:* B=Basic Scholarship, A=Applied Scholarship, I=Instructional Development

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

Appendix B

MARKETING JOURNAL CATEGORIES

A Plus Journals

Journal of Marketing Research
Journal of Marketing
Journal of Consumer Research
Marketing Science

A Journals

Journal of Retailing
Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science
Marketing Letters
International Journal of Research in Marketing

A Minus Journals

Journal of Consumer Psychology
Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management
Journal of Product Innovation Management
Journal of Advertising Research
Journal of Public Policy and Marketing

B Plus Journals

Journal of Advertising
Psychology & Marketing
Journal of International Marketing
Journal of Macromarketing
Industrial Marketing Management

B Journals

European Journal of Marketing
International Marketing Review
Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing
Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing
Journal of Consumer Affairs
Journal of Consumer Marketing
Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising
Journal of Direct Marketing
Journal of Global Marketing
Journal of Health Care Marketing
Journal of the Market Research Society (UK)
Journal of Marketing Education
Journal of Marketing Theory & Practice
Journal of Pricing Management
Journal of Services Marketing
Marketing Education Review

