

ANNUAL EVALUATION STANDARDS & PROCEDURES*

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

*Approved – Faculty Excellence – April 2017
Available for first use academic year 2017-18*

*Approved by tenured faculty in the Department of Economics on February 22, 2017. Intended for first use during the 2017-2018 evaluation period.

Introduction

The Department of Economics Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP) is a work assignment and evaluation system designed for the performance appraisal of the faculty in support of the mission of the Department of Economics. The AESP applies to all full-time tenured, tenure-earning, and non-tenure appointments.

The objectives of the AESP are to:

- Provide a range of workload assignments that allows each faculty member to be assigned to the track that best matches his or her teaching and research preferences, professional goals, and performance, to the mission of the Department.
- Allow faculty to capitalize on their professional strengths and be evaluated and rewarded relative to those strengths.
- Promote high quality research and teaching by faculty.
- Facilitate the evaluation of the faculty's performance of assigned duties.
- Comply with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

The AESP will require periodic changes as a result of changes in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and changes in the Department and College missions and objectives.

Faculty members are responsible for documenting their teaching, research, and service activities and contributions, as well as their achievements in the three areas. The burden of proof lies with the faculty member in making the case for a rating above "Satisfactory," whereas it lies with the Chair for a rating below "Satisfactory."

PART I: WORKLOAD TRACKS

Evaluation Weights by Assignment Track

Each year the Chair assesses faculty performance based on teaching, research, and service activities, as well as other duties. Overall evaluations are determined by weighting performance on teaching, research, and service by a faculty member's assignment of effort on each component. Table 1 contains the weights for the teaching, research, and service components of each track.

Table 1: Evaluation Weights by Workload Assignment

Professional Activity	Track A 8 3-hr Courses	Track B 7 3-hr Courses	Track C 6 3-hr Courses	Track D 5 3-hr Courses	Track E 4 3-hr Courses	Track F 3 3-hr Courses
Teaching	90%	80%	60%	50%	40%	30%
Research	0%	10%	30%	40%	50%	60%
Service	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%

Time is normally allocated in the proportions given in Table 1. The annual performance evaluation is based on the actual workload for the year. That is, it is based on the actual course equivalents, the actual research assignment, and the like. Course equivalents are determined by College policy and the Chair, in consultation with the Dean. The overall evaluation is determined by weighting performance on each of the components by the evaluation weights.

Track Assignment Procedures

The Chair, in consultation with the Dean, makes the final decision on assignment of each faculty member to a track. The track assignment is based on the faculty member's recent performance in teaching, research, and service, and the Department's teaching and research objectives. The Chair must notify the faculty member of the assignment prior to making the final written assignment. Upon receiving a faculty member's written request, the Chair must have a meeting with the faculty member regarding the assigned track.

The Chair, in consultation with the faculty member, decides on the distribution of courses between the Fall and Spring semesters. For example, a faculty member assigned to "Track F" could teach a 1-2 load, a 2-1 load, a 0-3 load, or a 3-0 load. In making the allocation, the Chair balances the faculty member's research and teaching goals and preferences with Department teaching needs and objectives.

Objective Setting Meeting

Every faculty member must meet annually with the Chair prior to, or at the beginning of, the evaluation period to discuss the member's planned objectives for the period. The agreed upon objectives in each area are recorded on the Faculty Member Annual Planned Objectives form, found on the last page of the document. In setting objectives, the Chair and the faculty member should discuss and agree on a small set of meaningful and tangible ways in which the faculty member can improve his or her teaching, research, and service performance.

If agreement is not reached in any area of assignment, the faculty member may either (i) appeal to the Dean to establish planned objectives, or (ii) proceed with their planned objectives and be evaluated in each area of assignment based on the standards given in this document.

Faculty members may request a meeting with the Chair during the evaluation period to discuss changes to the agreed upon planned objectives. If there is agreement on the new planned objectives, a new Faculty Member Annual Planned Objectives form must be completed.

Upon written request to the Chair, a faculty member in the Department may review the completed Faculty Member Annual Planned Objectives form of other faculty members in the Department for the current and previous years. Annual evaluations remain confidential.

Assessment of Overall Performance

Outstanding is assigned if the faculty member shows evidence of meeting the standards for a Satisfactory rating in an area of assignment and of achieving the agreed objectives in that area.

Above Satisfactory is assigned if the faculty member shows evidence of meeting the standards for a Satisfactory rating in an area of assignment and of making substantive progress on the agreed objectives in that area.

Satisfactory is assigned if the faculty member shows evidence of meeting the standards for a Satisfactory rating in an area of assignment, but does not document achieving, or making substantive progress toward, the agreed objectives in that area.

Conditional is assigned if the faculty member does not meet the minimum standards for a Satisfactory rating in an area of assignment, and was not rated Conditional or Unsatisfactory in that area for either of the previous two evaluation periods.

Unsatisfactory is assigned if the faculty member does not meet the minimum standards for a Satisfactory rating in an area of assignment, and was rated either Conditional or Unsatisfactory in that area during either of the previous two evaluation periods.

Consistent with University policy and deadlines, each year an annual report must be submitted to the Chair for evaluation. The overall evaluation rating and the rating in each activity is based on the scale in Table 2. The overall rating is calculated using a weighted average of the points earned across all areas of assignment for each track as described in Table 1, unless the faculty member receives a rating of “Unsatisfactory” in one or more areas. For example, the overall rating for a faculty member in Track D who is satisfactory in teaching, above satisfactory in research and outstanding in service, is calculated as follows: $.50 (2.00) + .40 (3.00) + .10 (4.00) = 2.60$. Table 2 shows that this value results in an overall evaluation of “Above Satisfactory.” A faculty member who receives a rating of “Unsatisfactory” in one or more activities will receive an overall evaluation of “Unsatisfactory” for the evaluation period.

Table 2: Evaluation Scale

Evaluation Label	Point Value	Rating Range
Outstanding	4.0	3.50 – 4.00
Above Satisfactory	3.0	2.50 – 3.49
Satisfactory	2.0	1.50 – 2.49
Conditional	1.0	0.50 – 1.49
Unsatisfactory	0.0	0.00 – 0.49

PART II: EVALUATION OF TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE

Evaluation of Teaching Performance

The Chair evaluates the teaching component and rates performance using the evaluation scale shown in Table 2. The teaching evaluation is based on all assigned teaching activities during the current evaluation period, normally one year. In distinguishing between teaching performance that is “Unsatisfactory” or “Conditional,” the Chair may consider teaching performance in the current evaluation period and the prior two evaluation periods. A three-year evaluation period is used for publication of textbooks, and a two-year window for publication of significant course supplements, such as study guides, instructor’s manuals, and test banks.

While recognizing that effective teaching has many aspects, the evaluation of teaching will be based primarily along four broad dimensions:

- The academic content of, and the pedagogy used in, the courses.
- Student, peer, and self-documented measures of teaching effectiveness.
- Documented evidence of student learning.
- Documented evidence of satisfying the minimum standards for a Satisfactory rating in teaching listed below.

Minimum Standards for a Satisfactory Rating in Teaching

- University, College, and Department guidelines for syllabi construction are followed, including clear statements of course objectives, and evaluation and grading standards.
- Classes are held according to the University schedule.

- Course content is based on current research and practice, and course materials reflect this.
- Teaching and learning methods, technological tools, and course materials are appropriate to each course and are used to facilitate communication and learning.
- The final exam, or an appropriate final project or exercise, is held according to the University calendar and policy unless an exemption is approved by the Chair.
- The course contains appropriate methods of measuring student performance.
- Except for lecture-capture courses, exams are written and graded by the instructor.
- Graded assignments require students to think independently and critically.
- Except for lecture-capture courses, graded assignments require students to communicate economic ideas in oral or written form, such as essay exams, papers, or oral presentations.
- Performance measurement is aligned with course objectives
- Quality and timely feedback is provided to students about their performance.
- The grade distribution in each course indicates discrimination by student performance.
- Office hours are posted, are adequate in number, and are held when scheduled.
- The instructor responds to student emails in a timely and professional fashion, and advises students when called upon to do so.
- Ratings on the Student Perception of Instruction reports in the category “Overall effectiveness of course instruction” are at least 50% in the “Good,” “Very Good,” and “Excellent” categories in each course taught.

Exemplary Teaching Standards

The following exemplary teaching standards apply only if the faculty member and Chair did not agree upon objectives for the evaluation period. In that event, if a faculty member meets the minimum standards for a rating of “Satisfactory,” then the Chair will consider the following teaching activities to determine if the faculty member warrants a rating of “Above Satisfactory” or “Outstanding.” As the ensuing list is not exhaustive, faculty members may document activities not included, and those activities may be considered in the evaluation. Note too that the activities are not necessarily weighted equally. The Chair considers the types of activities, the outcomes achieved, and the amount of effort expended in determining a rating.

- Course design and delivery exhibit extraordinary innovation and creativity.
- Four or more course preparations are successfully taught during an academic year.
- Successful development and teaching of a new course preparation.
- Successful implementation of a major course revision.
- Active mentoring of tenure-earning faculty in teaching.
- Active mentoring or advisement of the Economics Club, other student organizations, or groups.
- Other teaching related activities assigned by the Chair are successfully carried out.
- Supervised Honors-in-the-Major theses, independent studies, or other independent student work with distinction.
- Seminars on teaching are successfully conducted.
- Grants for teaching or learning improvement are received.
- TIP, University, College, or other teaching awards are received.

Rating Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching:

For faculty who reached agreement with the Chair on the objectives for the evaluation period, ratings are assigned as described in Part I under “Assessment of Overall Performance.”

Table 3 provides the standards for evaluating teaching in cases where the faculty member and Chair did not agree upon objectives for the evaluation period. “Consistently meets basic teaching

standards” means that documentation has been provided showing that all of the minimum standards for a “Satisfactory” rating in teaching have been met in all of the courses. In the event of minor departures from the standards, justification for the departures, and evidence that no material harm resulted, are required.

Table 3. Teaching Evaluation by Track Assignment

Rating	All Workload Tracks
Outstanding	Consistently meets basic teaching standards plus at least 8 exemplary teaching standards
Above Satisfactory	Consistently meets basic teaching standards plus at least 4 exemplary teaching standards
Satisfactory	Consistently meets basic teaching standards
Conditional	Fails to meet basic teaching standards, but did not fail in the previous two evaluation periods
Unsatisfactory	Fails to achieve standard for “Conditional”

Evaluation of Research Performance

The research component is evaluated based on intellectual contributions over the most recent three-year period. Tenure-earning faculty who received their doctoral degrees within the past two years have their research performance evaluated during the first two years at UCF based on research activities during those years. Tenure-earning faculty who have held the doctoral degree for more than two years, and all tenured faculty, have their research evaluated over the most recent three-year period, even if one or more of those years were spent at other institutions.

Research accomplishments are evaluated using the scale shown in Table 2. The Chair considers the full range of research productivity and the contribution of this productivity to each faculty member’s research program and to the mission of the Department in said evaluation. Consistent with standards of Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, the Chair considers learning and pedagogical research, contributions to practice, and discipline-based scholarship in evaluating intellectual contributions.

In determining the relative importance of different indicators of intellectual contributions, the Chair gives the highest importance to the following:

- The quantity and quality of publications in peer-reviewed journals and academic outlets.
- Research contracts, grants, and reports.
- Research monographs, scholarly books and chapters in scholarly books.
- Textbooks.
- Published book reviews.
- Presentations at academic or professional meetings, and papers published in proceedings of meetings.
- Faculty research seminars.
- Published course supplements, instructor’s manuals, workbooks, or test banks.
- Maintenance of academic currency for AACSB and SACS accreditation.
- Internal and external awards recognizing published research.

Peer-Reviewed Journals

Faculty members are expected to publish in leading general journals, leading field journals, or in other peer-reviewed journals in economics. Examples of leading general journals include *American Economic Review*, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, and *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. Examples of leading field journals include *Games and Economic Behavior*, *Journal of Development Economics*, *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, *Journal of Health Economics*, *Journal of Public Economics*, *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, and *Review of Economic Dynamics*.

Faculty might publish in related disciplines owing to the broad analytical applicability of economics. In such cases, documentation should be provided to assist the Chair in evaluating the quality of the journals. Normally, leading general or field journals in other disciplines are viewed as roughly comparable to leading general or field journals in economics.

Research Contracts and Grants

Research grants and contracts are evaluated according to the dollar amount of credit for the faculty member, the consistency of the research topic with the faculty member's research program, the funding agency, and the competitiveness of the grant program. For example, a competitively awarded grant from a federal agency to conduct discipline-based scholarship is more highly valued than a non-competitive award from a local agency to contribute to practice.

Research Monographs, Books and Book Chapters

Research contributions in books will be evaluated according to the originality, rigor, length, and the reputation of the publisher.

Evaluation of Research of Tenured and Tenure-Earning Faculty

For faculty who reached agreement with the Chair on the objectives for the evaluation period, ratings are assigned as described in Part I under "Assessment of Overall Performance."

For faculty who did not reach agreement with the Chair on objectives for the evaluation period, ratings are assigned as described in Table 4 below. In this case, the row of Table 4 labeled "Satisfactory" provides the minimum standards for a Satisfactory rating in research for tenured and tenure-earning faculty. When applying the standards, the Chair has discretion to evaluate the quality, impact, and equivalency of various research contributions. Given the specificity of Table 4, examples of different rating outcomes are not provided.

Table 4. Research Evaluation for Tenured and Tenure-Earning Faculty by Workload Assignment

Rating	Workload Track		
	A-B	C-D	E-F
Outstanding	Five intellectual contributions in the past 3 years including at least 1 in a peer-reviewed journal.	Five intellectual contributions in the past 3 years including at least 4 discipline-based publications and at least 1 in a leading general or field journal.	Six intellectual contributions in the past 3 years including at least 4 in peer-reviewed journals and at least 2 in leading general or field journals.

Above Satisfactory	Four intellectual contributions in the past 3 years including at least 1 in a peer-reviewed journal	Five intellectual contributions in the past 3 years including at least 3 discipline-based publications and at least 2 in peer-reviewed journals	Five intellectual contributions in the past 3 years including at least 3 in peer-reviewed journals and at least 1 in a leading general or field journal
Satisfactory	Three intellectual contributions in the past 3 years with at least 1 in a peer-reviewed journal	Three intellectual contributions in the past 3 years with at least 2 in peer-reviewed journals	Four intellectual contributions in the past 3 years with at least 3 in peer-reviewed journals
Conditional	Failure to meet the standard for “Satisfactory” for the current evaluation period, but not for either of the two previous periods	Failure to meet the standard for “Satisfactory” for the current evaluation period, but not for either of the two previous periods	Failure to meet the standard for “Satisfactory” for the current evaluation period, but not for either of the two previous periods
Unsatisfactory	Failure to meet the standards for “Satisfactory” for the current evaluation period, and for either of the two previous periods	Failure to meet the standards for “Satisfactory” for the current evaluation period, and for either of the two previous periods	Failure to meet the standards for “Satisfactory” for the current evaluation period, and for either of the two previous periods

Evaluation of Service Performance

Service is defined as any professional activity related to the faculty member’s expertise performed (gratis) for the Department, College, University, or academic profession, or for the public, community, or business, that supports the operations and advancement of that entity.

The Chair evaluates the department, college, university, and professional service efforts and achievements of the faculty member for the evaluation period and rates it using the scale in Table 2. The amount and type of service expected of a faculty member varies by rank and experience. Faculty members of advanced rank and/or academic experience are expected to take leadership roles in appropriate areas of service. The evaluation of service is not a simple counting of the number or variety of activities. Rather, it considers the effort expended and outcomes achieved.

The Chair considers the full range of service contributions in evaluating service performance, including, but not limited to:

- *Departmental, College, or University-level service:* committee activities and leadership positions, student advising, guest lectureships, and Faculty Senate appointments, but *not* United Faculty of Florida service.
- *Professional service:* editorial activities, manuscript review, and professional association activities such as committee service or executive council membership.
- *Public and Community service:* expert activities and committee membership at the local, state, or federal levels that draw on expertise in economics, but *not* consulting for which more than nominal payment is received.

The evaluation of service is based, in part, on documented evidence of a faculty member satisfying the minimum standards for a Satisfactory rating in service listed below.

Minimum Standards for a Satisfactory Rating in Service

- Regular attendance of Department and College meetings.
- Active participation in Department, College, or University committees.
- Active participation in one professional meeting, or invitation to a university, think tank, or the like.
- Review of (i) manuscripts for one professional meeting, (ii) a textbook or study guide, or (iii) for professional journals.

Exemplary Service Standards

The following exemplary service standards apply only if the faculty member and Chair did not agree upon objectives for the evaluation period. In that event, if a faculty member meets the minimum standards for a Satisfactory rating in service, then the Chair considers the following service activities to determine if the faculty member warrants a rating of “Above Satisfactory” or “Outstanding.” As the list is not exhaustive, faculty members may document activities not included, and they may be considered in the evaluation.

- Review manuscripts for top-tier journals.
- Service as an Associate Editor, or editorial review board member, of a professional journal.
- Service as an Editor of a professional journal without a course release.
- Active participation in at least two professional meetings.
- Organize and Chair a paper session at a professional meeting, or invitation to at least two universities, think tanks, or the like.
- Active participation as a member of a professional society.
- Active member of Department, College, or University committees that have a heavy workload.
- Chair of Department, College, or University committees that have a heavy workload.

Rating Guidelines for Evaluation of Service

For faculty who reached agreement with the Chair on the objectives for the evaluation period, ratings are assigned as described in Part I under “Assessment of Overall Performance.”

Table 5 provides the standards for evaluating service in cases where the faculty member and Chair did not agree upon objectives for the evaluation period. “Consistently meets basic service standards” means that documentation has been provided showing that all of the minimum standards for a Satisfactory rating in service have been met.

Table 5. Service Evaluation by Track Assignment

Rating	All Workload Tracks
Outstanding	Consistently meets basic service standards plus at least 6 exemplary service standards
Above Satisfactory	Consistently meets basic service standards plus at least 3 exemplary service standards
Satisfactory	Consistently meets basic service standards
Conditional	Fails to meet basic service standards, but did not fail in the previous two evaluation periods
Unsatisfactory	Fails to achieve standard for “Conditional”

Evaluation of Performance for Other Activities

Other duties are occasionally assigned during the course of the evaluation period for activities that are not included in a faculty member’s agreed upon objectives. Examples might include administrative duties that stem from requests by the Dean’s office, special projects, and other ad hoc assignments. As the nature of the assignments is highly variable, no attempt is made to specify the

dimensions of their evaluation or how the assignment is weighted.

Relationship Between Annual Evaluation and Tenure and Promotion

A faculty member's annual evaluation in the College is just one of numerous components that are examined in the University tenure and promotion process. Consistent with University policy and time deadlines, tenure-earning faculty members in the Department are independently reviewed each year, beginning in the second year, by a Department committee comprised of all tenured faculty. A separate review is conducted by the Chair and the Dean. Each tenure-earning faculty member must submit a comprehensive dossier of accomplishments and work in progress in the areas of teaching, research, and service. These reviews are separate from the annual evaluation. Annual evaluations focus on performance in the recent past, whereas promotion and tenure evaluations may consider cumulative contributions and potential for future contributions. 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 and promotion decision.

**Department of Economics
Faculty Member Annual Planned Objectives**

Faculty Member: _____ Date: ____/____/____

Evaluation Period: _____

Teaching and Student Engagement

Planned Objectives:

Research

Planned Objectives:

University and Professional Service

Planned Objectives:

Faculty Member

Department Chair