UCF FE Approved: May 4, 2025
First Use in Academic Year: 2025-2026

ANNUAL EVALUATION STANDARDS & PROCEDURES

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

Approved by Department of Economics – February 14, 2025

Available for first use in academic year 2025–26

Introduction

The Department of Economics Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP) is a work assignment and evaluation system designed for the performance appraisal of 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 faculty to be placed in the track that best matches their teaching, research, and service 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 and reward high quality research, teaching, and service.
- Facilitate the evaluation of faculty.

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

PART I: WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENT TRACKS

Evaluation Weights by 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 in each area. Table 1 contains the weights for teaching, research, and service in 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 4 3-hr Courses	Track E 3 3-hr Courses
Teaching	90%	70%	60%	40%	30%
Research	0%	20%	30%	50%	60%
Service	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 Dean. The overall evaluation is determined by weighting performance in each area by the evaluation weights.
Reduced effort in teaching may also be granted to faculty with contractual research obligations (e.g., $1.5 million in funding over five years for associate professors and $3 million in funding over five years for full professors) that are specified at the time of hire.

All course reductions from the prior year require the approval of the Dean.

Track Assignment Procedures

Tenured faculty can request any track, but Track E is typically reserved for first-year assistant professors or faculty in endowed positions. Reduced effort in teaching may also be granted to faculty with contractual research obligations that are specified at the time of hire. The assigned track is based on a faculty member's recent performance in teaching, research, and service. The Chair must notify a faculty member of the assignment at least six weeks in advance of its starting date, if practicable. Faculty may request a meeting with the Chair to discuss the assigned track.

The Chair, in consultation with a faculty member, decides on the distribution of courses between the Fall and Spring semesters. A faculty member assigned to Track E 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 attempts to balance a faculty member's research and teaching objectives and preferences with Department teaching needs and objectives.

Beginning Fall 2026, associate professors who have been tenured at least five years and wish to continue in Track D for the subsequent year based on research expectations, must initiate a Cumulative Progress Evaluation (CPE) and achieve an overall rating of at or above expectations from the department faculty, Chair, and Dean. Such an endorsement means that the evaluators believe the faculty member is highly likely to achieve the rank of professor in the next three years. Faculty who fall short of this endorsement and have been an associate professor for 8 years or more will be immediately placed on six-course load. Faculty who receive this endorsement but have not applied for promotion by the end of their eighth year post-tenure will be immediately placed on a six-course load. Such faculty can petition for a return to Track D through a subsequent CPE after two years in Track C. All changes in track assignments must be approved by the Dean. Moreover, the stipulations of Article 17 (Leaves) of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement apply when considering years in rank.

Professors—aka Full Professors—who wish to continue in Track D or Track E based on research expectations must consistently earn an evaluation of Satisfactory or higher in research. A rating of Conditional in research does not immediately move Professors to Track C, but a rating of Unsatisfactory does. Professors can petition for a return to Track D after two years in Track C.

Similarly, Professors who wish to continue in Track C based on research expectations must consistently earn an evaluation of Satisfactory or higher in research. A rating of Conditional in research does not immediately move Professors to Track B or Track A, but a rating of Unsatisfactory does. Professors can petition for a return to Track C after two years in Track B or Track A.

Objective Setting Agreement

Faculty may meet annually with the Chair prior to, or at the beginning of, the evaluation period to discuss their planned objectives for teaching and service for the period. Alternatively, a faculty member and Chair may agree in writing about planned objectives without meeting. The agreed upon objectives in teaching and service are recorded on the Faculty Annual Planned Objectives form, found on the last page of the AESP. Standards with respect to research are pre-established as explained in Part II of the AESP. Faculty do not have to set objectives for teaching and service, in which case they are evaluated based on the standards stated in Part II of the AESP.

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

Faculty 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 Annual Planned Objectives form must be completed.

Assessment of Overall Performance

The standards for performance in research are as stated in Tables 4 and 5, regardless of whether a meeting is held or objectives are discussed. If objectives are not discussed or agreed on, then the standards for performance in teaching are as stated in Table 3, and the standards for performance in service are as stated in Table 6. If objectives are agreed on, then the standards for performance in teaching and service are determined as follows:

Outstanding is assigned if the faculty member shows evidence of meeting the standards for a Satisfactory rating in an area of assignment per Tables 3 and 6, 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 per Tables 3 and 6, 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 per Tables 3 and 6, 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 per Tables 3 and 6, 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 per Tables 3 and 6, and was rated either Conditional or Unsatisfactory in that area during either of the previous two evaluation periods.

Each year faculty must submit an annual report to the Chair that documents activities and accomplishments in each area for the relevant evaluation period. The burden of proof lies with the faculty in making the case for a rating above Satisfactory, whereas it lies with the Chair for a rating below Satisfactory. The overall evaluation rating and the rating in each area is based on Table 2. The overall rating is calculated using a weighted average of the points earned across all areas for each track as described in Table 1, unless the faculty member receives a rating of Conditional or 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: 0.4 (2.0) + 0.5 (3.0) + 0.1 (4.0) = 2.7. Table 2 shows that this value results in an overall evaluation of Above Satisfactory. A faculty member who receives a rating of Conditional or Unsatisfactory in one or more areas will receive an overall evaluation of Conditional or Unsatisfactory, respectively, for the evaluation period.

Table 2: Evaluation Scale

Rating	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 teaching evaluation is based on all assigned teaching activities during the current evaluation period, typically one year. A 36-month evaluation period is used for publication of textbooks and significant course supplements, such as study guides, instructor's manuals, and test banks, as determined by the date of acceptance—not by the date of publication. Faculty are required to supply evidence of the date of acceptance.

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.
- 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 REAL courses, exams are written and graded by the instructor.
- Graded assignments require students to think independently and critically.
- Except for REAL 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 face-to-face 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 the instructor" 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 if a faculty member did not set objectives. 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 a higher rating is warranted. As the ensuing list is not exhaustive, faculty 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 effort expended in determining a rating.

- Course design and delivery exhibit extraordinary innovation and creativity.
- Three 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 faculty with regard to teaching, including quality and timely feedback.
- Active mentoring or advisement of student organizations.
- Other teaching related activities assigned by the Chair are successfully carried out.
- Supervision of Honors Undergraduate Theses carried out with distinction.
- Supervision of Directed Independent Research courses or other independent student work carried out with distinction.
- Seminars on teaching are successfully conducted.
- Grants for teaching or learning improvement are received.
- College, University, or other meaningful teaching awards are received.
- Publication of textbooks and significant course supplements, such as study guides, instructor's manuals, and test banks.

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 when a faculty member and Chair did not agree on objectives or meet. 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 for All Workload Tracks

Rating	
Outstanding	Meets the minimum standards for Satisfactory plus the equivalent of at least 8 exemplary teaching standards as agreed to by the Chair.
Above Satisfactory	Meets the minimum standards for Satisfactory plus the equivalent of at least 4 exemplary teaching standards as agreed to by the Chair.
Satisfactory	Meets the minimum standards for Satisfactory plus the equivalent of 3 or fewer exemplary teaching standards as agreed to by the Chair.
Conditional	Fails to meet the minimum standards for Satisfactory but did not fail in either of the previous two evaluation periods.
Unsatisfactory	Fails to meet the minimum standards for Satisfactory and also failed in either of the previous two evaluation periods.

Evaluation of Research Performance

Research performance is evaluated based on intellectual contributions over the most recent 36-month period, as determined by the date of acceptance—not by the date of publication. Faculty are required to supply evidence of the date of acceptance. Tenure-earning faculty who received their doctoral degrees within the past two years will have their research performance pro-rated during each of the first two years at UCF. 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 36-month period, even if one or more of those years were spent at other institutions. 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:

- Publications in Tier 1 and Tier 2 journals.
- Research contracts, grants, and reports.
- Research monographs, scholarly books and chapters in scholarly books.
- Published book reviews.
- Maintenance of academic currency for AACSB accreditation.
- Internal and external awards recognizing published research.

Peer-Reviewed Journals

Faculty are expected to publish in leading general journals, leading field journals, or in other well-regarded peer-reviewed journals in economics. Journals are categorized as Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3, the definitions of which, and journals in them, are as follows.

Tier 1: Journals of very high impact and quality. Publication therein demonstrates (i) significant progress towards promotion and tenure for junior faculty, (ii) significant progress towards promotion to Professor for Associate Professors, and (iii) continued research excellence for Professors in endowed positions on reduced teaching loads.

American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics, International Economic Review, Journal of Economic Theory, Journal of the European Economic Association, RAND Journal of Economics, Review of Economics and Statistics

Tier 2: Journals of high impact and quality. Publication therein signals meaningful progress toward achieving a national reputation. Along with publications in Tier 1 journals, publication in Tier 2 journals are part of a strong portfolio that (i) will lead to promotion and tenure for junior faculty, (ii) will lead to promotion to Professor for Associate Professors, and (iii) is evidence of continued research excellence for Professors in endowed positions on reduced teaching loads.

European Economic Review, Games and Economic Behavior, International Journal of Industrial Organization, Journal of Applied Econometrics, Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, Journal of Health Economics, Journal of Human Resources, Journal of International Money and Finance, Journal of Public Economics, Journal of Risk and Uncertainty, Review of Economic Dynamics

Tier 3: Any other economics journal that demonstrates research activity, i.e., any peer reviewed journal in economics that is read and cited, with an impact factor of 0.5 or higher as measured by the most recent *Journal Impact Factor* from *Clarivate Analytics*.

If faculty publish in an economics journal that is not listed as either Tier 1 or Tier 2, and if they believe that the journal is the equivalent of a listed Tier 1 or Tier 2 journal, then they are required to provide evidence to the Chair of said equivalence using the current *Academic Journal Guide* published by the *Chartered Association of UK Business Schools*. As the *Academic Journal Guide* undergoes periodic updates, the journals listed above as Tier 1 and Tier 2 may require periodic updating too. Note that the Chair's and faculty member's opinion of a journal's equivalence tier

is neither necessary nor sufficient.

Cross-Disciplinary and Multi-disciplinary Work

Faculty might publish in related disciplines owing to the broad analytical applicability of economics. Accordingly, if faculty publish in a journal listed as Tier 1 by another department in the College, it is treated as a Tier 1 publication by the Department of Economics. The same holds true for Tier 2 and Tier 3 publications. If faculty publish in fields outside of business and economics, then they are required to provide evidence of the quality of the journal through documents such as the AESP from the UCF department where the journal is used in annual evaluations, and/or from a respected third party ranking of journals in the field. As noted above, the Chair's and faculty member's opinion of a journal's equivalence tier is neither necessary nor sufficient.

Research Contracts and Grants

Research grants and contracts are evaluated according 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.

Clinical Faculty Journal Set

Lecturers in Track B or Track C are encouraged to publish in peer-reviewed research journals, but it is recognized that their skills, interests, allocation of effort, and value to the College may be best expressed through publications in outlets meant to influence practice or the ways to best prepare students to compete in today's world. This can be done through publication in highly visible practitioner journals, articles in journals that focus on pedagogy, or publication of case studies that can be used to teach the next generation of business leaders. Similar to the above, outlets are categorized as Tier 1 and Tier 2.

A wide array of publication outlets exists for this kind of work. The two tiers presented below comprise the most recognizable and visible outlets for this kind of work and are not meant to capture the universe of reputable outlets that could be part of a successful portfolio of publications that merit evidence of excellence in research/professional development.

Tier 1: Those journals most influential in achieving excellence in research and/or professional development for clinical faculty because of their high visibility in practitioner circles, association with a professional organization, and/or their influence in the academic community.

Academy of Management Learning & Education, Academy of Management Perspectives Advances in Financial Education, Business Horizons, California Management Review, Economics of Education Review, Harvard Business Review, International Review of Economics Education, Issues in Accounting Education, Journal of Accounting Education, Journal of Applied Finance, Journal of Economic Education, Journal of Economic Perspectives, Journal of Financial Education Journal of Marketing Education, Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, Organizational Dynamics, Sloan Management Review, The R Journal, The Stata Journal.

Tier 2: The most influential and widely used publishers of business case studies, and journals

with less impact and reach than those in Tier 1.

Applied Economics Teaching Resources, Atlantic Economic Journal, Darden Business Publishing, Emerald Publishing, Harvard Business Publishing, INSEAD Case Publishing, IVEY Publishing. Journal for Economic Educators, Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research, Journal of Economics and Finance Education, Journal of Economics Teaching, Perspectives on Economic Education Research, The American Economist

Non-tenure-earning faculty who publish in other outlets targeted at practitioners or teachers in their disciplines must provide evidence of the impact of the outlets at the time of their evaluation, either through the most recent JCR citation impact factors or paid circulation data. Non-tenure-earning faculty will earn Tier 1 credit for any such unlisted publication that either has an impact factor above 1.5 or a paid circulation in excess of 50,000. Non-tenure-earning faculty will earn Tier 2 credit for any such publication that has an impact factor above 0.5 or a paid circulation in excess of 10,000.

Evaluation of Research

Ratings for tenured and tenure-earning faculty are assigned as described in Table 4, and ratings for non-tenure-earning faculty are assigned as described in Table 5.—The tables describe the *minimums* for each rating. When Table 4 states, for example, "1 in a Tier 1 academic journal," it means at least 1 paper has been accepted by the editor of a Tier 1 academic journal in the past 36 months. The 36month window starts from May 8th of the current year and works backwards 36 months.

When applying the standards, the Chair has discretion to consider the quality, impact, and equivalency of various research contributions. Moreover, the Chair may take into consideration the number of authors on a piece of research when determining a rating, in which case the impact of such should be documented in the annual evaluation.

In Table 4, an intellectual contribution is defined as either (i) a manuscript that is accepted for publication or under review at a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 journal, (ii) a book chapter that is accepted for publication or under review, (iii) a book that is accepted for publication or under review, (iv) a manuscript that appears in a well-known working paper series, say the NBER or IZA. Intellectual contributions in Table 5 include those defined for Table 4 as well as (i) a manuscript that is accepted for publication or under review at a Tier 1 or Tier 2 clinical journal, or (ii) a conference paper likely to lead to publication in a Tier 1 or Tier 2 clinical journal.

.

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

	Workload Track		
Rating	**B (7 Courses)**	**C (6 Courses)**	**D (4 Courses) and E* (3 Courses)**
Outstanding	Two intellectual contributions, with: (i) 1 in a Tier 2 academic journal and 1 in a Tier 3 academic journal; *or* (ii) 3 in a Tier 3 academic journal.	Three intellectual contributions, with: (i) 2 in a Tier 2 academic journal and 1 in a Tier 3 academic journal.	Four (D) or five* (E) intellectual contributions, with: (i) 1 in a Tier 1 academic journal and 1 in a Tier 2 academic journal; *or* (ii) 3 in a Tier 2 academic journal; *or* (iii) 2 in a Tier 2 academic journal and 2 in a Tier 3 academic journal.

Above Satisfactory	Two intellectual contributions, with: (i) 1 in a Tier 2 academic journal; *or* (ii) 2 in a Tier 3 academic journal.	Three intellectual contributions, with: (i) 1 in a Tier 2 academic journal and 1 in a Tier 3 academic journal.	Four (D) or five* (E) intellectual contributions, with: (i) 1 in a Tier 1 academic journal and 1 in a Tier 3 academic journal; *or* (ii) 2 in a Tier 2 academic journal; *or* (iii) 1 in a Tier 2 academic journal and 2 in a Tier 3 academic journal.
Satisfactory	Two intellectual contributions, with: (ii) 1 in a Tier 3 academic journal.	Three intellectual contributions, with: (i) 1 in a Tier 2 academic journal; *or* (ii) 2 in a Tier 3 academic journal. Maintain SA Masters AACSB designation	Four (D) or five* (E) intellectual contributions, with: (i) 1 in a Tier 1 academic journal; *or* (ii) 1 in a Tier 2 academic journal and 1 in a Tier 3 academic journal; *or* (iii) 3 in a Tier 3 academic journal. Maintain SA Doctoral AACSB designation
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.

***** For faculty on Track E, the additional intellectual contribution relative to Track D standards must be a paper accepted for publication or under review in a Tier 1 or Tier 2 academic journal.

Table 5. Research Evaluation for Non-Tenure-Earning Faculty by Workload Assignment*

	Workload Track	
Rating	**B (7 Courses)**	**C (6 Courses)**
Outstanding	Two intellectual contributions, with: (i) 1 in a Tier 1 clinical journal; *or* (ii) 2 in a Tier 2 clinical journal; or (iii) meet the standard for Outstanding for track B in Table 4.	Three intellectual contributions, with: (i) 1 in a Tier 1 clinical journal; *or* (ii) meet the standard for Outstanding for track C in Table 4.
Above Satisfactory	Two intellectual contributions, with: (i) 1 in a Tier 2 clinical journal; *or* (ii) 2 in a Tier 3 clinical journal; *or* (iii) meet the standard for Above Satisfactory for track B in Table 4.	Three intellectual contributions, with: (i) 1 in a Tier 2 clinical journal and 1 revise-and-resubmit at a Tier 2 clinical journal; *or* (ii) meet the standard for Above Satisfactory for track C in Table 4.
Satisfactory	Two intellectual contributions, with: (ii) 1 in a Tier 3 clinical journal; *or* (ii) meet the standard for Satisfactory for track B in Table 4.	Three intellectual contributions, with: (i) 1 in a Tier 2 clinical journal; *or* (ii) meet the standard for Satisfactory for track C in Table 4.
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.
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.

*Non-tenure-earning faculty with research assignments must also maintain "SA-Masters" qualifications

according to AACSB standards.

Note: Publication in predatory journals cannot be used as valid evidence of research or professional development activity. Predatory journals are unethical publications that exploit the need for researchers to publish their work by charging high fees without providing legitimate peer review, editorial standards, or proper indexing. These journals often prioritized profit over quality and academic integrity, misleading authors into believing their work is being published in a reputable outlet. Predatory journals typically lack transparency in their editorial process, have low academic standards, and may deceive readers by mimicking credible journals in appearance and name. When uncertain, faculty must exercise caution by verifying journals through trusted sources like Directory of Open Access Journals, Journal Citation Reports, or Beall's List of Predatory Journals.

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, academic profession, the public, community, or business, that supports the operations and advancement of that entity. The service evaluation is based on all service activities during the current evaluation period, typically one year.

The amount and type of service expected of faculty varies by rank and experience. Faculty 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. Note too that the activities are not necessarily weighted equally.
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 at Department and College meetings.
- Regular attendance at the Department Seminar Series for faculty with a research appointment.
- Regular attendance at ad hoc meetings called by the Dean, such as breakfasts and lunches.
- Active participation on Department, College, or University committees.
- Active participation at one professional meeting, conference, or workshop.
- Review of (i) manuscripts for one professional meeting, (ii) one book, or (iii) one manuscript for a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 journal.

Exemplary Service Standards

The following exemplary service standards apply if a faculty member did not set objectives. In that case, 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 higher rating. As the list is not exhaustive, faculty may document activities not included, and they may be considered in the evaluation.

- Review manuscripts for Tier 1 journals.
- Serve as an Associate Editor, or editorial review board member, of a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 journal.
- Serve as an Editor of a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 journal without a course release.
- Active participation in at least two professional meetings or conferences.
- Organize and/or Chair a noteworthy paper session at a professional meeting or conference.
- Organize, or assist in the organization of, a well-run conference.
- Receive invitations to present research at two or more professional meetings, conferences,

or universities.
- 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.
- Regularly meet with job candidates, seminar speakers, and visitors, and attend meals with them.
- Attend the Hall of Fame banquet.
- Attend and fully participate in at least one Active Learning Lab (ALL) for a REAL course.

Rating Guidelines for Evaluation of Service

For faculty who reached agreement with the Chair on objectives for the evaluation period, ratings are assigned as described in Part I under "Assessment of Overall Performance." Table 6 provides the standards for evaluating service in cases where the faculty member and Chair did not meet or agree upon objectives for the evaluation period.

Table 6. Service Evaluation for All Workload Tracks

Rating	
Outstanding	Meets the minimum standards for Satisfactory plus the equivalent of at least 6 exemplary service standards as agreed to by the Chair.
Above Satisfactory	Meets the minimum standards for Satisfactory plus the equivalent of at least 3 exemplary service standards as agreed to by the Chair.
Satisfactory	Meets the minimum standards for Satisfactory plus the equivalent of 2 or fewer exemplary service standards as agreed to by the Chair.
Conditional	Fails to meet the minimum standards for Satisfactory , but did not fail in either of the previous two evaluation periods
Unsatisfactory	Fails to meet the minimum standards for Satisfactory and also failed in either of the previous two evaluation periods.

Evaluation of Performance for Other Activities

Other duties are occasionally assigned during the course of the evaluation period. 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

An annual evaluation is one of many pieces of information examined in the University tenure and promotion process. Consistent with University policy and time deadlines, tenure-earning faculty are independently reviewed each year, beginning in the second year, by a Department committee comprised of all tenured faculty—this is known as a Cumulative Progress Evaluation (CPE). A separate review is conducted by the Chair and the Dean. The CPE is distinct from the annual evaluation. Annual evaluations focus on performance in the recent past, whereas CPEs consider cumulative contributions and potential for future contributions. Therefore, it should *not* be construed that achieving a satisfactory or higher rating in any or all annual evaluations will automatically result in a satisfactory or higher rating on a CPE or a positive tenure and promotion decision.

Department of Economics
Faculty Annual Planned Objectives

Faculty Name:_____Date:____/____/_____

Evaluation Period:_____

Teaching and Student Engagement

Planned Objectives:

University and Professional Service

Planned Objectives:

_____ _____
Faculty Member Department Chair

CBA Criteria for AACSB Academic Qualification

SCHOLARLY ACADEMIC (SA):
The SA classification is divided into three sub-categories:
SA-
Doctoral
SA-
Masters
SA-Undergraduate

Regardless of subcategory, an SA faculty member will generally have the following preparation:

1. A research doctoral degree or J.D. in the area in which the individual teaches, OR
2. A research doctoral degree in a related field. However, the fact that the degree in not in the primary discipline must be offset by relevant in-discipline academic publications.

Typically, the College of Business Administration will grant SA status to newly hired faculty members who earned their research doctorates (or JDs) within the last five years. To maintain SA status, faculty members must show a sustained record of scholarship by publishing in academic journals as noted below:

SA-Doctoral:	three academic publications during a rolling 5-year period. Normally, this requirement is met during the preceding five-year period by **three publications in high quality peer reviewed academic journals** related to their area of teaching responsibility.
SA-Masters:	two academic publications during a rolling 5-year period. Normally, this requirement is met during the preceding five-year period by **three publications intellectual contributions** with **at least two contributions in peer reviewed journals** related to their area of teaching responsibility.
SA-Undergraduate:	one academic publication during a rolling 5-year period. Normally, this requirement is met during the preceding five-year period by **three publications intellectual contributions** with **at least one contribution in peer reviewed journals** related to their area of teaching responsibility.

(NOTE: Generally, a JD will suffice for SA-Doctoral designation only for faculty teaching in the areas of business law or taxation.)

In addition, SA-Undergraduate status will be granted to doctoral students for up to three years after completion of their comprehensive exam or other significant degree milestone.

Finally, administrators shall be deemed to maintain their existing SA qualification for the duration of their tenure as an administrator, plus three years subsequently in order to have time to retool for active faculty status.

PRACTICE ACADEMIC (PA):

A PA faculty member will generally have the following preparation:

1. A research doctoral degree or J.D. in the area in which the individual teaches, OR

2. A research doctoral degree in a related field. However, the fact that the degree in not in the primary discipline must be offset by a history of relevant in-discipline academic publications and related activities.

Typically, the College of Business Administration will grant PA status to faculty members who develop and engage in activities that involve **substantive** links to practice, consulting and other forms of professional engagement (rather than scholarly activities). To maintain PA status, faculty members must show a sustained record of currency and relevance through their scholarship and related activities (examples noted below):

- Publish in practitioner-focused journals and trade publications.
- Engage in significant--in excess of 80 hours annually--related work experience (e.g., service as a consultant, an expert witness, a practicing professional, a corporate board member, a faculty fellow or intern).
- Develop and teach executive education programs in the field—minimum 30 contact hours over a 3-year period.
- Create a business or own and operate a business related to the field of teaching.

For faculty who hold professional designations (e.g., CPA, CFA, members of the bar):

- Provide evidence of having maintained those designations and completed all continuing education requirements.

Administrators shall be deemed to maintain their PA qualification for the duration of their tenure as an administrator, plus one year subsequently in order to have time to retool for active faculty status.

SCHOLARLY PRACTITIONER (SP):

An SP faculty member will typically hold a Master's degree in an area related to the courses they teach. SPs are required to maintain currency and relevance through continued professional experience and/or engagement related to their professional background.

Typically, the College of Business Administration will grant SP status to faculty members who enhance their background by engaging in activities involving substantive scholarly activities in their fields of teaching. To maintain SP status, faculty members must show a sustained record of currency and relevance through their scholarship and related activities (examples noted below):

- Publish an article in a refereed journal.
- Publish a scholarly book.
- Present scholarly work at a national or major regional academic conference
- Serve as a member of a refereed journal's editorial review board.
- Serve as an editor of a refereed journal.

INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTITIONER (IP):

An IP faculty member holds at least a Master's degree in an area related to the course taught.

IP faculty who have 10 years or more of exceptional experience, demonstrated by professional experience in the corporate world, are qualified to teach in Professional or Executive Master degree programs. IPs are required to sustain currency and relevance through continued professional experience and/or engagement related to their professional background. Typically, IP status is designated for newly hired faculty members with significant professional experience as outlined below. To maintain IP status, faculty members must show a sustained record of currency and relevance through their scholarship and related activities (examples noted below):

- Engage in significant--in excess of 80 hours annually--related work experience (e.g., service as a consultant, an expert witness, a practicing professional, a corporate board member, a faculty fellow or intern).
- Develop and teach executive education programs in the field—minimum 30 contact hours over a 3-year period.
- Create a business or own and operate a business related to the field of teaching.
- Publish a case study or technical report in the discipline.

For faculty who hold professional designations (e.g., CPA, CFA, members of the bar):

- Provide evidence of having maintained those designations and completed all continuing education requirements.

SCHOLARLY PRACTITIONER (SP):
An SP faculty member will typically hold a Master's degree in an area related to the courses they teach. SPs are required to maintain currency and relevance through continued professional experience and/or engagement related to their professional background.

Typically, the College of Business Administration will grant SP status to faculty members who enhance their background by engaging in activities involving substantive scholarly activities in their fields of teaching. To maintain SP status, faculty members must show a sustained record of currency and relevance through their scholarship and related activities (examples noted below):

- Publish an article in a refereed journal.
- Publish a scholarly book.
- Present scholarly work at a national or major regional academic conference
- Serve as a member of a refereed journal's editorial review board.
- Serve as an editor of a refereed journal.

INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTITIONER (IP):
An IP faculty member holds at least a Master's degree in an area related to the course taught. IP faculty who have 10 years or more of exceptional experience, demonstrated by professional experience in the corporate world, are qualified to teach in Professional or Executive Master degree programs. IPs are required to sustain currency and relevance through continued professional experience and/or engagement related to their professional background. Typically, IP status is designated for newly hired faculty members with significant professional experience as outlined below. To maintain IP status, faculty members must show a sustained record of currency and relevance through their scholarship and related activities (examples noted below):

- Engage in significant--in excess of 80 hours annually--related work experience (e.g., service as a consultant, an expert witness, a practicing professional, a corporate board member, a faculty fellow or intern).
- Develop and teach executive education programs in the field—minimum 30 contact hours over a 3-year period.
- Create a business or own and operate a business related to the field of teaching.

- Publish a case study or technical report in the discipline.

For faculty who hold professional designations (e.g., CPA, CFA, members of the bar):

- Provide evidence of having maintained those designations and completed all continuing education requirements.