

Annual Evaluation Standards And Procedures

**Department of Finance and
Dr. P. Phillips School of Real Estate
College of Business Administration
University of Central Florida**

Available for first use academic year 2025-2026

This version revised by the Department's full professors on 9/6/2024.
Approved by Department faculty members on
Submitted to AA with request to implement 2/20/25

1. Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures: Overview

This document, entitled Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (hereafter referred to as AESP), provides the framework by which annual performance evaluations will be conducted for full-time faculty members in the Department of Finance and Dr. P. Phillips School of Real Estate (hereafter jointly referred to as the Department).

The plan has multiple tracks differentiated by faculty classification, course load, and assignment of effort to teaching, research, professional development, and service activities. The objectives of the AESP are to:

- Provide a range of work assignments that will place faculty members in consultation with the Department chair, on the track that best matches their teaching and research performance, professional goals, and interests, and also with goals outlined in the strategic plan of the College.
- Promote high-quality research, teaching, service, and professional development by the Department faculty members.
- Beginning Fall 2026, associate professors who have been tenured for at least five years and wish to continue on a four-course load based on research expectations must initiate a Cumulative Performance Evaluation (CPE) during their sixth-year post-tenure and achieve an overall rating of at expectations or better from the department faculty, department chair, and dean to maintain this teaching load for the subsequent year. Such an endorsement means that the evaluators believe the candidate is highly likely to achieve the rank of Full 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 a four-course load through a subsequent CPE after two years in the higher teaching load track. These teaching loads do not include the impact of any course releases provided for administrative assignments or unusually time-consuming service assignments.

1(a) Evaluation Weights by Assignment Track

Each year, the Department chair will assess each faculty member's professional performance based on teaching, service, and research activities, as well as any other assigned duties.

Faculty members will be evaluated based on one of the four assignment tracks presented in Table 1 below. Each track provides the number of courses (three credit hour or equivalent) that the faculty member will be assigned during their nine-month contract.

Doctorly-qualified, non-tenure earning lecturers may request either Track A or B. Tenure-earning faculty members typically will be assigned to Track D in Table 1. Tenured faculty members will have the opportunity to request any one of the five tracks. However, the assignment will be made by the Department chair in consultation with the dean.

Table 1: Evaluation Weights for Qualified Faculty Members

Professional Activity	Track A	Track B	Track C	Track D	Track E
# of courses	8 courses	7 courses	6 courses	4 courses	3 courses
Teaching	80%	70%	60%	40%	30%
Research	10%*	20%	30%	50%	60%
Service	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%

* Faculty in the Track A classification will have no research assignment, and instead will be provided an evaluation for professional development in lieu of a research evaluation. These faculty members will have teaching, service and professional development assignment.

Although expectations are that most faculty members' time will be allocated in the proportions given above, it is recognized that circumstances may arise which warrant variations in the percentages under each option. The Department chair has the flexibility to make minor adjustments to the weights listed in Tables 1, with the faculty member's consent, when special circumstances warrant making the change. For example, atypical circumstances (such as a special service commitment which is valuable to the Department but is unusually time-consuming) may warrant a temporary course release for a faculty member. Or a professionally qualified instructor who is heavily involved in valuable service activities may warrant a 20% service assignment, rather than the typical 10%.

Reduced effort in teaching may also be granted to faculty with contractual research obligations that are specified at the time of hire. Significant research funding expectations are \$1.5 million in funding over five years for associate professors and \$3 million in funding over five years for full professors. All course reductions from the prior year require the approval of the Dean.

1(b) Evaluation of Other University Duties

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 weights for other university duties in

Table 1. In those cases where other duties are a significant part of evaluating a faculty member's performance, the faculty member, in consultation with the chair, will determine alternate weights and include them on the faculty member's assignment form for all categories at the beginning of each academic year.

1(c) Relationship between Annual Evaluation and Tenure/Promotion

The result of a faculty member's annual evaluation in the College of Business Administration is just one of numerous components that are examined in the university tenure and/or promotion process. Therefore, it should NOT be construed that achieving a satisfactory or higher rating in any or all annual evaluations will automatically result in a positive tenure or promotion decision.

1(d) Modifications of the AESP

The AESP document may require periodic changes and will be revised in accordance with the current BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and changes in the Department and college missions and objectives.

1(e) Data to be Included in the Faculty Annual Report

In general, evaluation periods begin May 8th and continue through May 7th of the following year. Teaching and service contributions are to be reported for the most recent academic year, which will comprise the previous Summer, Fall, and Spring terms. Instructor professional development activities will also be reported for the most recent academic year. Research contributions are to be reported for the most recent 36 months. Faculty get evaluated in May, and the preceding 36-months will be included in evaluating the research contributions.

1(f) Due Date for Faculty Annual Report

Each year, annual reports shall be due to the Department Chair on the date specified by the most recent collective bargaining agreement. The Chair may, at the written request from an employee, provide an extension of up to twenty-one days to submit the annual report.

1(g) Track Assignment and Change Procedures

- Track assignments and changes in track assignments will be made in accordance with the CBA. The assignment procedure is summarized in Appendix B.
- Faculty members may appeal changes in track assignments in accordance with the CBA.

2. Evaluation Process and Standards

2(a) Overview

At the end of the evaluation period, the Department chair shall evaluate each faculty member's performance. The evaluation shall follow the standards and procedures described in the AESP, the current UCF-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), and the annual Assignment of Effort provided to the faculty member at the beginning of the year, or as modified during the year. Annual Assignments of Effort may vary depending upon whether the faculty member is in a tenure track or non-tenure track position classification. Additional effort variation will occur based upon the track assignment (number of courses) for the faculty member, as described below.

Each year, by or prior to the established deadline, every faculty member shall submit an annual report that documents the faculty member's activities and accomplishments in each area of assignment for the relevant time window (prior year for teaching, service, and professional development; prior 36 months for research publications). It is the responsibility of the faculty member to thoroughly document activities and accomplishments in the annual report. The faculty member must provide information regarding courses taught on an overload basis or under a supplemental summer agreement. The faculty member may, but is not required to, provide information regarding activities and accomplishments that occur when the faculty member is not under contract (e.g., during the summer semester when the faculty member does not have a supplemental summer agreement).

2(b) Goal Setting Meeting

Each faculty member in the Department will meet with the chair during the evaluation period to discuss the faculty member's intended teaching, service, and research or professional development activities for the period. During or following that meeting, the faculty member and the chair will agree on intended exemplary activities in each area of assignment. The exemplary activities are intended to be significant, substantive, and consequential endeavors, aligned with program and college goals.

Because the exemplary activities are to be significant and consequential, requiring substantial levels of time and effort, those exemplary activities can be relatively few in number. The level of the exemplary activities engaged in by a faculty member will be a function of the faculty member's track assignment, position classification, and rank in position. For example, a tenured professor on a three-course load would be expected to successfully complete higher-level service exemplars (e.g., university committees, promotion and tenure matters, faculty senate activities, etc.) than an instructor on an eight-course load. Similarly, that tenured professor would be expected to engage in teaching

exemplar options that extend beyond the domain of an instructor (e.g., doctoral student engagements).

The faculty member and the chair will come to agreement on specific exemplar activities as well as goals for those activities. These activities and goals will be recorded on the Faculty Annual Goals form (Appendix C), which shall be signed by the faculty member and the chair. If an agreement is not reached, the faculty member may appeal to the dean or dean's representative to establish goals or may proceed with intended activities and be evaluated based on the standards stated in each section of this document.

In general, the faculty member will need to meet the minimum standards for a satisfactory rating in each area of assignment. If a faculty member receives an evaluation of unsatisfactory (conditional) in any area of assignment, the faculty member's overall rating shall be unsatisfactory (conditional) for the evaluation period.

Achieving the agreed upon exemplary-level goals for activities in a specific area will result in an outstanding rating in that particular area. Making substantive progress towards the agreed upon exemplary-level goals for activities in an area will result in an above satisfactory rating in that specific area.

The faculty member can request a meeting with the chair during the evaluation period to discuss changes to the agreed upon goals. If there is agreement on new activities and/or goals, a new Faculty Annual Goals form will be completed and signed. Completed Faculty Annual Goals forms for the current year and previous years will be made publicly available.

2(c) Evaluation of Each Area of Assignment

Each of the remaining sections of this document relates to an area of assignment (teaching, research, service, and professional development). For each area of assignment, minimum standards for achieving an evaluation rating of satisfactory are described. In the research area, evaluations higher than satisfactory are achieved through additional publications beyond those required for a satisfactory rating and other exemplary research-oriented activities. In the teaching, service, and professional development areas, evaluations higher than satisfactory are achieved through exemplary activities defined for those corresponding assignment areas. In general, the evaluation ratings in each area of assignment are determined as follows (with the additional publication proviso for the research area):

Outstanding will be assigned if the faculty member meets the minimum standards for a rating of satisfactory in the area of assignment and either (a) there is evidence of success in substantially more of the listed additional exemplary activities, in quality, difficulty, variety or number of occurrences, than a majority of the faculty member's peers or (b) the faculty member has achieved the goals agreed to by the faculty member and chair at the beginning of the evaluation period for specific exemplary activities in that area of assignment.

Above Satisfactory will be assigned if the faculty member meets the minimum standards for a rating of satisfactory and either (a) there is substantive evidence of multiple listed additional exemplary activities or (b) the faculty member has made substantial progress towards the specific exemplary activities in that area of assignment agreed to by the faculty member and chair at the beginning of the evaluation period.

Satisfactory will be assigned if the faculty member meets the minimum standards for a rating of satisfactory and there is little or no evidence of any additional exemplary activities in the area.

Conditional will be assigned if the faculty member does not meet the minimum standards for a rating of satisfactory for the current evaluation period and was not assigned a conditional or unsatisfactory rating in the area for either of the previous two evaluation periods.

Unsatisfactory will be assigned if the faculty member does not meet the minimum standards for a rating of satisfactory for the current evaluation period and was assigned a conditional or unsatisfactory rating in the area for either of the previous two evaluation periods.

In addition, it will be the burden of the Department chair to document and present evidence whenever it is deemed that a faculty member should receive an evaluation rating that is below satisfactory in any area of assignment.

2(d) Overall Rating

In general, the overall annual evaluation rating shall be calculated as the weighted average evaluation over all areas of assignment, where the evaluation in each area is assigned a number as follows:

- Outstanding = 4
- Above Satisfactory = 3
- Satisfactory = 2
- Conditional = 1
- Unsatisfactory = 0

The weight for each area shall be the assignment of effort for the area, as indicated in Table 1. The numerical result shall be rounded to the nearest whole number and the overall rating of outstanding, above satisfactory, satisfactory, conditional, or unsatisfactory shall be assigned following the preceding numerical equivalences (e.g., 3.50 rounds to 4 which is

an evaluation of outstanding, whereas 3.49 rounds to 3 which is an evaluation of above satisfactory.)

In this annual overall rating determination, if a faculty member receives an evaluation of unsatisfactory in any area of assignment, the faculty member's overall rating shall be unsatisfactory for the evaluation period. Similarly, if a faculty member receives an evaluation of conditional in any area of assignment, the faculty member's overall rating shall be conditional for the evaluation period.

3. Evaluation of Teaching Performance

The Department chair will evaluate each faculty member's teaching activities and rate her/his performance using the evaluation scale described in section 2(c). The teaching evaluation will be based only on teaching activities performed during the current evaluation year.

A teaching activity is defined as any in which the faculty member individually mentors, instructs, debates, discusses, and/or advises a student or a group of students. Therefore, serving as the faculty advisor for a student organization is classified as a teaching activity. Making a presentation to a student group and serving as a member of a dissertation committee are teaching activities. However, attending a meet and greet event for a student organization is a service activity. Grading a Ph.D. comprehensive exam would also be considered a service activity since grading is done anonymously.

In their annual reports, faculty members will document their teaching activities that meet the minimum standards, as well as exemplary teaching activities, which are necessary to attain an evaluation of above satisfactory or outstanding. The minimum standards and a list of exemplars are included in this document.

A faculty member not meeting the minimum standards for a rating of satisfactory will be given a rating of conditional for the evaluation year. If the faculty member does not meet the minimum standards for satisfactory during the following year, the faculty member will be given an unsatisfactory teaching evaluation for that year.

3(a) Minimum Teaching Standards

1. Course syllabi:

- University/college/department guidelines for syllabi construction are followed.
- Course objectives are clearly stated.
- Evaluation procedures are clearly stated.

- Learning outcomes are clearly stated.
2. Course content:
 - Course content is based on current research and practice in the field. Course materials (text, handouts, cases, etc.) reflect this.
 3. Course structure and design:
 - Teaching and learning methods, technological tools, and course materials appropriate to each course are used to facilitate communication and active learning.
 - Practical applications are included in course materials and pedagogy.
 - Final exam (or appropriate final project or exercise) is held according to the university calendar and policy unless an exception is approved by the Department chair.
 4. Assessment of student performance:
 - Assessment/evaluation procedures are clearly stated in the syllabus.
 - Course contains multiple, timely, and appropriate methods of measuring student performance.
 - Course objectives and performance measurement are in alignment.
 - Quality and timely feedback is provided to students about their performance.
 - Course GPA allows discrimination among student performance levels.
 5. Assessment of Learning Outcomes
 - Instructor collects assessment data in a timely and appropriate manner according to a schedule supplied by the Department chair.
 - Instructor participates and contributes to the Department's review and refinement of the assessment process and outcomes.
 6. Student Perception of Instruction
 - Faculty members will achieve student rating in the category "Overall Effectiveness of the Instructor" on the Student Perception of Instruction reports of at least 50% in the "Good", "Very Good," and "Excellent" categories (accumulated across all courses taught).
 7. Curriculum development

- Actively participates in Department and/or program curriculum review and development process when asked or elected to participate.
- Actively participates in deliberation on curriculum revision indicated by assessment process results.

8. Interactions with Students

- Advises students when called upon to do so.
- Classes are held according to the university schedule.
- Relays information to students regarding college and university activities, such as internships, job fairs, workshops, guest speakers, training and professional development opportunities, etc.
- Office hours are posted, are adequate in number, and are held when scheduled.

3(b) Teaching Activity Exemplars

The minimum standards for a rating of satisfactory are described in section 3(a) above. If a faculty member meets these standards, the chair will consider the following teaching activities to determine if the faculty member warrants a rating of above satisfactory or outstanding. This is not an exhaustive list of activities, and they are not necessarily weighted equally. The chair will consider the types of activities, the outcomes achieved, and the amount of effort expended. It must be noted that the burden of proof for teaching with distinction rests with the faculty member.

1. Student SPI ratings place the faculty member in the top half of the Department.
2. Develop and teach a new course for the doctoral, graduate or the undergraduate program.
3. Receive a teaching award from external organization, or student organization.
4. Receive college/UCF teaching excellence award.
5. Receive college teaching award.
6. Receive UCF TIP award.
7. Supervise one or more independent studies.
8. Supervise an Honors-in-Major thesis.
9. Mentor or advise student organizations, groups, competitions, etc.
10. Serve on a Ph.D. student advisory committee.
11. Participate in Ph.D. student training (seminars, committee work, mentoring, etc.).

4. 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 described in section 2(c) of this document. Service is expected of all faculty members. Service activities typically comprise 10% of a faculty member's assignment, regardless of the assigned AESP track. A 10% assignment of effort for service equates to approximately 150 hours during the 9-month academic year. It must be noted that the burden of proof for satisfactory service or service with distinction rests with the faculty member.

The faculty member's primary goal in service should be advancing the interests and meeting the needs of both internal (department, college, the university) and external constituencies (professional and academic organizations related to the Department's focus, and the local business community).

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.

All service activities must be documented in the faculty member's annual report.

The evaluation of service is not a simple counting of the number or variety of activities; it seeks to measure both significant efforts expended, and substantive outcomes achieved. Activities that involve greater effort and time commitment will carry greater weight.

4(a) Fundamental Service Activities

As part of the 150-hour minimum service requirement, each faculty member should record and strive for substantive service effort. The following basic service activities are expected of each faculty member:

1. Active participation, especially by research active faculty (on a 2-2 or lower teaching schedule) in Departmental research seminars, in particular for internal presentations by Departmental colleagues and/or graduate students.
2. Attend several major events for the Department and/or the College of Business Administration during the year. These would include attending Joust competitions, the commencement exercise, Welcome to the Majors and Meet the Firms.
3. Active participation in department, college or university committee(s) or council, or on the faculty senate.

4. Active participation in Departmental and college faculty meetings or Department advisory board meetings.

4(b) Service Activity Exemplars

In addition to the substantive service effort that a faculty member will strive to provide, the chair will also consider the following service activities to determine if the faculty member warrants a service rating of above satisfactory or outstanding.

The following are examples of exemplary service activities that benefit the program, college, university, profession, and/or business community. Repetition of these activities, when possible, will provide additional justification for a higher rating. This is not an exhaustive list of activities, and they are not necessarily weighted equally. Faculty members may bring to the attention of the chair and document activities not included in this list that may be counted towards the service performance evaluation. The chair will consider the effort expended, the substance and depth of the activity, and the outcomes achieved.

In some circumstances, one or more of the additional service activities may be allowed to substitute for some of the minimum requirements. For example, this might be the case if a faculty member's teaching schedule conflicts with faculty meetings.

- Present a paper at a research seminar hosted by the Department or by other universities in conjunction with UCF.
- Serve as a program coordinator in the Department.
- Serve on a Department or college faculty recruiting committee and/or conference interviewing committee.
- Serve on department, college, or university committees/task forces beyond the basic expectation listed above. Multiple committee assignments count as multiple service activities.
- Chair department, college, or university committees/task forces beyond the basic expectation listed above.
- Provide professional service to scholarly and professional organizations, governmental boards, agencies, and commissions, at the state, regional, or national level.
- Receive a college, university, or national Excellence in Service Award.
- Serve in a leadership position related to a UCF activity or initiative.
- Deliver profession-related talks or speeches to university, local, regional, or national/international groups or organizations.

- Serve in a leadership role in professional and/or community organizations impacting the discipline/profession.
- Serve as an external reviewer at another university.
- Serve as a reviewer for a peer reviewed journal.
- Serve as an officer in an organization relevant to the discipline, e.g., AFA, FMA, etc.

4(c) Professional Development Activities (Tracks A)

The chair will consider the effort expended, the substance and depth of the activities performed to maintain professional qualification, and the outcome achieved. The following list of activities related to professional development is not exhaustive. These activities are not necessarily weighted equally.

- Involvement in continuing education, either in a degree program or non-degree program.
- Achieving or maintaining formal professional certification.
- Publishing an article in academic or practitioner focused outlet(s).
- Presentation at an academic or professional conference.
- Consequential board membership.
- Teaching in executive education program.
- Editing and/or reviewing articles or books for possible publication.
- Reviewing textbooks.
- Industry internship.
- Publishing case studies.
- Serving as an expert witness.

4(d) Reporting Service Participation

It is the faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate that a reported service activity represents a valuable contribution and a significant time commitment. When listing service activities in the annual report, a faculty member shall provide a brief description of the activity, including information such as the number of meetings, and an estimate of the amount of time spent on the activity during the year. If this information is not provided, the service activity may not be factored into the annual evaluation. Service assignments which result in little or no effort during the evaluation period will not be factored into the annual evaluation. Service activities which are compensated (course release or payment) will not be factored into the annual evaluation.

5. Evaluation of Research Performance

5(a) Research Evaluations for Doctorly-qualified Faculty

Faculty with a research assignment will be evaluated based on research publications, supplemented with a variety of additional exemplary research activities. The research publication component of this assignment dimension will be evaluated based on activity over the most recent 36-months period. Faculty get evaluated in May, and preceding three years will be included in evaluating the research contributions.

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 exemplary activities, as noted below. A listing of 20 journals, in the department, and their respective assignment into Tier 1 and Tier 2 is provided in Appendix A-1, for Tenured and Tenure-earning faculty, and in Appendix A-2 for non-TTE faculty. Any other peer-reviewed journal (excluding pay-for-publications journals) will be in Tier 3.

To encourage cross disciplinary collaboration at college level, publications in journals in one department will be treated the same way as it is treated in another department. Thus, if a faculty member in Department A gets a publication in a journal listed as Tier 1 in Department B, it is treated as a Tier 1 publication by the home department. The same would be true for a publication in Tier 2 journal.

If a faculty member publishes in fields outside of business and economics, or in journals not included in either the Tier 1 or the Tier 2 lists, the faculty member is required to provide evidence of the quality of the outlet through documents such as the AESP from the UCF department where the journal is used in annual evaluations and/or from some respected third party ranking of journals in the field.

In the evaluation of research and creative activity, the chair will evaluate the caliber of the faculty member's most recent 36-months publication record, as measured by the categories of the journals in which those publications appear. Newly hired faculty members direct from a Ph.D. program may count their publications from their programs, as long as the 36-months window is not exceeded. New faculty with prior academic experience who bring no credit (zero years) towards promotion/tenure may count research publications from their prior positions, as long as the 36-months window is not exceeded. Newly hired faculty members who bring some years' credit towards tenure from prior positions may count research publications from those prior positions, as long as the 36-months window is not exceeded. The chair will rely on information provided in the faculty member's annual evaluation portfolio to gauge the quality and quantity of the supplemental research activities (exemplars) engaged in during the annual evaluation period, again with a window not to exceed 36-months.

5(b) Minimum Standards for Satisfactory Rating

A rating on research activities will only be provided for department faculty who have a research assignment. Generally speaking, faculty in the 8-course teaching track will have no research assignment, and instead will be provided an evaluation for professional development (see Professional Development Section). Furthermore, faculty in the rank of lecturer or tenure track classifications have different research assignment weights, so the minimum standards for a satisfactory rating will differ depending upon those research assignment weights. Table 2 below displays those minimum standards for all faculty who have a research activity assignment.

Necessarily, new faculty with publications from their PhD programs and/or prior academic positions will need to establish and accumulate a research record at UCF that is consistent, and sufficient in quality and quantity. Thus, research evaluation for faculty with 3 or fewer years of credit towards promotion/tenure will be at the discretion of the chair, and based on quantity and quality of research publications, the programmatic focus of the research, and the nature, quality, and quantity of work in process.

In any case, a basic criterion for a Satisfactory evaluation for all faculty is to maintain status as academically qualified (in a rolling 5-year period) with respect to AACSB/SACS, as follows:

Tracks D & E: Maintain academic qualification for AACSB/SACS accreditation at least at the Scholarly Academic (SA)-doctoral level.

Tracks B & C: Maintain academic qualification for AACSB/SACS accreditation at least at the Scholarly Academic (SA)-master's level.

Track A: Maintain academic qualification for AACSB/SACS accreditation in at least one of the following categories: Practice Academic (PA), Scholarly Practitioner (SP), Instructional Practitioner (IP).

5 (c) Research Activity Exemplars:

The minimum standards described in Table 2 include only publications. Other potential exemplary research-oriented activities which the Department chair may consider for Outstanding (as against Above Satisfactory) rating evaluations are listed below.

List 1: Exemplars of Outstanding Activity

- Paper accepted for a premier academic conference (AFA, ARES, AREUEA, FMA, European Finance Association (EFA), NBER, FIRS, SFS Cavalcade, WFA etc.).
- Best publication award by national scholarly organization or a Tier 1 or 2 journal.
- Best paper award at a national conference.
- CBA Excellence in Research Award recipient.
- Principal or co-investigator on external research grant from a prestigious body such as the National Science Foundation.
- Co-authored article(s) with doctoral student(s).
- A revise & resubmit (R&R) invitation from a Tier1 or a Tier 2 journal.

List 2: Exemplars of Above Satisfactory Activity

- Paper accepted for a national or international academic conference
- Strong portfolio of research in progress
- Working papers with doctoral student(s) accepted at conferences

In addition to the academic research publications, faculty on a 3-course teaching load must have at least two (2) of the exemplars from List 1 to be considered Outstanding.

Faculty on a 2-2 teaching load must have at least one (1) of the exemplars from List 1 to be considered Outstanding.

The list of exemplars of additional research activities is not considered to be exhaustive. Faculty members may bring to the attention of the chair activities not included in the above list that may be counted towards the research-performance evaluation.

Table 2

**Minimum Research Evaluation Standards for Doctorly-qualified Faculty
by Tracks (Appendix A-1 for Tracks E, D, & C and Appendix A-1/ A-2
for Track B)**

Rating	Track E-3 Courses	Track D-4 Courses	Track C-6 Courses	Track B-7 Courses
O	One Tier 1 <u>OR</u> Two Tier 2	One Tier 1 <u>OR</u> Two Tier 2		
	<u>plus</u> two outstanding research activity exemplar	<u>plus</u> one outstanding research activity exemplar	One Tier 2	One Tier 2 from A-2 or one Tier 3 from A-1
AS	One Tier 2 plus two above-satisfactory research activity exemplar	One Tier 2 plus one above-satisfactory research activity exemplar	Progress towards publication in a Tier 2 journal	Maintain AACSB academic qualification.
S	Progress towards publication in a Tier 2 journal plus one research activity exemplar	Progress towards publication in a Tier 2 journal	Maintain AACSB academic qualification.	Maintain Professional Certification
	<u>AND</u>	<u>AND</u>	<u>AND</u>	<u>OR</u>
	Maintain required AACSB academic qualification.	Maintain required AACSB academic qualification	Progress towards a refereed publication.	Progress towards publication.

Track E, and D: Maintain SA – Doctoral AACSB designation

Track C: Maintain SA – Masters AACSB designation

Track B: Maintain SA – Undergraduate AACSB designation

Conditional will be assigned on research if the faculty member does not meet the minimum standards for a rating of Satisfactory for the current evaluation period and was not assigned a Conditional or Unsatisfactory rating on research in the previous evaluation period.

Unsatisfactory will be assigned on research if the faculty member does not meet the minimum standards for a rating of Satisfactory for the current evaluation period and was assigned a Conditional or Unsatisfactory rating on research in the previous evaluation period.

Appendix A-1

Departments of Finance Journal List (for Tenured/Tenure Earning (T/TE) Faculty)

The following journal list will be used for evaluating basic research publications in the research section of the AESP. The list of journals is not exhaustive. There are quality journals that are not populated by our faculty's current research that have not been included in the list.

Tier 1

Journal of Finance
Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis
Journal of Financial Economics
Review of Financial Studies

Tier 2: Finance & Real Estate journals of high quality that signal meaningful progress in research and, along with publications in Tier 1, are part of a strong portfolio of accomplishments that demonstrates significant progress toward tenure and promotion for junior faculty or are evidence of continued research excellence for people on reduced teaching loads:

Real Estate Economics
Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics
Journal of Real Estate Research
Journal of Banking and Finance
Journal of Corporate Finance
Review of Corporate Finance Studies
Financial Analysts Journal
Financial Management
Financial Review
Journal of Empirical Finance
Journal of Financial Markets
Journal of Financial Research
Journal of Financial Services Research
Journal of Portfolio Management
Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance
Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting

Tier 3

Any peer-reviewed journal, with an impact factor of 0.5 or higher, but excluding any predatory (pay-for-publication) journals.

Appendix A-2

Department of Finance Journals List (for non-T/TE faculty)

While we encourage our clinical faculty colleagues to publish in academic journals, we recognize 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 we best prepare our students to compete in today's world. This can be done through publication in highly visible practitioner journals associated with the faculty's areas of interest, articles in journals that focus on teaching pedagogy in our disciplinary fields, or publication of case studies that can be used to teach the next generation of business leaders.

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.

Clinical Tier 1: The journals below are most influential in achieving excellence in research/professional development for clinical faculty in the college, 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
Harvard Business Review
Journal of Accounting Education
Issues in Accounting Education

Journal of Applied Finance
Journal of Economic Perspectives
Journal of Economic Education
Journal of Financial Education
Journal of Marketing Education
Journal of Marketing Practice
Organizational Dynamics
Sloan Management Review

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

Harvard Business Publishing
INSEAD Case Publishing
Ivey Publishing
Darden Business Publishing
Emerald Publishing

Clinical faculty who publish in other outlets targeted at practitioners or teachers in their discipline **must** provide evidence of their impact at the time of their evaluation either through the most recent JCR citation impact factors or paid circulation data at the time of publication.

Non-tenure earning faculty will receive **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 Quantity & Quality for Clinical Faculty on 3/3 load

	Clinical Faculty on 3/3*
Outstanding	1 Tier 1 or 2 Tier 2 (relevant to discipline)
Above Sat	1 Tier 2 AND Either 1 RR at Tier 2 (or equivalent) or 1 Conference paper likely to lead to journal publication
Sat	1 Tier 2 (or equivalent relative to discipline)

*must also maintain SA-Masters qualification

Predatory Journals

We caution all our colleagues to avoid predatory journals. **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 prioritize profit over quality and academic integrity, misleading authors into believing their work is being published in a reputable outlet. They typically lack transparency in their editorial process, have low academic standards, and may deceive readers by mimicking credible journals in appearance and name.

All faculty must exercise caution by verifying journals through trusted sources like Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), Journal Citation Reports (JCR), or Beall's List of Predatory Journals.

Publication in predatory journals cannot be used as valid evidence of research or professional development activity.

Appendix B - Assignment Track Procedures and Criteria

Criteria

1. Each faculty member's chair/director, in consultation with the dean, will determine the appropriateness of the requested track assignment. The determination will be based upon the relationship between that requested assignment and both the college's mission and goals and the needs and the professional development of the faculty.
2. Each faculty member's annual evaluation will be based upon the actual assignment for that year. That is, it will be based upon the actual number of courses taught, the actual research assignment, etc.

Procedures

1. Every third year each faculty member will be required to submit an updated Faculty Assignment Application (number of courses within the track range) that will last for a period of three years. This application must be made by September 1 of the year preceding the Fall semester in which the new track assignment is to begin. Faculty who are hired in the midst of a three-year assignment cycle, as well as faculty who have changed their assignment in the midst of a three-year assignment cycle (as provided for in item 4 below), will get on cycle at the next track assignment submission date.
2. After a review of the application, the chair, in consultation with the dean, will make the final decision on the 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 "E" 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 track during the course of a three-year assignment period. This request can be made by submitting a new Faculty Assignment Application to the chair by September 1 of the year preceding the Fall semester in which the proposed new track assignment would begin. The process for reviewing and responding to the application will be the same as the process described in item 2 above. The dean must approve all changes in track assignments.
5. Faculty may appeal track assignments according to the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Appendix C
Department of Finance and School of Real Estate
Annual Goals (MM/DD/YY-MM/DD/YY Evaluation Period)

Faculty Member: _____

Type of Submission (check one)

☒

Initial Goal Submission

☐

Revised Goal Submission

Date of Submission _____

Teaching and Student Engagement **Intended**
Activities

Goal(s)

Professional Development
Intended Activities

Goal(s)

University and Professional Service
Intended Activities

Goal(s)

Signatures

Faculty Member

Date

Chair, Finance/Real Estate

Date

Appendix D – College AACSB Standards

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 is 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 5-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 is 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 three-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.