Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP)

GUIDANCE FOR ANNUAL REPORT PREPARATION

Department of Foodservice & Lodging Management
Rosen College of Hospitality Management
University of Central Florida

Developed by faculty committee during Fall 2019 to Fall 2020
(Committee members: A. Gregory, H. Hagglund, J. Judy, T. Kaufmann, C. Mejia, M. Rivera)
Unanimously approved by Foodservice & Lodging Management Department faculty secret ballot on
05/26/2021

Approved by RCHM Dean on 05/26/2021
Approved by Faculty Excellence on 06/01/2021

Approved – Faculty Excellence – June 1, 2021. Available for first use academic year 2022-2023

Approved by Faculty Excellence, June 1, 2021
Available for First Use 2022-2023 Academic Year

INTRODUCTION

The Foodservice & Lodging Management (FLM) Department Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP) is a work assignment and evaluation system designed for performance appraisal of faculty housed within the Department of Foodservice & Lodging Management. The plan is a contemporary plan that is built upon the culture of accountability and comradery that exists within the Department, recognizes the objective set of evaluation standards from prior years, acknowledges existing as well as emerging behaviors and accomplishments not explicitly listed, and has multiple tracks differentiated by faculty classification, course load, and assignment of effort to teaching, research, and service activities. The objectives of the FLM AESP are to:

- Provide a range of work assignments that permit faculty members, in consultation with the FLM Department Chair, to be placed on the track that best matches their teaching and research capabilities, professional goals, and interests, consistent with the mission of the Department.
- Promote opportunities for FLM faculty to engage in activities toward the strategic goals of UCF Rosen College of Hospitality Management.
- Assist FLM faculty in contributing to UCF's Mission and Strategic Plan.
- Promote and recognize high-quality teaching, research, and service by FLM faculty members.

PART I - WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENTS AND TRACKS

Workload Assignment and Change Procedures

Workload assignments and changes in workload assignments will be made in accordance with the most current UCF-United Faculty of Florida (UFF) Collective Bargaining Agreement. The workload assignment procedure is summarized in Appendix 1. Faculty members may appeal changes in workload assignments in accordance with the most current UCF-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Evaluation Weights by Assignment Track

Each year, the FLM Department Chair will assess each faculty member's professional performance based on teaching, research and other scholarly activities, and service activities, as well as any other assigned duties. Overall evaluations will be determined by weighting performance on each of the components according to the faculty member's Annual Assignment of Duties. Table 1 contains the target weights for teaching, research, and service for each workload option based on course assignment (3 SCH courses or equivalent) over a regular 9-month annual contract.

Table 1: Evaluation Weights by Workload Assignment

Activity	Track 1 (7+ courses)	Track 2 (6 courses)	Track 3 (5 courses)	Track 4 (4 courses)	Track 5 (3 courses)	Track 6 (2 courses)
Teaching	80%	60%	50%	40%	30%	20%
Research	0%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%
Service	20%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%

Tracks 2 and 3 represent the typical/regular workload assignment for tenure-track FLM faculty and Track 1 is the typical/regular workload assignment for lecturers/instructors. When a faculty member requests a different workload assignment, the FLM Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean, will determine the appropriateness of the requested workload assignment. The determination will be based upon the relationship between the requested assignment and the College's mission and goals, and the needs, resources, and professional development of the faculty member.

Evaluation of Other University Duties

Although expectations are that most faculty members' time will be allocated in the proportions given in Table 1, it is recognized that circumstances may arise which warrant variations in the percentages under each option. Ultimately, each faculty member's annual performance evaluation will be based upon the actual workload for that evaluation period. In those cases where other duties are a significant part of evaluating a faculty member's performance, the faculty member, in consultation with the FLM Department Chair, will determine alternate weights and include them in the faculty member's evaluation during the regular review period at the end of the academic year.

Relationship between Annual Evaluation and Tenure/Promotion

The result of a faculty member's annual evaluation in the UCF Rosen College of Hospitality Management is 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.

Modifications of the Annual Evaluation and Standards Procedures

This plan may require periodic changes and will be revised in accordance with the most current UCF-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement and changes in the Department and College missions and objectives.

Data to be Included in the Spring Annual Report

Evaluation periods begin with the first day of the Fall semester (or preceding Summer, if appropriate) and end with the last day of the Spring semester according to the published University academic calendar. Teaching and Service contributions are to be reported for the most recent academic year, which will comprise the previous Summer (if applicable), Fall, and Spring terms. If faculty complete Summer teaching in the preceding year, they must include student perception of instruction (SPIs) scores and associated teaching information in that AESP cycle. For Research and Other Scholarly Activities, contributions to Section I (journal publications and funded external grants/contracts and textbooks/book chapters/case studies) are to be reported for the most recent three academic years to ensure longer-term authorship and grant activities are fully taken into consideration, while contributions to Section II (funded internal grants, submitted grants/contracts, and all other scholarly activities) are to be reported for the most recent academic year.

Due Date for Faculty Annual Report

Faculty Annual Reports shall be due as required in Article 10 of the most current UCF-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement.

PART II – EVALUATION PROCESS AND STANDARDS

Overview

After the end of the evaluation period, the FLM Department Chair shall evaluate each faculty member's performance. The evaluation of Teaching, Research and Other Scholarly Activities, and Service is conducted on an annual basis; however, Research Section I activities (journal publications and funded external grants/contracts) are reported for the prior three years and averaged for the current year's evaluation. The evaluation shall follow the standards and procedures described in this document, the most current UCF-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, and the annual Assignment of Duties provided to the faculty member at the beginning of the year, or as modified during the year. Annual Assignments of Duties 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 workload assignment (number of courses) for the faculty member, as described below.

Each year, by or prior to the established deadline, each FLM faculty member shall submit their annual report via the FLM AESP Excel form for the given academic year which documents the faculty member's activities and accomplishments in each area of assignment for that academic year. It is the responsibility of the FLM faculty member to thoroughly document activities and accomplishments in their annual report.

Evaluation Process and Meeting

Each faculty member in the FLM Department will meet with the Chair at the end of the academic year to discuss the faculty member's actual performance, as well as their plan for Teaching, Research and Other Scholarly Activities, Service, and/or professional development activities for the upcoming evaluation period. The level of the additional activities engaged in by a faculty member will be a function of the faculty member's workload assignment, changes in course assignments, position classification, and rank in position. For example, a tenured professor on a 3-course load would be expected to successfully complete higher-level service activities (e.g., University committees, promotion and tenure matters, Faculty Senate activities, etc.) than an instructor on an 8-course load. Similarly, that tenured professor would be expected to engage in teaching activities that extended beyond the domain of an instructor (e.g., doctoral student engagement).

It is important to note that when setting and agreeing upon workload, student credit hours are to be considered, as is the allocation of Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) support to faculty. Although a rigid prescriptive approach is not recommended, it is imperative that overall student credit hours and GTA allocations are incorporated into all workload discussions between the faculty member and the FLM Department Chair.

Completed annual reports (e.g., AESP Excel forms) for the current year and previous years will be made available within the shared FLM Teams Drive and stored securely in hard copy in the faculty member's file, in addition to being stored securely in digital format.

Evaluation of Each Area of Assignment

Each of the remaining sections of this document relates to an area of assignment (Teaching, Research and Other Scholarly Activities, and Service). For each area of assignment, a points-based standard is applied for achieving evaluation ratings of Unsatisfactory, Conditional, Satisfactory, Above Satisfactory, and Outstanding. *Conditional* and *Unsatisfactory* are described below:

> *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. A **Conditional** rating cannot be assigned for two consecutive years.

> *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, faculty members should be prepared to provide support for, and evidence of, achievement of the standards and their activities and accomplishments. The FLM Department Chair will provide a written explanation whenever it is deemed that a faculty member should receive an evaluation rating that is below Satisfactory in any area of assignment.

Overall Rating

In general, the overall annual evaluation rating shall be calculated as the weighted average evaluation over all areas of assignment, based on the following scale:

Outstanding:	The faculty member receives 3.20 to 4.00 points in total.
Above Satisfactory:	The faculty member receives 2.80 to 3.19 points in total.
Satisfactory:	The faculty member receives 2.40 to 2.79 points in total.
Conditional:	The faculty member receives 2.00 to 2.39 points in total.
Unsatisfactory:	The faculty member receives 1.99 or fewer points in total.

The weight for each area shall be the assignment of effort for the area, as indicated in Table 1. Example evaluations for three typical workload assignments (Tracks 1, 2 and 3) are provided in Appendix 2.

Overall Rating as Applied to Research Faculty (Tracks 2 – 6)

The following conditions relative to the determination of an *Overall Rating* apply to faculty members whose workload assignment includes Research and Other Scholarly Activities (Tracks 2 – 6):

- Actual points earned for Research and Other Scholarly Activities must be standardized prior to weighting and inclusion in the overall evaluation. Standardization is based on the following rationale:
  - Using Track 3 (40% research effort) as the baseline, a 10% change in research effort increases or decreases expected research output (in points) by 1.2 points.
  - This differential is determined by taking 12 total points for the overall evaluation (4.00 Teaching, 4.00 in Research and Scholarly Activities, 4.00 in Service) and multiplying by the 10% change in effort.
- A minimum requirement for a Satisfactory rating in the area of Research and Other Scholarly Activities (see Part IV) must be met in order for a final ***Overall Rating*** to be calculated according to the above scale. In the event a faculty member does not meet the minimum requirement but earns enough cumulative points in Research and Other Scholarly Activities for a Satisfactory rating (or higher), their final rating will be determined by the FLM Department Chair.

PART III – EVALUATION OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE

Overview

The time frame for the teaching portion of the evaluation is one academic year, which will include Summer teaching (if applicable) as outlined on page 3. Each faculty member will be evaluated for teaching based on the standards in Table 3. Each faculty member is expected to provide high-quality instruction. The evaluation of teaching performance shall include consideration of the individual's effectiveness in imparting knowledge and skills, stimulating students' critical thinking and creative abilities, the development or revision of curriculum and course structure, effective student performance, evaluation procedures, and adherence to accepted standards of professional behavior in meeting teaching responsibilities to students.

The learning objectives of each course, the means of assessing learning objectives, and the actual outcomes of the assessment should be evaluated as part of the teaching performance. The FLM Department Chair will consider the teaching portfolio of each faculty member, which may include, but not be limited to, class notes, syllabi, student exams and assignments, and any other materials relevant to the teaching assignments.

The teaching evaluation should consider any relevant materials, including the Student Perception of Instruction (SPI) results and other teaching-related activities including, but not limited to, classroom visits or observations, student advising, new course development, course revisions, development of innovative teaching methods, and using multiple types of learning assessments.

Table 2 provides a list of Teaching Activities and Standards and their corresponding point values. The evaluation of teaching activities will be based on the following scale:

Outstanding:	The faculty member receives 3.20 or more points in total.
Above Satisfactory:	The faculty member receives 2.80 to 3.19 points in total.
Satisfactory:	The faculty member receives 2.40 to 2.79 points in total.
Conditional:	The faculty member receives 2.00 to 2.39 points in total.
Unsatisfactory:	The faculty member receives 1.99 or fewer points in total.

Table 2: Teaching Activities and Standards

SPIs	Points
Annual Average of Student Perceptions of Instruction (SPI) Evaluations (Overall Effectiveness Scores) [SPIs X 0.60]	
Designations/Recognition (*per course)	
State (or higher) Course Quality Designation (e.g., State of Florida Quality Online course)*	0.30
University Course High Quality Designation (High Quality Course badge)*	0.25
University Course Quality Designation (Quality Course badge)*	0.20
Course Development (*per course, application, project, instance)	
Creator of E-media content for platform/course (including design, development, implementation)*	1.00
New course preparation (not taught ever or within 3+ years)*	0.50
Integration of intensive hands-on service learning / consulting student projects for industry organizations*	0.50
Clear evidence of updates to courses, including syllabi and content*	0.20
Creator of E-media assessment using University-based or external widgets (e.g., Materia games, chapter review, assignment introduction videos, etc.)*	0.15
Additional Teaching Efforts (*per course, lab section, instance)	
Guest Lectures (within or beyond Rosen College and/or UCF)*	0.15
Course supervisor/mentor/leader (mentoring new instructor, etc.)*	0.15
Large class size (n=25+ graduate; n=75+ undergraduate)*	0.15
Multiple types (3+) of learning assessments and/or teaching methodologies used*	0.15
Faculty for lab-related courses*	0.10
Travel/Advising/Mentorship (*per competition, student)	
Faculty lead for study abroad program	1.00
Faculty advisor for student competition with travel*	1.00
Faculty advisor for student competition without travel*	0.50
Chair of thesis/dissertation/undergraduate honors thesis committee*	1.50
Member of thesis/dissertation/undergraduate honors thesis committee*	1.00
Student Mentoring (RAMP, LEAD Scholar, or Honor/Graduate student)*	0.50
Research supervisor/mentor/leader (College/University approved independent study, papers/projects involving undergraduate/graduate students outside of assigned teaching load)	0.30
Coordination of College event involving students (e.g., Career Fair, Conference)	0.30
Personal (*per review, event)	
Special teaching and curriculum development assignments outside the Rosen College	0.30
Individual professional development efforts such as professional diplomas, certifications, etc.	0.30
Professional or peer instructional evaluations*	0.15
Active participation/presentation at a teaching and learning conference/workshop*	0.15
Teaching Award (Current year only)	
External Teaching award from ICHRIE or other respected institutions	1.00
University/College Teaching Award (e.g., Excellence in Teaching, TIP, etc.)	1.00
Student Association Teaching Award	0.30
Funded Seminars	
Co-Lead of industry or academic educational seminar held at UCF RCHM	

Below $10,000	1.00	
$10,001 to $25,000	1.50	
$25,001 to $49,999	1.75	
$50,000+	2.00	
(Contributors get 50% of the points listed above)		
(Sole Leads get 125% of the points listed above)		
Other Teaching Activities*		
Other teaching-related activity not specifically described in this table [*Activity and corresponding point value must be approved by the FLM Department Chair BEFORE engaging in the activity in order for the activity to be counted in the annual evaluation]	0.10 to 2.00	

PART IV – EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND OTHER SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

Overview

Faculty with a research assignment will be evaluated for Research and Other Scholarly Activities based on the standards listed in Table 4. Contributions to Section I (journal publications, textbooks/book chapters/case studies, and funded external grants/contracts) will be evaluated for the most recent three academic years, while contributions to Section II (funded internal grants, submitted grants/contracts, and all other scholarly activities) will be evaluated annually. Newly hired tenure-track faculty members who receive credit towards tenure will have an evaluation window that includes those years of tenure credit and the research publications therein. In addition, the Department 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.

The FLM Department Chair shall consider the full range of research and scholarly activities and the contribution of accomplishments. Evidence of research and other scholarly activities shall include, but not be limited to, published cases, chapters and/or books, articles, papers and research notes in academic refereed and/or professional/industry journals, research and/or papers presented at meetings of professional academic, governmental or industry conferences, funded grant or contract activities, reviews, and research and creative activities that have resulted in publication, display, or performance. The evaluation shall include consideration of the employee's research quality and productivity during the evaluation period, and other creative programs and contributions recognized by the academic and/or professional communities.

The evaluation of research activities will be based on the scale below. Actual points earned will be standardized prior to weighting and inclusion in the overall evaluation based on the rationale outlined in the Overall Evaluation section on page 6.

Outstanding: The faculty member receives 3.20 or more points in total.
Above Satisfactory: The faculty member receives 2.80 to 3.19 points in total.
Satisfactory: The faculty member receives 2.40 to 2.79 points in total.
Conditional: The faculty member receives 2.00 to 2.39 points in total.
Unsatisfactory: The faculty member receives 1.99 or fewer points in total.

Additionally, in keeping with the University and College goals of achieving research status, in order to achieve a rating of Satisfactory or better, faculty members must earn a minimum of 25% of their research points, as determined by the expected research output for workload assignment, from Section I of Table 4, as well as the total required points for the rating. If this minimum is not met, the highest rating a faculty member can achieve in Research and Other Scholarly Activities is Conditional, regardless of total points earned. Table 3 summarizes the expected research output and associated minimum point value required from Section I for a Satisfactory (or better) rating for each workload assignment.

Table 3:
Expected Research Output and Section I Minimum Point Requirement by Workload Assignment

	Track 2 (6 courses)	Track 3 (5 courses)	Track 4 (4 courses)	Track 5 (3 courses)	Track 6 (2 courses)
Research Effort	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%
Expected Research Output	2.80	4.00	5.20	6.40	7.60
Minimum Point(s) Required from Section I	0.70	1.00	1.30	1.60	1.90

FLM Department Academic Journal Categories

The FLM Department recognizes that focusing on publications in the hospitality and tourism journals acknowledged by the Shanghai Ranking, the Scopus CiteScore™ Tourism, Leisure, & Hospitality Management subject category, and the Web of Science Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism subject category is consistent with the strategic goals of the College and the University; however, these lists are limited and exclude many subject areas, fields of research, and context-specific journals relevant to researchers in the FLM Department. Therefore, in addition to all College-recognized journals, the FLM Department also recognizes publications in single/double blind, peer-reviewed journals, as delineated in Table 4, that are broadly related to and advance the discipline. It is the responsibility of the FLM faculty member to provide support in terms of a journal's SSCI (or subject-equivalent) status and Impact Factor (as reported by Web of Science and the Journal Citation Reports™) and/or the CiteScore™ (as reported by Scopus) *at the time of an article's acceptance*.

Table 4 provides a list of Research and Other Scholarly Activities and Standards and their corresponding point values.

Table 4: Research and Other Scholarly Activities and Standards

SECTION I – Journal Publications, Textbooks/Book Chapters/Case Studies, and Funded External Grants/Contracts	Points

(Past 3 Academic Years)	
Academic Journal Publications (per article/research note, averaged over 3 years)	
Accepted and/or published refereed **journal article** in Shanghai Ranking's journal list **OR** SSCI (or subject equivalent) with an impact factor of 3.5 or greater **OR** Scopus CiteScore of 5.0 or greater	1.50
Accepted and/or published refereed **journal article** in SSCI (or subject equivalent) journals with an impact factor of 2.0 – 3.499 **OR** Scopus CiteScore of 4.0 - 4.9	1.25
Accepted and/or published refereed **journal article** in SSCI (or subject equivalent) journals with an impact factor of 1.0 – 1.999 or greater **OR** Scopus CiteScore of 3.0 – 3.9	1.00
Accepted and/or published refereed **journal article** in SSCI (or subject equivalent) journals with an impact factor of less than 1.0 **OR** Scopus CiteScore of less than 3.0	0.75
Accepted and/or published refereed **journal article** not meeting the above criteria	0.50
Accepted and/or published refereed **research note** in SSCI (or subject equivalent) journals with an impact factor of 2.0 or greater **OR** Scopus CiteScore of 4.0 or greater	1.00
Accepted and/or published refereed **research note** not meeting the above criteria	0.50
Textbooks/Book Chpts/Case Studies (per textbook/book chpt/case study, averaged over 3 years)	
Single author of published scholarly book/textbook	1.50
Co-author of published scholarly book/textbook	0.75
Author or Co-Author of published scholarly book chapter or case study	0.50
Funded External Grants/Contracts (per grant, per year, averaged over 3 years)	
Co-Investigator of external grant/contract, funded	
Below $10,000	1.00
$10,000 to $24,999	1.25
$25,000 to $74,999	1.50
$75,000 or more	2.00
(Contributors get 50% of the points listed above)	
(Principal Investigators get 110% of the points listed above)	
(Sole Investigators get 125% of the points listed above)	
SECTION II – Other Scholarly Activities (Past Academic Year Only)	
Funded Internal Grants (per grant)	
Principal Investigator/Co-Investigator internal UCF or College grant, funded	1.00
Submitted Grants/Contracts (per proposal)	
Principal Investigator/Co-Investigator **external** grant/contract or consultancy contract proposal, submitted	0.75
Principal Investigator/Co-Investigator **internal** grant/contract or consultancy contract proposal, submitted	0.50
Applications of Research Expertise (*per proceeding, journal, issue, article, submission)	
Editor or Co-Editor of a published scholarly book or textbook	1.00
Editor of an academic journal*	1.00
Senior Associate Editor/Associate Editor for an academic journal*	0.65
Guest Editor of a Special Issue for an academic journal*	0.65
Editorial Board Member of an academic journal*	0.30

Chair/Co-Chair of a national/international academic/research conference	0.65
National/international academic/research conference Committee Member	0.30
Editor of a book of academic papers/conference proceedings*	0.65
Editor of a refereed conference proceeding*	0.40
Editor of a non-refereed conference proceeding*	0.20
Ad-hoc reviewer for an academic journal*	0.15
Reviewer for a Conference*	0.15
Presentations (*per presentation)	
Invited presentation at an Academic, Industry, Government or Association conference event	0.25
Refereed paper presentation*	0.25
Refereed poster presentation*	0.15
Research Awards (*per award/paper/poster)	
External research award (e.g., Lifetime research award, etc.)*	1.00
University/College research awards (e.g., Excellence in Research, RIA, etc.)*	1.00
Best paper/outstanding paper award from a journal*	0.65
Best/outstanding paper or poster award from a conference*	0.35
Industry recognition of research	0.25
Collaboration/Consultation	
Evidence of collaboration with junior faculty and/or graduate students	0.10
Evidence of collaboration with other Colleges or Institutions	0.10
Complete conference reports, book reviews, and encyclopedia entries	0.10
Demonstrated/recognized lead of academic or industry research activity (e.g., first author, pro bono/industry research, etc.)	0.10
Consultation with and/or providing technical assistance for organizations and agencies	0.10
Industry publication (e.g., report, an interview, newspaper or magazine article, etc.)	0.10
Scholarly work cited by other scholars (during the evaluation period, per citation)	0.03
Other Research or Scholarly Activities*	
Other research or scholarly activity not specifically described in this table [*Activity and corresponding point value must be approved by the FLM Department Chair BEFORE engaging in the activity in order for the activity to be counted in the annual evaluation]	0.10 to 2.00

PART V – EVALUATION OF SERVICE

Overview

The service component of each faculty member's assignment will be evaluated annually by the FLM Department Chair based on the standards in Table 5. Internal, community, and industry service are the responsibility of all FLM faculty members. Faculty should demonstrate a willingness to support the University, College, and the Department through service and leadership roles. Service activities at the University should include various roles (e.g., member, chairperson) at various levels of service (e.g., Department, College, University, industry, local, regional, national, and international).

Service is expected of all FLM faculty members. However, the type and amount of service activity may vary based on an individual's professional focus. Table 5 provides a list of Service Activities and Standards and their corresponding point values. The overall evaluation of service activities will be based on the following scale:

Outstanding: The faculty member receives 3.20 or more points in total.
Above Satisfactory: The faculty member receives 2.80 to 3.19 points in total.
Satisfactory: The faculty member receives 2.40 to 2.79 points in total.
Conditional: The faculty member receives 2.00 to 2.39 points in total.
Unsatisfactory: The faculty member receives 1.99 or fewer points in total.

Table 5: Service Activities and Standards

University, College, and Department Service (per activity, committee, organization)	Points
University Committee/Board Leadership [within UCF or for another university] (e.g., Promotion and Tenure [P&T] committee chair, Accreditation/program review chair for another university)	1.30
Faculty Senate membership	1.20
Department/College Committee Leadership	0.85
Faculty advising of student organizations	0.75
University/College/Department Committee Member/Board Member (within UCF or for another university)	0.65
Voluntary university/college service activities/events (e.g., workshops, student events/recruitment, gala dinners, hosting/attending University/College/Department guests, etc.)	0.30
Mentorship of new faculty	0.30
Industry, and Community Service (per activity, committee, organization)	
Academic/Industry/Community Association/Organization Leadership	1.00
Invited Keynote Speech	0.90
Academic/Industry/Community Association/Organization Member/Advisory Board Member/Panelist	0.80
Active participation in an industry/community event with travel	0.85
Active participation in an industry/community event	0.65
Industry/Community Service/Scholarship Awards	0.65
Non-funded industry or community research project	0.20
Industry print or electronic media report, newspaper/magazine article, blog	0.15
Other Service Activities*	
Other service activity (internal or external) not specifically described in this table [*Activity and corresponding point value must be approved by the FLM Department Chair BEFORE engaging in the activity in order for the activity to be counted in the annual evaluation]	0.10 to 2.00

APPENDIX 1 – WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENT PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA

Criteria

1. The FLM Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean, will determine the appropriateness of the FLM faculty member's requested workload assignment. The determination will be based upon the relationship between requested assignment and both the College's mission and goals and the needs and the professional development of the faculty.

2. Each FLM faculty member's annual evaluation will be based upon the actual workload for the regular 9-month annual contract (and as applicable any summer assignments). That is, it will be based upon the actual number of courses taught, the actual research and scholarly activities conducted/completed, and the actual service conducted.

Procedure

On an annual basis, each faculty member will be provided the opportunity to submit a request for a change in workload assignment. After a review of the request, the FLM Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean, will make the final decision on track assignment. The FLM Department Chair will notify the faculty member prior to finalizing his or her assignment. If a faculty member is assigned to a track other than the track for which the Annual Assignment of Duties form was generated, the FLM Department Chair will have a meeting with the faculty member regarding the approved assignment.

APPENDIX 2 – EVALUATION EXAMPLES FOR TYPICAL ASSIGNMENTS IN FLM

Note: These examples may not apply if the faculty member and Department Chair have agreed upon other/additional activities and goals for the evaluation period.

Example #1: Track 1 Workload Assignment (7+ courses)

	Actual Points	**Weighted Points**	**Final (Overall) Evaluation**
Teaching (Effort = 80%)	Must earn at least 2.40 points, based on criteria in Table 2	1.92 (2.40 x 80%)	**Satisfactory** (1.92 + 0.48 = 2.40)
Service (Effort = 20%)	Must earn at least 2.40 points, based on criteria in Table 5	0.48 (2.40 x 20%)	

	Actual Points	**Weighted Points**	**Final (Overall) Evaluation**
Teaching (Effort = 80%)	Must earn at least 3.20 points, based on criteria in Table 2	2.56 (3.20 x 80%)	**Outstanding** (2.56 + 0.64 = 3.20)
Service (Effort = 20%)	Must earn at least 3.20 points, based on criteria in Table 5	0.64 (3.20 x 20%)	

Example #2: Track 2 Workload Assignment (6 courses)

	Actual Points	Standardization	Weighted Points	Final (Overall) Evaluation
Teaching **(Effort = 60%)**	Must earn at least 2.40 points, based on criteria in Table 2	N/A	1.44 (2.40 x 60%)	
Research **(Effort = 30%)** **(Expected Research Output = 2.80)**	Must earn at least 0.70 points from Section I and 1.68 points in total, based on criteria from Tables 3 and 4	1.68 / 2.80 = 60% 60% x 4 = 2.40	0.72 (2.40 x 30%)	**Satisfactory** (1.44 + 0.72 + 0.24 = 2.40)
Service **(Effort = 10%)**	Must earn at least 2.40 points, based on criteria in Table 5	N/A	0.24 (2.40 x 10%)	

	Actual Points	Standardization	Weighted Points	Final (Overall) Evaluation
Teaching **(Effort = 60%)**	Must earn at least 3.20 points, based on criteria in Table 2	N/A	1.92 (1.92 x 60%)	
Research **(Effort = 30%)** **(Expected Research Output = 2.80)**	Must earn at least 0.70 points from Section I and 2.24 points in total, based on criteria from Tables 3 and 4	2.24 / 2.80 = 80% 80% x 4 = 3.20	0.96 (3.20 x 30%)	**Outstanding** (1.92 + 0.96 + 0.32 = 3.20)
Service **(Effort = 10%)**	Must earn at least 3.20 points, based on criteria in Table 5	N/A	0.32 (3.20 x 10%)	

Example #3: Track 3 Workload Assignment (5 courses)

	Actual Points	Standardization	Weighted Points	Final (Overall) Evaluation
Teaching **(Effort = 50%)**	Must earn at least 2.40 points, based on criteria in Table 2	N/A	1.20 (2.40 x 50%)	**Satisfactory** (1.20 + 0.96 + 0.24 = 2.40)
Research **(Effort = 40%)** **(Expected Research Output = 4.00)**	Must earn at least 1.00 point from Section I and 2.40 points in total, based on criteria from Tables 3 and 4	2.40 / 4.00 = 60% 60% x 4 = 2.40	0.96 (2.40 x 40%)	
Service **(Effort = 10%)**	Must earn at least 2.40 points, based on criteria in Table 5	N/A	0.24 (2.40 x 10%)	

	Actual Points	Standardization	Weighted Points	Final (Overall) Evaluation
Teaching **(Effort = 50%)**	Must earn at least 3.20 points, based on criteria in Table 2	N/A	1.60 (3.20 x 50%)	**Outstanding** (1.60 + 1.28 + 0.32 = 3.20)
Research **(Effort = 40%)** **(Expected Research Output = 4.00)**	Must earn at least 1.00 point from Section I and 3.20 points in total, based on criteria from Tables 3 and 4	3.20 / 4.00 = 80% 80% x 4 = 3.20	1.28 (3.20 x 40%)	
Service **(Effort = 10%)**	Must earn at least 3.20 points, based on criteria in Table 5	N/A	0.32 (3.20 x 10%)	