

**The University of Central Florida**  
**Rosen College of Hospitality Management**  
**Foodservice and Lodging Management (FLM) Department**  
**Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures**

**Introduction**

The purpose of this document is to provide standards and procedures to evaluate the annual performance of all faculty members in the Foodservice and Lodging Management (FLM) Department at the Rosen College of Hospitality Management. Annual evaluations will be based on this document which conforms to the UCF BOT-UFF CBA.

**General Guidelines**

Faculty members are expected to contribute to the orderly and effective functioning of the University of Central Florida, the Rosen College of Hospitality Management, and the FLM Department. The annual evaluation will be based upon the professional performance in the areas of teaching, research, service, and other assigned duties. Instructional activities, meeting with students during office hours and other duties are responsibilities that require performance at a specific time and location. However, other non-scheduled assigned activities such as research projects and site visits may be appropriately performed in a manner and place determined by the faculty member, with the agreement of the Chair of the FLM Department.

Each faculty member and the Department Chair will agree on the percentage of her/his assignments in teaching, research, service, and other assigned areas as applicable, six weeks prior to the start of each academic year. Each faculty member should have measurable objectives related to standards outlined under teaching (see Table 1), research (see Table 2), and service (see Table 3). If new tasks are undertaken beyond the activities listed in Tables 1, 2 and 3, the Department Chair will work with the faculty member to readjust the AA-46 Faculty Assignment of Duties Form and evaluate the faculty member accordingly.

The ratings used for faculty members will be Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Conditional, and Unsatisfactory. Each of these ratings will correspond to points received in each area, as follows:

- **Outstanding:** The faculty member receives 9.6 to 12 total points.
- **Above Satisfactory:** The faculty member receives 7.8 to 9.5 total points.
- **Satisfactory:** The faculty member receives 4.8 to 7.7 total points.
- **Conditional:** The faculty member receives 2.4 to 4.7 total points.
- **Unsatisfactory:** The faculty member receives below 2.4 total points.

The overall rating will be determined based on the percentage distribution of activities stated for each faculty member in the AA-46 Faculty Assignment of Duties Form. For example, if a faculty receives 8.5 points for teaching, 7.5 points for research, and 8 points for service, these points would be calculated using a weighted average. Therefore, a faculty member who was assigned .60 FTE for teaching, .30 FTE for research, and .10 FTE for service would have an overall rating figured by  $(.60*8.5) + (.30*7.5) + (.10*8) = 5.1 + 2.25 + .8 = 8.15$ , which will be above satisfactory. As illustrated in Tables 1, 2 and 3, each faculty member can accumulate points in each of the three areas by undertaking specific activities and/or achieving certain outcomes. However, when determining the overall annual evaluation rating, a maximum 12 points will be given in each area (teaching, research, and service).

## **Evaluation of Teaching Performance**

The time frame for this teaching portion of the evaluation is one academic year. Each faculty member will be evaluated for teaching based on the standards in Table 1. 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 Department Chair will take into account 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 take into account any relevant materials, including the Student Perception of Instruction (SPI) survey results and classroom visits or observations by the Department Chair or others after notifying the faculty at least two (2) weeks in advance of the date, and place. Faculty members are expected to perform teaching related activities such as new course development, course revisions, and/or the development of innovative teaching methods.

Teaching effectiveness guidelines are provided below for the ratings of unsatisfactory, conditional, satisfactory, above satisfactory, and outstanding. Please refer to Table 1 for teaching requirements and activities as well as for the total points required for the ratings of Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Conditional, and Unsatisfactory.

- **Outstanding:** The faculty member receives 9.6 to 12 total points in the teaching activities listed in Table 1.
- **Above Satisfactory:** The faculty member receives 7.8 to 9.5 total points in the teaching activities listed in Table 1.
- **Satisfactory:** The faculty member receives 4.8 to 7.7 total points in the teaching activities listed in Table 1.
- **Conditional:** The faculty member receives 2.4 to 4.7 total points in the teaching activities listed in Table 1.
- **Unsatisfactory:** The faculty member receives below 2.4 in total points in the teaching activities listed in Table 1.

**Table 1: Teaching Standards<sup>1</sup>**

	<b>Points<sup>2</sup></b>	
<b>SECTION I (maximum possible points = 5)</b>		
Annual average of Student Perception of Instruction (SPI) course mean scores	Up to 5.00	
<b>SECTION II (maximum possible points = 5)</b>		
Professional or peer instructional evaluations (1.0 per review)	Up to 2.00	
Faculty for study abroad program (per program)	1.00	
Faculty advisor for student competition with travel (per competition)	1.00	
Faculty advisor for student competition without travel (per competition)	0.50	
Integration of intensive hands-on service learning projects for industry organizations (per project)	1.00	
Faculty for lab related courses (.10 per lab section)	Up to 1.00	
Chair of thesis/dissertation committee per student (1.5 points per committee)	Up to 3.00	
Member of thesis/dissertation committee per student (1.0 points per committee)	Up to 2.00	
Chair of undergraduate honors thesis per student (1.0 points per student)	Up to 2.00	
Member of undergraduate honors thesis per student (0.5 points per student)	Up to 1.00	
Mentoring LEAD Scholars and RAMP (0.5 points per student)	Up to 1.00	
Newly assigned course never taught before, resulting in a new preparation (per class)	0.50	
Large class; any class over 48 (.10 per class)	Up to 0.50	
M and W courses taught (.10 per class)	Up to 0.50	
Participation or presentation/lecture at teaching workshop or other college/university (.10 per event)	Up to 0.50	
Teaching a graduate class (.50 per class)	Up to 1.00	
Creator of E-media, including development, simulation, etc. (per application)	0.50	
Teaching Award (per award; received during annual evaluation period)		
External Teaching award from ICHRIE or other respected institutions	3.00	
University Teaching Award	3.00	
College or Departmental Teaching Award	3.00	
Student Association Teaching Award By a SGA recognized association	1.00	
<b>Total of Section II (maximum of 5 points)</b>		
<b>SECTION III (maximum possible points = 2)</b>		
Department Chair teaching assessment <sup>3</sup>	Up to 2.00	
<b>Total Annual Points</b>		

Outstanding: 9.6 to 12 points  
 Above satisfactory: 7.8 - 9.5 points  
 Satisfactory: 4.8 - 7.7 points  
 Conditional: 2.4 - 4.7 points  
 Unsatisfactory: Below 2.4 points

**Evaluation of Research and Other Scholarly Activities**

<sup>1</sup> Excellence in teaching is expected for all faculty members regardless of rank or teaching load.

<sup>2</sup> Each faculty member can accumulate during the academic year evaluation period a maximum of 5 points in Section I, a maximum of 5 points in Section II, and a maximum of 2 points in Section III in Table 1.

<sup>3</sup> The chair's evaluation of teaching is related to the chair's overall assessment of the quality of a faculty member's annual teaching performance, and is based on teaching-related activities both inside and outside the classroom. .

The time frame for this research and scholarly activity portion of the evaluation is three academic years. The evaluation will correspond with the faculty member's assigned duties in the area of research and scholarly activities. Each faculty member will be evaluated for research and other scholarly activities based on the standards listed in Table 2. The total points for the activities listed in Section I and Section II of Table 2 will be accumulated for the past three academic years. The total points should then be divided by three to reach an annual average. When a faculty member joins the university with a prior record of research or scholarly activities, these activities over the past three academic years will be included in their evaluation at UCF. In the case of an assistant professor who joins the university without prior research or scholarly activities, their research and scholarly output will be evaluated from the beginning of the academic year in which they are employed at UCF.

The Department Chair shall consider the full range of research and scholarly activities and the contribution of accomplishments. Evidence of research and other creative activities shall include, but not be limited to, published books, articles, and papers in professional refereed journals, papers presented at meetings of professional conferences, funded grant activities, 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, other creative programs and contributions, and recognition by the academic and professional community.

Research effectiveness guidelines are provided below for the ratings of unsatisfactory, conditional, satisfactory, above satisfactory and outstanding. Please refer to Table 2 for research requirements and activities as well as for the total points required for the ratings of Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Conditional, and Unsatisfactory.

- **Outstanding:** The faculty member receives 9.6 to 12 total points in the research and scholarly activities listed in Table 2.
- **Above Satisfactory:** The faculty member receives 7.8 to 9.5 total points in the research and scholarly activities listed in Table 2.
- **Satisfactory:** The faculty member receives 4.8 to 7.7 total points in the research and scholarly activities listed in Table 2.
- **Conditional:** The faculty member receives 2.4 to 4.7 total points in the research and scholarly activities listed in Table 2.
- **Unsatisfactory:** The faculty member receives below 2.4 in total points in the research and scholarly activities listed in Table 2.

**Table 2: Research and Other Scholarly Activity Standards<sup>4</sup>**

	<b>Points<sup>5</sup></b>
<b>SECTION I (total points for three prior academic years with 26 point maximum)</b>	
Accepted refereed journal article in a first tier journal <sup>6</sup> (per article)	3.00
Accepted refereed journal article in a second tier journal <sup>7</sup> (per article)	1.00
Principal Investigator/Co-Investigator of external grant/contract funded (per grant)	
Below \$10,000 (per grant)	1.00
\$10,001 to \$25,000 (per grant)	2.00
\$25,001 and above(per grant)	3.00
<b>SECTION II (total points for three academic years with 10 point maximum)</b>	
Principal or Co-Investigator for submitted external grant/contract funded or unfunded (per grant)	0.50
Principal Investigator/Co-Investigator internal UCF or college grant funded (per grant)	1.00
Author/co-author of published textbook (per textbook)	1.00
Author/editor of published scholarly book chapter or case study (per publication)	0.50
Refereed paper presentation (per presentation)	0.50
Refereed poster presentation (per presentation)	0.25
Editor of a book of academic papers (per book)	2.00
Editor of non-refereed conference proceedings (per proceeding)	0.50
Editor of an academic journal (per journal)	2.00
Guest Editor / Associate Editor of a special issue for an academic journal (per issue)	1.00
Editorial Board Member or Associate Editor of an academic journal (per journal)	1.00
Ad-hoc reviewer academic journal (per journal)	0.50
Editor of refereed conference proceedings (per proceeding)	1.00
A national/international conference committee member or reviewer (per conference)	0.50
Chair/Co-chair of national/international research conference (per conference)	1.00
Research Awards (per award):	
Best paper/outstanding paper award from a journal	2.00
Best paper/outstanding paper award from a conference	1.00
University research award	2.00
College or Departmental research award	1.00
Scholarly work cited by other scholars during the evaluation period (per citation) <sup>8</sup>	0.10
Industry publication such as a report, an interview, newspaper, magazine article (per publication)	0.25
Non-funded industry or community research project (per project)	0.50
<b>Total Points (prior 3 years)</b>	
<b>Average Annual Points<sup>5</sup></b>	

**Average Annual Points**

Outstanding: 9.6 to 12 points

Above satisfactory: 7.8 - 9.5 points

Satisfactory: 4.8 - 7.7 points

Conditional: 2.4 – 4.7 points

Unsatisfactory: Below 2.4 points

<sup>4</sup> Research and scholarly activities are based on a period of three academic years. Journal articles will be counted upon the official notification of acceptance and will be counted only one time during the evaluation period.

<sup>5</sup> Each faculty member can accumulate over the prior three academic years a maximum of 26 points in Section I and a maximum of 10 points in Section II in Table 2, and then divide the total points by three to arrive at their average annual points. If a new faculty member has no research and scholarly activities in years prior to the most recent academic year, their total points for the prior academic year will represent their average annual points. If a faculty member has one or two years of prior scholarly and research activities, their total points should be divided by 2 and 3, respectively, to arrive at their average annual points.

<sup>6</sup> The list of tier one journals and other explanations are provided on the following page.

<sup>7</sup> Definition and explanations about second tier journal articles are provided on the following page.

<sup>8</sup> Faculty members are required to provide a list of their citations and evidence for each citation in their current CV.

### **First-Tier Journals**

The Foodservice and Lodging Management Department has determined that there are eight (8) academic journals to be considered as first-tier publications for faculty research in our area. To establish this list, we compared the hospitality journal rankings and methodology from McKercher, Law, and Lam (2006)<sup>9</sup>, Law and van der Veen (2008)<sup>10</sup> and Severt, Tesone, Bottorff, and Carpenter (2009)<sup>11</sup> for determining top hospitality program rankings. The following journals are presented in alphabetical order and are not ranked.

- Cornell Hospitality Quarterly
- International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management
- International Journal of Hospitality Management
- International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration
- Journal of Foodservice Business Research
- Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research
- Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management
- Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism

When a faculty member publishes a refereed journal article in a first-tier journal in other fields, which may include, but not be limited to, tourism, economics, strategic management, marketing, human resources management, and organizational behavior, such refereed article can be accepted as a first-tier journal article. However, the faculty member needs to provide evidence that the respective journal employs a double blind review process. Additionally, the journal should be considered equivalent or better than the first-tier journals selected by the FLM department, as supported by documented evidence. The department Chair and the Department Promotion & Tenure Committee can make the final decision based on the evidence provided. If necessary, the Department Chair or the Department Promotion & Tenure Committee may ask for the opinion of external experts from the hospitality field about the quality of the journal. Research notes, research-in-briefs, discussion papers, letters to the editor, book reviews and conference reports are not considered as refereed journal articles.

### **Second-Tier Journals**

In addition to the above list of first-tier journals, there are many other refereed journals in the hospitality and tourism field as well as in other fields. When a faculty member publishes a paper in a refereed journal outside the above list, it can be accepted as a second-tier journal article as long as the faculty member provides evidence that the respective journal employs a double blind review process and the paper went through the double blind review process. Research notes, research-in-briefs, discussion papers, letters to the editor, book reviews and conference reports are not considered as refereed journal articles.

---

<sup>9</sup> McKercher, B., Law, R. and Lam, T. (2006). "Rating tourism and hospitality journals," *Tourism Management*, Vol. 27, No. 6, pp. 1235-1252.

<sup>10</sup> Law, R. and van der Veen (2008). "The popularity of prestigious hospitality journals: a Google Scholar approach," *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 113-125.

<sup>11</sup> Severt, D. E., Tesone, D.V., Bottorff, T.J., and Carpenter, M.L. (2009). "A World Ranking of the Top 100 Hospitality and Tourism Programs," *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 451-470.

## **Evaluation of Service Performance**

The time frame for this service portion of the evaluation is one academic year. Each faculty member will be evaluated for their service activities based on the standards listed in Table 3. Internal, community and industry service is a responsibility of all faculty members. Faculty should demonstrate a willingness to support the university, college and 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 effectiveness guidelines are provided below for the ratings of unsatisfactory, conditional, satisfactory, above satisfactory and outstanding. Please refer to Table 3 for service requirements and activities as well as for the total points required for the ratings of Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Conditional, and Unsatisfactory.

- **Outstanding:** The faculty member receives 9.6 to 12 total points in the service activities listed in Table 3.
- **Above Satisfactory:** The faculty member receives 7.8 to 9.5 total points in the service activities listed in Table 3.
- **Satisfactory:** The faculty member receives 4.8 to 7.7 total points in the service activities listed in Table 3.
- **Conditional:** The faculty member receives 2.4 to 4.7 total points in the service activities listed in Table 3.
- **Unsatisfactory:** The faculty member receives below 2.4 in total points in the service activities listed in Table 3.

**Table 3: Service Standards**

	<b>Points<sup>12</sup></b>
<b>Section I</b>	
<b>University and College Service and Awards</b> (per committee, organization, award, or event)	
University committee active member	2.00
University committee leadership (i.e., P&T committee chair)	3.00
Serves on Faculty Senate	3.00
College or department committee active member	1.00
College or department committee leadership	2.00
Faculty advising of student clubs	1.00
Student association award (non-teaching) by a SGA recognized association	1.00
Voluntary university/college service activities/events	1.00
<b>Section II</b>	
<b>Industry and Community Service and Awards</b> (per committee, organization, activity, or event)	
Industry or community association/organization membership	1.00
Industry or community association committee member	2.00
Industry or community association Board Member, Chair, or President	3.00
Industry keynote speaker	2.00
Industry panel speaker	1.00
Active participation in an industry/community event	2.00
Industry/community service awards	1.00
Non-funded industry or community research project (per project)	0.50
Industry print or electronic media (report, newspaper/magazine article, blog, etc.)	0.25
<b>Total Annual Points</b>	

Outstanding: 9.6 to 12 points  
 Above satisfactory: 7.8 - 9.5 points  
 Satisfactory: 4.8 - 7.7 points  
 Conditional: 2.4 - 4.7 points  
 Unsatisfactory: Below 2.4 points

**Other Assignments:** Other university duties are occasionally assigned for special activities, such as administrative duties or other special projects. Since these assignments usually vary by faculty member, no attempt has been made to specify the nature or weighting of these assignments in this document.

<sup>12</sup> Each faculty member can accumulate a maximum of 12 combined points for Section I and Section II in Table 3.