

ANNUAL EVALUATION STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES

GUIDANCE FOR ANNUAL REPORT PREPARATION

*DEPARTMENT OF HOSPITALITY SERVICES
ROSEN COLLEGE OF HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA*

Developed by a faculty committee in Fall 2024 and Spring 2025(Committee members: N. Hua, J. Park, D. Weissberg, M. Altin, W. Wei, D. Kwun & A. Fyall). The amended version was approved by the Hospitality Services Department on 03.14.2025.

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Hospitality Services (HS) Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP) is a work assignment and evaluation system designed for performance appraisal of faculty housed within the HS Department. The plan has multiple tracks, which are differentiated by faculty classification, course load, and effort assigned to teaching, research, and service activities. The objectives of the AESP are to:

- Promote high-quality teaching, research, and service among the HS faculty.
- Guide faculty in engaging activities that help achieve the strategic goals of the Rosen College of Hospitality Management (RCHM).
- Facilitate a fair and constructive annual evaluation process that results in continued faculty growth.
- Provide a range of work assignments that permit faculty members to be evaluated according to the track designated on their assignment of duties, consistent with the mission of the department and deferential to the diversity of subject areas and respective outputs represented in HS faculty.
- Provides guidance to faculty on the development of their annual activity report and the reporting of the quality and impact of their activities across three workload categories: teaching, research, and service.
- Describe the standards for faculty performance in each rating category (i.e., xxx).
- Provide a framework for the Department Chair to communicate to a faculty member a qualitative assessment of their performance for assigned duties by providing written constructive feedback that will assist in improving their performance, expertise, and foster high-impact, high-quality teaching, research, and service by HS faculty members.

PART I - WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENT TRACKS

Evaluation by Workload Assignment Track

Each year, the HS Department Chair will assess each faculty member's professional performance based on teaching, research, and service activities, as well as any other assigned duties. Overall evaluations will be determined by weighting performance on each of the components by the faculty member's formal assignment of effort on each. There are four general types of assignment tracks available for faculty members with 9-month appointments in the HS Department:

- **Track 1:** 8 Courses per year (Instructor/Lecturer Track)
- **Track 2:** 4 Courses per year (Tenure Track)
- **Track 3:** 3 Courses per year (Tenure Track)
- **Track 4:** 2 Courses per year (Tenure Track)

If faculty complete summer teaching in the preceding year, then this will be included for evaluation purposes but not in determining their workload.

Evaluation of Other University Duties

It is recognized that circumstances may arise that warrant variations in the assignment of duties. Ultimately, each faculty member's annual performance evaluation will be based upon the actual workload assignment 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 Chair, will jointly define appropriate standards of performance and include them on the faculty member's assignment form for all categories at the beginning of each academic year.

Relationship between Annual Evaluation and Tenure/Promotion

The result of a faculty member's annual evaluation in the Rosen College of Hospitality Management (RCHM) 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.

Data to be included in the Spring Annual Report

The faculty annual report is due at the end of the Spring semester, on a date announced by Faculty Excellence. In general, evaluation periods begin at the end of the first week in August and continue through the end of the first week in May of the following year. Teaching and Service contributions are to be reported for the most recent academic year, which will comprise the previous Fall, Spring, and Summer (if relevant) terms. Research contributions are to be reported for the most recent three academic years to ensure longer-term authorship and grant activities are fully taken into consideration.

PART II – EVALUATION PROCESS AND STANDARDS

At the end of the evaluation period, the HS Chair shall evaluate each faculty member's performance. The evaluation shall follow the standards and procedures described in this document and the Assignment of Duties forms provided to the faculty member for the corresponding year or as modified during the year. Faculty Assignment of Duties varies depending upon the type of track faculty are on, as specified in Part I. There may be additional effort variation based upon other assigned duties.

Goal Setting Meeting

Each faculty member in the HS Department will meet with the Chair before or at the beginning of the evaluation period to discuss the faculty member's intended teaching, research, service activities, and/or additional assigned duties for the period. All faculty members submitting this form are expected to meet all the criteria for Satisfactory performance in teaching, research, and service, as delineated throughout this document. During or following that meeting, the faculty member and the Chair will agree on a plan or strategy for each assignment category and jointly define what additional activities or outcomes would contribute to achieving above satisfactory or outstanding results.

It is the joint responsibility of the Chair and Faculty member to meet and develop goals that will be indicative of high-quality and high-impact teaching, research, and service. As experts in their fields, faculty members are in the best position to identify the types of additional activities or outcomes that demonstrate quality and impact. Notwithstanding, the Chair will serve as a guide to the Faculty Member in the goal-setting process. The Faculty Member's goals for the next evaluation period shall be recorded and documented in the Faculty Member Annual Plan form found in Appendix 1.

While the agreement documented in the annual plan will guide faculty members towards achieving a rating of above satisfactory or outstanding, the Chair should allow for periodic goal reviews where faculty can present evidence of impactful accomplishments not included in the initial agreement. The purpose of this flexibility is to encourage dynamic faculty contributions that are demonstrative of quality and impact while still aligning with department, college, and university goals. Faculty Assignment of Duties varies depending upon the type of track faculty are on, as specified in Part I. There may be additional effort variation based on other assigned duties.

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 category of assignment for the relevant evaluation period (i.e., prior year for teaching and service; prior three years for research and creative activities). It is the responsibility of the Faculty Member to document activities and accomplishments in the annual report. Faculty are encouraged to use the annual report to explain the quality and impact of their activities and accomplishments. An updated Curriculum Vitae is also required from each faculty member as an appendix to their annual report.

Evaluation of Quality and Impact

Standards for a rating of **Satisfactory** in the core workload categories of teaching, research, and service are described in Parts III-V of this document. A rating of **Satisfactory** implies that the faculty member meets performance expectations consistent with the mission of the RCHM and the University of Central Florida (UCF).

It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to provide his/her evaluation of the quality and impact of the faculty member's performance. To guide the efforts of faculty, examples of additional activities and outcomes that are indicative of quality and impact for each workload category are provided in Appendix 2-4.

The additional activities and outcomes are intended to be significant and consequential endeavors, aligned with program and college goals, and indicative of high quality and impact. However, faculty members may elect to use additional efforts and activities to demonstrate quality and impact. This allows faculty to be flexible throughout the year to capitalize on unforeseen opportunities and situations that emerge.

To achieve Above Satisfactory or Outstanding ratings, the faculty member and HS Chair will agree on performance goals during the Goal Setting Meeting. These performance goals will be recorded on the Faculty Member Annual Plan form found in Appendix 1, which shall be signed by the faculty member and the HS Chair.

If an agreement is not reached with the Chair, the faculty member may appeal to the RCHM Dean or Dean's representative to establish goals or may proceed with intended activities/efforts and be evaluated based on the standards stated in each section of this document. The faculty member can request a meeting with the HS 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 Member Annual Plan form will be completed and signed.

PART III – STANDARDS FOR TEACHING AND STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Overview

The HS Chair will evaluate the teaching and student engagement performance and effectiveness of the faculty member for the evaluation period as part of the annual evaluation process. The evaluation of teaching is not a simple counting of the number or variety of activities; it seeks to measure both efforts expended, progress made, and outcomes achieved.

Sources of Information

In forming the evaluation of teaching and student engagement, the HS Chair will consider the faculty member's teaching assignment for the year (number, types of courses, and enrollment) and will receive information from (some examples can be found in Appendix 2):

- Teaching and student engagement-related materials submitted by the faculty member as a part of their annual report;
- Feedback from students, peers, and others regarding the faculty member's teaching performance and effectiveness. If the Chair receives negative feedback that might reasonably be expected to impact the faculty member's annual evaluation, the faculty member will be informed of this feedback in writing within seven days and provided the opportunity to respond to it;
- Written reports such as student perception of instruction (SPI) numerical feedback and written comments;
- Teaching observations and evaluations, if conducted. If the Chair, designee, or peer conducts an observation and evaluation of teaching, it will be done in accordance with UCF requirements and on an equitable basis.

Teaching Activities: Defined

It is important to clearly delineate faculty activities that are classified as "teaching-related." For purposes of evaluation in the HS Department, 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. Teaching activities also include the time and effort expended in the preparation of materials for these types of engagements, as well as the time and effort expended in any student assessments for these activities. Thus, acting in the role of a faculty advisor to a UCF-sponsored student organization is classified as a teaching-related activity. This is also true for faculty serving as a member of a thesis/dissertation committee and for the grading of a Ph.D. comprehensive written or oral exam.

Standards for a Satisfactory Rating

The standards for teaching and student engagement focus on the faculty members' teaching assignments, including work outside of the classroom that supports assigned classes and the students enrolled in them.

In order to earn a rating of **Satisfactory** or higher, the faculty member is expected to do the following for each course taught (if a faculty member completes any of the items in the Above Satisfactory or Outstanding and wishes that item to be considered for Satisfactory rating, the Chair can consider that request. The Chair will assess:

- faculty member meets essential teaching standards, such as holding classes as scheduled, including a final exam or other activity during the scheduled final exam period, and course updates to maintain relevancy;
- act in a professional manner in classrooms, in meetings, and in communications;
- faculty members at this level fulfill their teaching responsibilities, engage in mentoring, and participate in university or college-level teaching and learning workshops, colloquiums, or conferences.
- use a syllabus that includes all elements as required by the UCF Syllabus Policy, as well as adopt textbooks by the established deadlines;
- deliver the course as designed in the course's content description, including reporting on Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs) when appropriate;
- provide informative and timely performance feedback to students (e.g., grades and comments on assignments) using the rubrics established for the course;
- hold office hours consistent with the College policy;
- adhere to the standards of conduct described in the UCF Employee Code of Conduct.
- faculty efforts align with the college's mission and contribute to the core academic environment.

If the faculty member meets the standards for a **Satisfactory** rating, the Chair will consider a faculty member's additional activity for evidence of **Above Satisfactory** or **Outstanding** performance.

Outstanding:

- To achieve an "Outstanding" rating, the faculty member must demonstrate excellence in teaching.
- They must actively lead in mentoring roles, such as serving as Chair or lead in thesis or dissertation committees or providing significant mentorship to students or student-led organizations.
- The faculty member significantly revises existing course(s) to enhance student learning.
- They actively contribute to the academic community by presenting at or coordinating teaching and learning conferences, workshops, or colloquiums at the college, university, or external levels.

- Additionally, they effectively implement innovative teaching methodologies that positively impact student outcomes or consistently demonstrate leadership through peer observation feedback or collaborative efforts.
- Recognition through prestigious teaching awards or other external accolades further distinguishes this level.
- Organize or actively lead university or college-level teaching and learning events.

Above Satisfactory:

- An "Above Satisfactory" rating requires stronger teaching performance than a "Satisfactory" rating.
- Faculty members participate in committees or, serve as members of thesis or dissertation committees, or engage in student mentoring.
- They regularly update their courses to improve content and student learning outcomes and effectively employ diverse teaching methodologies.
- Participation in professional development is essential, with the expectation of involvement in university or college-level teaching and learning events.
- Receiving college or departmental teaching awards also contribute to achieving this rating.

Conditional:

- A "Conditional" rating signifies that there are areas in need of significant improvement.
 - For example, a lack of active engagement in course updates, committee involvement, or mentoring activities.
 - Failing to meet syllabus and textbook order deadlines
- Their participation in professional development, such as attending workshops, colloquiums, or conferences, is inadequate to improve teaching.
- Faculty members at this level may face challenges in effectively performing the 'satisfaction' level and contributing to essential departmental goals.

Unsatisfactory:

- An "Unsatisfactory" rating reflects inadequate teaching performance.
- No evidence of updating course content or syllabi.
- Faculty members at this level may face significant challenges in effectively performing the 'satisfaction' level and contributing to essential departmental goals.
- Prevalent negative feedback from students and a lack of efforts to address these issues indicate a failure to fulfill essential teaching responsibilities.

In considering the impact of a faculty 'member's teaching and student engagement, the Chair shall take into account other factors, such as the number of SPI submissions, SPIs in similar courses, class sizes, or student credit hours, when conducting their evaluation and award consideration for the differential time and effort dedicated to large course enrollments.

PART IV – STANDARDS FOR RESEARCH & CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

Overview

Faculty with a research assignment will be evaluated on the basis of research publications and internal or external grant/contract submissions and/or awards. The research publication and grant components of this assignment category will be evaluated on the basis of publication and grant/contract activity over the most recent three-year period. Additional research activities in Appendix 3 are some examples to be considered.

Sources of Information

In the evaluation of research activity, the Chair will assess the caliber of the faculty member's most recent three-year publication and grant record, as measured by the Quartile of the journals in which those publications appear and the sources and amounts of grant funding awarded in the HURON and AURORA reports, or the relevant university reporting system(s) for research grants, patents, and licensing. Newly hired assistant professors with no credit towards tenure will have their research evaluated annually (for the first two years) on the basis of identifiable research activities at UCF (e.g., publications, journal submissions, papers that are to be revised and resubmitted to the same journal, working papers, grant submissions, etc.). 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 Chair will rely on information provided in the faculty member's annual evaluation portfolio to gauge the quality and impact of the additional research activities engaged during the evaluation period.

Standards for a Satisfactory Rating

A rating on research activities will only be provided for HS faculty who have a research assignment. Table 1 displays those standards for all faculty who have a research assignment. The standards for research and creative activities are performance expectations over a three-year period. When faculty are engaged in a large number or high-value project(s) or contract(s), this may result in considerable time commitments with a negative impact on research publication productivity in the evaluation periods in which the project(s) is being conducted; therefore, the standard number of publications will be reviewed by the Chair to ensure equity and fairness.

Different workload assignment tracks carry with them different research expectations; therefore, standards for the various ratings will be a function of the assignment track as determined by the assignment of duties. Table 1 summarizes the research accomplishments necessary to obtain a **Satisfactory** rating for the different workload assignment tracks. The Chair will assess faculty performance among the following tracks against research expectations:

Table 1. Standards for Satisfactory Research Rating by Faculty Workload Assignment Track (Over the Last Three Academic Years)

Track 1 (8 courses)	Track 2 (4 courses)	Track 3 (3 courses)	Track 4 (2 courses)
<p>Faculty with no research assignment</p> <p>(typically, faculty at the rank of Instructor, Associate Instructor, Senior Instructor, Lecturer, Associate Lecturer, or Senior Lecturer) will not be expected to conduct research.</p>	<p>Publish 2 articles in refereed academic journals.</p> <p>Publish at least 1 of the above in an SSCI indexed, Scopus Q1 & Q2, or the College Indicative List.</p> <p>Submit one grant, contract, or consultancy proposal as PI or Co-PI.</p> <p>Beyond the 2 articles published as specified above, two Scopus Q1 or SSCI articles would be considered equivalent to one grant application;</p> <p>Present at one peer-reviewed academic conference or an invited presentation.</p>	<p>Publish 3 articles in refereed academic journals.</p> <p>Publish at least 1 of the above in an SSCI indexed, Scopus Q1 & Q2, or the College Indicative List.</p> <p>Submit one grant, contract, or consultancy proposal as PI or Co-PI.</p> <p>Beyond the 3 articles published as specified above, two Scopus Q1 or SSCI articles would be considered equivalent to one grant application.</p> <p>Present at two peer-reviewed academic conferences or an invited presentation.</p>	<p>Publish 4 articles in refereed academic journals.</p> <p>Publish at least 2 of the above in an SSCI (or Scopus) index and the College Indicative List.</p> <p>Submit at least 2 grants, contracts, or consultancy proposals as PI or Co-PI.</p> <p>Present in two peer-reviewed academic conferences or invited presentations.</p>

Note: Publication records will be based on the Acceptance letters

Track 2:

Outstanding

1. To achieve an "Outstanding" rating, the faculty member must demonstrate stronger research performance based on the criteria established by "Above Satisfactory." For example, a faculty member published four articles with at least one in an SSCI-indexed journal, secured two external grants, or published at least three articles in an SSCI indexed, Scopus Q1 & Q2, or the College Indicative List.
2. Faculty members at this level may be recognized through various categories, such as research awards, authoring scholarly books or chapters, making impactful conference presentations, or keynote speeches at academic conferences.

Above Satisfactory

1. To achieve an "Above Satisfactory" rating, the faculty member must demonstrate stronger research performance based on the criteria established by Satisfactory. For example, a faculty member published three articles with at least one in an SSCI-indexed journal, secured one external grant, or published at least two articles in an SSCI indexed, Scopus Q1 & Q2, or the College Indicative List, or two conference presentations.

Conditional

1. A "Conditional" rating suggests that faculty members need to improve their research activities.
2. Scholarly contributions are limited and below the satisfactory level.
3. There is little or no effort to secure research funding, involvement in presentations, or collaborative projects.

Unsatisfactory

1. An "Unsatisfactory" rating reflects inadequate research performance.
2. Faculty members in this category demonstrate no publication records in refereed journals, lack involvement in research projects or funding efforts, and fail to contribute to the academic or professional community through presentations or industry publications.

Track 3:

Outstanding

1. To achieve an " Outstanding " rating, the faculty member must demonstrate stronger research performance based on the criteria established by "Above Satisfactory." For example, a faculty member published five articles with at least one in an indexed journal, or submitted one and secured two external grants, or published at least three articles in an SSCI-indexed, Scopus Q1 & Q2, or the College Indicative List.
2. Faculty members at this level may be recognized through various categories, such as research awards, authoring scholarly books or chapters, making impactful conference presentations, or keynote speeches at academic conferences.

Above Satisfactory

1. To achieve an "Above Satisfactory" rating, the faculty member must demonstrate stronger research performance based on the criteria established by Satisfactory. For example, a faculty member published three articles with at least two in an SSCI-indexed journal, submitted two grant proposals and secured one external grant, or published at least two articles in an SSCI indexed, Scopus Q1 & Q2, or the College Indicative List, or three conference presentations.

Conditional

1. A "Conditional" rating suggests that faculty members need to improve their research activities.
2. Scholarly contributions are limited, with only a few journal publications.
3. There is little or no effort to secure research funding, involvement in presentations, or collaborative projects.

Unsatisfactory

1. An "Unsatisfactory" rating reflects inadequate research performance.

2. Faculty members in this category demonstrate few or no publication records in refereed journals, lack involvement in research projects or funding efforts, and fail to contribute to the academic or professional community through presentations or industry publications.

Track 4:

Outstanding

1. To achieve an "Outstanding" rating, the faculty member must demonstrate stronger research performance based on the criteria established by "Above Satisfactory." For example, a faculty member published six articles with at least two in an SSCI-indexed journal, or submitted two and secured two external grants, or published at least three articles in an SSCI indexed, Scopus Q1 & Q2, or the College Indicative List.
2. Faculty members at this level may be recognized through various categories, such as research awards, authoring scholarly books or chapters, making impactful conference presentations, or keynote speeches at academic conferences.

Above Satisfactory

1. To achieve an "Above Satisfactory" rating, the faculty member must demonstrate stronger research performance based on the criteria established by Satisfactory. For example, a faculty member published five articles with at least two in an SSCI-indexed journal, or submitted two and secured one external grant, or published at least four articles in an SSCI indexed, Scopus Q1 & Q2, or the College Indicative List, or four conference presentations.

Conditional

1. A "Conditional" rating suggests that faculty members need to improve their research activities.
2. Scholarly contributions are limited, with only a few journal publications.
3. There is little or no effort to secure research funding, involvement in presentations, or collaborative projects.

Unsatisfactory

1. An "Unsatisfactory" rating reflects inadequate research performance.
2. Faculty members in this category demonstrate few or no publication records in refereed journals, lack involvement in research projects or funding efforts, and fail to contribute to the academic or professional community through presentations or industry publications.

The quality of scholarly publications shall be evaluated using widely available metrics for judging the quality and impact of different journals. The Chair shall rely on metrics developed by the scientific publisher Elsevier in the Scopus database to identify how a given journal ranks in the distribution of journals in that subject area. Accordingly, the journals with the highest quality are ranked in the top quartile of a subject area (Q1), the second highest quality journals are those in the second quartile (Q2), the third highest quality journals are those in the third quartile (Q3), and the journals in the fourth quartile are deemed to be of lower quality (Q4). Faculty are encouraged to always publish in journals indexed in the Scopus and Web of Science databases, since journals that are not indexed cannot be assessed using this framework. Specifically, faculty are encouraged to publish in journals indexed in the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI), the Science Citation

Index Expanded (SCIE), the Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI), the Arts & Humanities Citation Index (AHCI), or the Conference Proceedings Citation Index (CPCI). Faculty are discouraged from publishing in predatory journals or any outlets that are not indexed in Scopus or Web of Science.

Beyond the quality of journals, faculty can demonstrate the impact of their activities in terms of their contribution to each publication, grant submission, or funded award, such as being the lead author or principal investigator, or the sole author. Similarly, faculty can demonstrate impact through the demonstrated use of research outputs to advance early career researchers such as graduate students, junior faculty, and visiting scholars, as indicated by co-authorship with early career researchers. In addition, faculty can demonstrate the reach of their impact through co-authorship of publications or grants with international collaborators. To discern differences in quality and impact for grant awards, the Chair shall consider the source and competitiveness of funding sources, as well as the role of the faculty member in those funded projects and the amount of funds awarded to the faculty member in the HURON and AURORA reports. Furthermore, the Chair shall consider licensing and patents secured by the faculty member as indicators of the quality and impact of research and creative activities.

PART V – STANDARDS FOR SERVICE

Overview

The HS Chair will evaluate the university and professional service efforts and achievements of the faculty member for the evaluation period as part of the annual evaluation process. The evaluation of service is not a simple counting of the number or variety of activities; it seeks to measure time and effort expended as well as the impact of outcomes achieved. It will be the responsibility of the faculty member to document the service activities, time expended, and outcomes achieved in the Faculty Annual Report. There are many service assignments and activities that, individually, may seem minor, but collectively are critical to the day-to-day operation of the department, college, and university.

Sources of Information

In the evaluation of service, the Chair will assess the faculty member's performance on the following. The Chair will receive information from materials related to service submitted by the faculty member as a part of his or her annual report, which should thoroughly document all activities (some examples can be found in Appendix 4).

Standards for a Satisfactory Rating

In order to earn a rating of **Satisfactory** or higher, the Chair will assess faculty members' performance on the following:

The faculty member meets the fundamental standards for service, such as:

- Participate in department, college, or university committees.
- Contribute to events or engage in community or industry activities. Service efforts at this level include basic participation in student organizations, volunteering for events or performing routine review work for journals or conferences.

Outstanding (meeting at least three of the following four criteria in addition to being satisfactory)

1. An "Outstanding" rating in service reflects exceptional contributions across multiple levels, including university, college, and the broader academic community.
2. Faculty members at this level hold leadership positions in key committees, such as chairing university or department-level committees and national or international conference committees. They are actively involved in voluntary service activities, serve as advisors for student organizations, and contribute to university or college-wide events.
3. They demonstrate strong industry and community engagement through leadership roles or recognized service awards.
4. Faculty members contribute extensively to the academic profession by editing books or serving editorial roles in journals.
5. Faculty members commit long hours and extensive efforts in serving students.

Above Satisfactory (meeting at least two of the following three criteria in addition to being satisfactory)

1. To achieve an "Above Satisfactory" rating, the faculty member must show strong involvement in university, college, or departmental service activities. This includes serving as a member of multiple committees, volunteering for service events, or acting as a faculty advisor for student organizations.
2. Faculty members at this level may also engage in community or industry organizations, taking on roles such as panel members or advisory board members. They contribute to the academic profession by reviewing for journals, serving on editorial boards, or holding conference committee memberships.
3. Recognitions, such as industry or community awards, also align with this level.

Conditional

1. A "Conditional" rating suggests that service activities need improvement.
2. Faculty members at this level show limited committee involvement or lack active participation in required service activities.
3. They miss meetings frequently, offer few contributions to events or organizations, or have no evidence of leadership roles.

Unsatisfactory

1. An "Unsatisfactory" rating reflects inadequate service performance.
2. Faculty members at this level demonstrate inadequate involvement in university, college, or departmental service activities.
3. They do not participate in committees, voluntary events, advising roles, or lack engagement with community or industry organizations.

APPENDIX 1

Faculty Member Annual Summary & Goals

August 8, 20XX- May 7, 20XX Evaluation Period

All faculty members submitting this form are expected to meet all the criteria for **Satisfactory** performance in teaching, research, and service, as delineated throughout this document. The additional activities that are listed in this form will serve towards achieving **Above Satisfactory** or **Outstanding**.

Faculty Name:

Type of Submission (check one):

Initial Plan Submission

Plan Evaluation

Date of Submission:

Teaching

Summary Report & Achieved Additional Activities

--

Goals for Following Academic Year

--

Research

Summary Report & Achieved Additional Activities

--

Goals for the Following Academic Year

--

Service

Summary Report & Achieved Additional Activities

--

Goals for the Following Academic Year

--

Signatures

_____	_____	_____	_____
Faculty Member	Date	HS Chair	Date

APPENDIX 2

Activity Examples to Demonstrate Quality and Impact in Teaching

Sample activities that indicate quality and impact in teaching may include, but are not limited to:

Teaching & Course Development

- Designing a newly assigned course (a course that exists but your first time teaching it)
- New course preparation (never taught; change of modality; or not taught within 3+ years)
- Involvement in teaching and curriculum development assignments
- State (or higher) course quality designation (e.g., State of FL Quality Online Course)
- University high-quality course designation (High-Quality Course badge)
- University course quality designation (Quality Course badge)
- Participating in affordability counts initiatives and building textbooks into classes at low or no cost to students
- Author or co-author of an Open Educational Resource (OER) for a course
- Expanding the body of knowledge in pedagogical/pedagogical practices (publish articles, chapters, or magazine pieces in journals or other publications focused on pedagogy/andragogy)

Student Support & Mentorship

- Chair of thesis/dissertation committee
- Member of thesis/dissertation committee
- Chair of undergraduate honors thesis
- Member of the undergraduate honors thesis
- Advising a student club (RSO Advisor)
- Working with RAMP, LEAD Scholar, or Honor student
- Conducting Department/College approved independent study
- Generation of student credit hours (i.e., the number of students multiplied by course credit hours)

Professional Development & Recognition

- Professional or peer instructional evaluations (satisfactory or higher)
- Individual professional development efforts (e.g., professional diplomas, certifications, etc.)
- Receiving a teaching award at UCF or from other respected institutions
- Active participation/presentation at a teaching and learning conference/workshop
- Lead a research workshop or seminar for students, faculty, or professionals (e.g., NGOs, professional industry organizations) that can include a lead speaker or panelist (e.g., webinar, seminar, workshop, etc.).
- Received internal/external funding from an education-related program (e.g., CDL for course redesign initiative, etc.; cannot be recognized in research)

Program Development

- Degree underwriting for a new degree program
- Certificate underwriting for a new program
- Study abroad program development

- Created a continuing education program (e.g., industry or academic educational seminar held at UCF/RCHM or beyond)

Leadership & Engagement

- Chair or serve as a course leader
- Serving as an assessment coordinator or reviewer
- Production of or active involvement in a college event
- Using industry immersion (such as participating in webinars, site visits, and industry advisory boards)
- Serving as a guest speaker in another class

OTHER TEACHING ACTIVITIES AGREED UPON WITH THE FACULTY MEMBER & THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR

The above list of additional teaching 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 performance evaluation. The faculty member and HS Chair may also determine that certain time-intensive activities or an exceptional level of performance may count as more than one activity.

APPENDIX 3

Activity Examples to Demonstrate Quality and Impact in Research and Creative Activities

Sample activities that indicate quality and impact in research may include, but are not limited to:

Research Publications & Authorship

- Publishing more articles than the required minimum (consider authorship, evidence of collaboration with graduate students/junior faculty/visiting scholar/post-doc fellow; cross-disciplinary collaboration)
- Having multiple publications in Q1 journals
- Publishing a paper or abstract in proceedings of a national/international academic conference
- Publishing case studies/books/book chapters
- Publishing in industry magazines or journals
- Co-authoring with individuals from other countries
- Editing/reviewing articles or books for possible publication

Research Funding & Grants

- Submitting more or higher-value grant proposals
- Leading an interdisciplinary team in submitting larger external grants (>1 million) as PI or Co-PI
- Receiving more or higher value grants and contracts
- Receiving internal and external funding for research-related programs (e.g., CDL for course redesign initiatives)

Awards & Recognition

- Receiving best paper/outstanding paper publication award from a national/international scholarly organization, a journal, or a conference
- Receiving research awards (RIA, Excellence in Research)
- Best paper/outstanding paper award from a journal
- Best paper/outstanding paper award from a conference
- Industry research award from a professional organization

Research Impact & Application

- Media coverage of research outcomes
- Research outcomes adopted or implemented by communities, institutions, industry partners, and governmental/non-governmental agencies
- Research leading to policy changes, new regulations, new programs or services, or other societal impacts

Research Skills & Development

- Attending a seminar/workshop for developing research skills or grantsmanship
- Acquiring a certificate in research skills

Intellectual Property, Innovation, & Leadership

- Filing provisional or non-provisional patents or receiving patent awards.

- Invited speaker (keynote presentation or panel) at an academic, industry, government, association, community, or conference event (at UCF or beyond)

OTHER RESEARCH ACTIVITIES AGREED UPON WITH THE FACULTY MEMBER & THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR.

The above list 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 performance evaluation. The faculty member and HS Chair may also determine that certain time-intensive activities or an exceptional level of performance may count as more than one activity.

APPENDIX 4

Activity Examples to Demonstrate Quality and Impact in Service

The following are examples of additional service activities that benefit the program, college, university, profession, and/or business community. Additional service activities include, but are not limited to:

University, College, and Department Leadership

- Serving on more committees than the minimum requirement
- University or board leadership
- College committee leadership
- Department committee leadership
- Faculty Senate membership
- Mentorship of new faculty
- Serve as a judge for student contests
- Participate in RCHM promotional activities (e.g., student recruitment, State of the College Video, student events, etc.)

Professional Engagement & Service

- Maintain membership in appropriate professional organizations
- Serving on a committee for national/international research academic, industry/government/civic organizations
- Volunteer for an industry organization to assist with research efforts (i.e., survey design/distribution/analysis, leads, focus group, etc.)
- Deliver "talks/seminars" to professional associations, business groups, governments, or civic organizations
- Fundraising for a program or the college (e.g., event sponsorships or courses)
- Volunteer for university/college/high school events (e.g., Recruit/open house events, EMCEE at an awards ceremony, assist with event registration, present at a student event (POMP), UCF Research Week, judge student contests, etc.)
- Create, set up, or start a new student chapter of an industry organization and/or assist an existing student chapter with re-organization/SOPs/membership strategy, etc.
- Receiving Industry and Community Service Awards
- Receiving a Student Association Award – Non-Teaching (RSO)
- Leading an Academic, Industry, or Community Association/Organization
- Assist in the production of an RCHM event (e.g., Hospitality Hall of Fame, career fair (aside from teaching the class), live production, etc.)
- Active participation in an industry/community event
- Provide a lecture for an individual/organization outside of UCF occurring at UCF

Advisory Boards & External Committees

- Serve on Rosen/UCF/external industry advisory board
- Chair or co-chair an Advisory Board (internal or external)
- Being involved in industry/community service/scholarship awards
- Serving on a corporate or government board
- Serving as an expert witness

Editorial & Academic Conference Roles

- Editing a book/non-referred or refereed conference proceedings/an academic journal
- Serving as an editor-in-chief/co-editor/associate editor/assistant editor for an academic journal
- Serving as a Guest Editor/Associate Editor of a Special Issue for an academic journal
- Serving as an Editorial Board Member of an academic journal
- Serving as an ad-hoc reviewer for an academic journal
- Serve on an organizing/planning committee for a national/international research/academic/industry/government/civic organization conference
- Chair/co-chair an organizing/planning committee for a national/international research/academic/industry/government/civic conference
- Being a member of a national/international research/academic/industry conference committee (e.g., scientific review committee, speaker selection committee, etc.)
- Serve as moderator at a conference session
- Reviewing for a national/international research/academic/industry conference

Industry, Government, & Civic Service

- Editing a discipline-related book
- Serve as a moderator at a conference session

OTHER SERVICE ACTIVITIES AGREED UPON WITH THE FACULTY MEMBER & THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR

The above list of additional service 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 performance evaluation. The faculty member and HS Chair may also determine that certain time-intensive activities or an exceptional level of performance may count as more than one activity.