

ANNUAL EVALUATION STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES

*KENNETH G. DIXON SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTING
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA*

Developed by faculty committee in Spring 2022

Approved by Kenneth G. Dixon School of Accounting faculty members by secret ballot
on 02/25/2022

Approved by CBA Dean on 03/10/2022

Approved by Faculty Excellence on 03/15/2022

Available for first use academic year 2022-2023

Introduction

The Dixon School Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP) is a work assignment and evaluation system designed for performance appraisal of faculty housed within the Dixon School. Depending upon faculty classification and assignment of duties, faculty will be assigned to one of the six tracks presented below. The objectives of the AESP are to:

- Provide examples of work assignments that permit faculty members, in consultation with the Director, to be placed in the track that best matches their teaching and research capabilities, professional goals, and interests, and supports the mission of the Dixon School.
- Promote high-quality research, teaching, and professional service by Dixon School faculty members.
- Facilitate the evaluation of faculty members' professional performance of assigned duties.

PART I - WORKLOAD TRACKS

Evaluation Weights by Assignment Track

Each year, the Director of the Dixon School will assess each faculty member's professional performance based on teaching, research, 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. 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

Professional Activity	Track A 8 Courses	Track B 7 Courses	Track C 6 Courses	Track D 5 Courses	Track E 4 Courses	Track F 3 Courses
Teaching	80%	70%	60%	50%	40%	30%
Research	10% ¹	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%
Service	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%

In general, annual assignments will be as follows:

¹ Faculty members in Track A may choose to be evaluated on Professional Development (Section IV below) in lieu of Research.

- Teaching & Student Engagement: Typically, the teaching and student engagement component of a faculty member's load will be between 30% and 80% and will be determined as follows: 10% per 3-hour course during the 9-month academic year (e.g., 4-4 load = 80%; a 2-2 load = 40%). The standard teaching load for faculty members in the Dixon School varies by rank: Instructors 4-4; Lecturers 3-3; tenure track faculty 2-2; however, the standard load may be reduced or increased as a function of research expectations and service expectations as agreed upon by the faculty member and the Director
- Research: Typically, the research component of a faculty member's load will be 0% for instructors, 30% for lecturers and between 30% and 60% (depending on previously agreed upon expectations between the faculty member and the Director) for tenure track faculty; and
- University & Professional Service: Typically, the service component of a faculty member's load will be 10%. However, the standard load may be increased or decreased based on expectations as previously agreed upon by the faculty member and the Director.

Evaluation of Other University Duties

Other university duties are occasionally assigned for special activities such as administrative duties or other special projects. Since the nature of these assignments is variable, no attempt is made to specify evaluation in proportion to the total amount of time the assignment is weighted in the annual assignment form. In those cases where other duties are a significant part of evaluating a faculty member's performance, the faculty member, in consultation with the Director, will determine alternate weights and include them on the faculty member's assignment form for all categories at the beginning of each academic year.

In the event that the assignment of duties document indicates a time allocation different from that assumed by the tracks designated in the AESP, the faculty member and Chair of the Dixon School of Accounting will determine and document expectations for each category (i.e., teaching, research, and service). If no expectations are documented a priori, the faculty member will be evaluated based on the criteria applicable to the lesser time allocation in each category.

Relationship between Annual Evaluation and Tenure/Promotion

The result of a faculty member's annual evaluation in the Dixon School of Accounting is just one of numerous components that are examined in the University tenure and/or promotion process. Therefore, it should NOT be construed that achieving a Satisfactory or higher rating in any or all annual evaluations will be sufficient to result in a positive tenure or promotion decision.

Modifications of the Annual Evaluation and Standards Procedures

The AESPs may require periodic changes and will be revised in accordance with the most current Collective Bargaining Agreement and changes in the Dixon School and College missions and objectives.

Data to be Included in the Spring Annual Report

In general, evaluation periods begin May 8th and continue through May 7th of the following year. Teaching and Service contributions are to be reported for the most recent academic year, which will comprise the previous Summer (if applicable), Fall, and Spring terms. Instructor Professional Development activities will also be reported for the most recent academic year. Research contributions are to be reported for the most recent five (5) academic years.

Faculty Annual Report due dates are determined by the current version of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

PART II – EVALUATION PROCESS AND STANDARDS

Goal Setting Meeting

Each faculty member in the Dixon School will meet with the Director no later than six weeks prior to the beginning of the evaluation period to discuss the faculty member's intended teaching, research, service, and professional development (if applicable) activities for the period relative to the school's needs. During or following that meeting, the faculty member and the Director will agree on intended activities and goals in each area of assignment. The activities are intended to be aligned with Dixon School and College goals. The faculty member and the Director also will come to agreement on specific goals for those activities. These activities and goals will be recorded on the Faculty Member Annual Goals form found in Appendix A, which shall be signed by the faculty member and the Director. If agreement is not reached, the faculty member may appeal to the Dean or representative to establish goals or may proceed with intended activities and be evaluated based on the standards stated in each section of this document.

In general, meeting the minimum standards for a Satisfactory rating in an area of assignment and achieving the goals for agreed upon exemplary activities in that area will result in an Outstanding rating in that area. Meeting the minimum standards for a Satisfactory rating in an area of assignment and making substantive progress on agreed upon exemplary activities in that area will result in an Above Satisfactory rating in that area. The faculty member can request a meeting with the Director 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 Goals form will be completed and signed.

Evaluation of Each Area of Assignment

Each area of assignment shall be assigned an annual rating of Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Conditional, or Unsatisfactory. In each of the remaining sections of this document relating to an area of assignment, minimum standards for achieving a rating of Satisfactory are described. Examples of additional exemplary activities are also listed. The evaluation in each area will be assigned as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

Overall Rating

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

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

The weight for each area shall be based on the percentages in the workload assignment. The numerical result shall be rounded to the nearest whole number and the overall rating of Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Conditional, or Unsatisfactory shall be assigned following the preceding numerical equivalences (e.g., 3.50 rounds to 4 which is an evaluation of Outstanding, whereas 3.49 rounds to 3 which is an evaluation of Above Satisfactory.)

The one exception to this general process is if the faculty member receives an evaluation of Unsatisfactory in any area of assignment, the faculty member's overall rating shall be Unsatisfactory for the evaluation period.

Faculty members cannot receive an overall rating that exceeds the rating received in their highest weighted assignment (Table 1).

PART III – STANDARDS FOR TEACHING, RESEARCH, SERVICE, AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

I. Teaching Overview

The Director will evaluate the teaching performance and effectiveness of each faculty member as part of the annual evaluation process (for the summer (if applicable), fall, and spring evaluation period). The faculty member's primary role in teaching is to foster student learning; therefore, the focus of these evaluation standards is on activities and accomplishments that directly foster learning by the faculty member's students. The evaluation of teaching is not a simple counting of the number or variety of activities undertaken by the faculty member; it seeks to measure efforts expended, progress made, and outcomes achieved.

For purposes of evaluation in the Dixon School of Accounting, teaching activity is defined as any activity in which the faculty member individually instructs, grades, and mentors a student or group of students. Teaching a course, developing curricula for a new course, or serving as a member on a dissertation committee is a teaching activity. However, acting in the role of faculty advisor to a student organization or attending a Meet the Firms event will count as service.

While recognizing that effective teaching has many aspects, the evaluation of the teaching component of a faculty member's assignment will be based primarily along three broad professional dimensions of teaching performance:

1. The academic content and pedagogy used in courses as documented by each faculty member
2. Student, peer, and self-documented measures of teaching effectiveness and engagement, and documented evidence of teaching effectiveness and engagement in student learning, and
3. Other documented teaching-related activities/achievements.

Sources of Information: Teaching

In forming the evaluation of teaching, the Director will consider the faculty member's teaching assignment for the year (number and types of courses) and the pre-established exemplary teaching activities agreed upon during the beginning-of-the-year goal setting meeting. The Director will gather information from:

- teaching, student, and faculty 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 Director 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 as soon as practicable and provided the opportunity to respond to it

- written reports, such as student perception of instruction (SPoI) numerical feedback and written comments
- teaching observations and evaluations, if conducted. If the Director, designee, or peer conducts observation and evaluation of teaching, it will be done according to the requirements of the most current Collective Bargaining Agreement and on an equitable basis (e.g., some defined group such as all faculty members in the first two years of UCF employment, all faculty members earning evaluations below Satisfactory in the previous year, etc.).

Minimum Standards for a Satisfactory Rating: Teaching

The minimum standards for teaching focus on the faculty member's teaching assignment, including work outside of the classroom that supports assigned courses and the students enrolled in them.

To earn a rating of Satisfactory or higher, the faculty member must do all of the following:

A. Course syllabi:

- Dixon School/College/University guidelines for preparation of syllabi are followed (University level guidelines are available through UCF's Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning [FCTL])
- course objectives are clearly stated
- learning outcomes are clearly stated
- assessment of learning outcomes is clearly stated and linked to course objectives
- evaluation (grading) procedures and standards are clearly stated

B. Course content:

- course content is current; it is based on contemporary research and practice in the field
- course materials (text, handouts, lectures, cases, etc.) are based on contemporary research and practice in the field
- where applicable and as designated by the curriculum committee, deliver coordinated (common) courses as designed by a Dixon School subcommittee (e.g., ACG 3131, ACG 3141, and ACG 4651)

C. Course structure and design:

- teaching/learning methods, technological tools, and course materials appropriate to each course are used to facilitate communication and active learning
- practical applications are infused into course materials and pedagogy
- classes are held as scheduled, including a final exam or other activity during the scheduled final exam period (unless a written exemption is granted by the Director, in advance where possible)

D. Evaluation of student performance:

- course contains multiple, timely, and appropriate methods of measuring student performance
- course objectives and performance measures are in alignment
- informative and timely performance feedback is provided to students
- performance feedback should reflect meaningful differences in performance across students as demonstrated by grade distributions

E. Curriculum development:

- active participation in Dixon School and/or program curriculum review and development process when asked/elected
- active and timely participation in deliberations on assessment results

F. Professionalism:

- office hours are posted, are adequate in number, and are held when scheduled
- faculty member responds to student email messages and phone calls in a timely fashion
- student advising is performed when asked to do so
- information to students (regarding, e.g., internships, job fairs, co-curricular opportunities, COBA Exchange speakers) is relayed on a timely basis
- demonstrate a high level of engagement with students through active participation in student-focused events (e.g., Welcome to the Majors, Meet the Firms, Career Week, weekly lunches, Beta Alpha Psi and/or other Accounting Student Organization events, and commencement)
- mentors Ph.D. students/candidate and/or assistant professors teaching the same primary course taught
- acts in a professional manner and shows proper respect for students in classroom settings, in other face-to-face meetings, and in communications (this requirement does not preclude having high expectations for student efforts and behavior or high grading standards)
- adheres to the standards of conduct described in the UCF Code of Conduct
- maintains academic and/or professional qualifications necessary under accreditation standards (SACSCOC and AACSB) for your faculty classification and rank within that classification

Exemplary Teaching Activities

If the faculty member meets the minimum standards for a Satisfactory rating and the faculty member and Director fail to agree on goals for the review period, the Director will consider the following activities and apply them to the ratings guidelines described previously. These activities are not weighted equally, and not all activities are available or appropriate for faculty in different tracks (See Table 1) or different modes of course type (i.e., lecture capture or Ph.D. Seminars). The Director will consider the effort expended, the

substance/depth of the activity, the link to learning outcomes, and the outcome achieved for each exemplar on a faculty member's annual statement of goals.

Examples of Exemplary Teaching Activities

- course design/delivery that successfully incorporates multiple active learning techniques to encourage student engagement with the course content, and these techniques are directly linked to and support learning outcomes
- course design/delivery that successfully incorporates active learning techniques to encourage student engagement with other students in the class, and these techniques are directly linked to and support learning outcomes
- student learning is productively enhanced through use of technology above the minimum standards required for the course taught
- consistent use of higher-order learning activities in courses (e.g., essay exams, projects/cases, assignments requiring computer skills beyond word processing, assignments requiring quantitative analyses), and they are directly linked to and support learning outcomes
- integration of writing and/or speaking assignments into course that are directly linked to and support learning outcomes
- successfully developing and implementing a new course
- commendably chairing an Honors-in-the-Major thesis
- successfully supervising a student's independent study
- efficiently supervising accounting/tax internships
- chairing a Ph.D. dissertation with distinction
- effectively teaching a workshop at a professional meeting for other faculty or Ph.D. students
- student SPoI ratings above the Dixon School mean
- winning an internal UCF teaching award or a teaching award from an external organization (e.g., the American Accounting Association, American/Florida Institute of CPAs, Institute of Management Accountants)

The above list is not considered exhaustive; faculty members may bring to the attention of the Director and thoroughly document activities not included in the above list; and those may be counted towards the teaching performance evaluation. In addition, successful completion of other teaching-related activities as assigned by the Director during the evaluation period may be counted towards the teaching performance evaluation.

Unsatisfactory Evaluations. A remediation plan will be developed by the faculty member in consultation with the Director for implementation in the next evaluation period.

Examples of Different Ratings Outcomes

Example 1: Faculty member meets the standards for a Satisfactory evaluation. In addition, the faculty member developed and designed a new course that was well-received by students. Evaluation is Satisfactory.

Example 2: Faculty member meets the standards for a Satisfactory evaluation. In addition, the faculty member taught a new course that was well received by students; successfully incorporated data analytics into coursework; delivered an innovative teaching workshop; and their course design/delivery successfully incorporated multiple active learning techniques to encourage student engagement with the course content, and these techniques were directly linked to and supported learning outcomes. Evaluation is Above Satisfactory.

Example 3: Faculty member meets the standards for a Satisfactory evaluation. In addition, the faculty member chairs a Ph.D. dissertation with distinction; wins a teaching award from an external organization; and creates student consulting opportunities where they can practice and feature their skills to potential employers. Evaluation is Outstanding.

II. Research and Creative Activities Evaluation of Research Performance

The research component of each faculty member's assignment will be evaluated based on research accomplishments over the most recent five-year period. Publications (accepted or conditionally accepted) are counted for the latest 5-year period (including the evaluation year). Newly hired assistant professors with no credit towards tenure and newly hired lecturers will have their research in the first two years evaluated based on identifiable research activities (e.g., publications, journal submissions, papers that are to be revised and resubmitted to the same journal, working papers, etc.) at UCF. Newly-hired tenured faculty members will be evaluated over the most recent five-year period.

The Director shall consider research productivity and the contribution of this productivity to each faculty member's research program and to the mission and goals of the Dixon School and College. It is the responsibility of faculty members to fully document their research productivity and activities in the annual report. Scholarship is expected of all faculty members whose assignment includes a research dimension. While our primary research focus is on discipline-based scholarship, research publications in related disciplines and other types of academic and professional scholarship that are relevant to a faculty member's research program are also encouraged.

The Director's evaluation includes an evaluation of the quantity and quality of publications in scholarly journals and other academic outlets, research contracts and grants, and other exemplary activities. While input may be solicited from a faculty advisory committee, the ultimate performance appraisal is the sole responsibility of the Director. In determining the relative importance of different indicators of research productivity, the Director will give the highest importance to the following indicators:

1. The quantity and quality of publications in peer-reviewed, discipline-based journals and other academic, pedagogical, and professional outlets (see Table 2 and Table 3),
2. Quantity and quality of discipline-based research in appropriate out-of-field peer-reviewed, high-quality journals,
3. Research presentations at national and international peer reviewed conferences,
4. Internal and external awards recognizing published research,
5. Maintenance of academic qualification for AACSB/SACS accreditation (see Appendix C),
6. Research grants and contracts, and
7. Other exemplary activities that contribute to the research productivity of the Dixon School (see Table 4).

<p>Table 2. Evaluation of Quality of Research Publications</p> <p>The quality of research publications will be assessed using internationally recognized, well-respected measures of journal quality. These measures may include Web of Science Journal Citation Report impact factors, Google Scholar journal metrics, and external journal rankings such as the Financial Times Business 45 Top Journals, ABCD Australian Rankings, and the BYU Accounting Rankings.</p>
<p><i>The following definitions of journal types will be used in the evaluation of publication quality.</i></p>
<p>Premier Journals. This category consists of internationally recognized academic peer-reviewed generalist and specialist journals. Journals in this category must meet an elite quality threshold based on metrics such as journal citation reports, published journal ranking studies, and/or the consensus of senior researchers who are recognized experts in the area of research specialization.</p>
<p>High-quality research journals. This category consists of an additional limited set of academic peer-reviewed, basic research journals internationally recognized as quality research outlets. This includes several important national and international journals. In most cases, these journals are the major secondary outlets for academic work in specialty areas.</p>
<p>Other peer-reviewed journals. This category consists of all other peer-reviewed, basic research journals and high impact pedagogical journals.</p>
<p>Practice-oriented journals. This category consists of high impact practice-oriented journals.</p>
<p>Note: The Director has the discretion to use similar processes to evaluate the contribution, value, and quality of out-of-field (non-accounting) publications.</p>

Table 3. Evaluation of Quantity of Research Publications

A. The following matrix will be used to evaluate indicator 1 regarding whether the faculty member has published in high quality peer-reviewed journals or other outlets appropriate to the track assignment to meet requirements for a “Satisfactory” evaluation:

Tracks	Minimum Quantity Requirement for Satisfactory Evaluation
A-B	Publication in any journal as defined in Table 2 and maintenance of AACSB/SACS academic qualification.
C-D	Two (2) publications in “Other Peer-Reviewed” journals (or better) as defined in Table 2 and maintenance of AACSB/SACS academic qualification.
E-F	Two (2) publications in “High-Quality Research” journals (or better) as defined in Table 2 and maintenance of AACSB/SACS academic qualification.

The following matrix will be used to evaluate indicator 1 regarding whether the faculty member has published in high quality peer-reviewed journals or other outlets appropriate to the track assignment to meet requirements for an “Outstanding” evaluation:

Tracks	Minimum Quantity Requirement for Outstanding Evaluation
A-B	At least two (2) publications in any journals as defined in Table 2 and maintenance of AACSB/SACS academic qualification.
C-D	At least three (3) publications in “Other Peer-Reviewed” journals” (or better) as defined in Table 2—at least one of which is in a “High-Quality” or “Premier” publication—and maintenance of AACSB/SACS academic qualification.
E - F	At least one (1) publication in a “Premier” journal and at least two (2) other publication in a ”High-Quality” journal as defined in Table 2 and maintenance of AACSB/SACS academic qualification.

Table 4. Exemplary Research Activities
The Director’s evaluation of research considers evidence of exemplary activities beyond the quality of research publications. The Director will take these current year activities into account, the effort expended, the substance/depth of the activity, and the outcome achieved for each exemplar in making an overall assessment of a faculty member’s research performance.
• best publication award by national scholarly organization or premier journal
• best paper at a national conference
• CBA Excellence in Research Award recipient
• multiple publications in Premier and High-Quality journals (above those required for a rating)
• principle or co-investigator on external research contract or grant
• research presentation at an academic conference
• strong portfolio of research in progress
• co-authoring articles with doctoral students
The above list of exemplars of additional research activities is not considered to be exhaustive. Faculty members may bring to the attention of the Director activities not included in the above list that may be counted towards the performance evaluation. The faculty member and Director also may determine that certain time-intensive activities or an exceptional level of performance may count as more than one activity.

Overall Evaluation of Research Performance

The Director’s overall evaluation of a faculty member’s research performance will utilize the guidelines listed below:

- a) An “Outstanding” evaluation will be assigned if the faculty member meets the criteria for ‘Satisfactory’ and has excelled in several or all of the indicators used to evaluate research performance.
- b) An “Above Satisfactory” evaluation will be assigned if the faculty member meets the criteria for ‘Satisfactory’ and has made significant contributions in several or all of the indicators.
- c) A “Satisfactory” evaluation will indicate the faculty member has published in high quality peer-reviewed journals or other outlets appropriate to the track assignment, has maintained AACSB/SACS academic qualification and has made some additional contributions.
- d) A “Conditional” evaluation is assigned if a faculty member fails to meet Dixon School expectations for publications in high-quality peer-reviewed journals or other outlets appropriate to the track assignment.
- e) An “Unsatisfactory” evaluation is assigned if a faculty member fails to meet Dixon School expectations for publications in high-quality peer-reviewed journals or other outlets appropriate to the track assignment, and also fails to make contributions in a majority of the other indicator areas.

III. Service and Student Engagement

Overview

The Director of the Dixon School will evaluate the Service and Student Engagement efforts and achievements of the faculty member for the evaluation period as part of the annual evaluation process. The faculty member's primary goal in these efforts should be advancing the interests and meeting the needs of the Dixon School as well as the needs of the College of Business Administration, the University of Central Florida, the profession, and the business community. The evaluation of service and student engagement is not a simple counting of the number or variety of activities; it seeks to measure both efforts expended, and outcomes achieved.

Sources of Information

In the evaluation of service, the Director will consider the faculty member's interests, opportunities for service and engagement, and any activities and related goals to which the faculty member and Director agreed at the beginning of the evaluation period. The Director will gather information from:

- materials related to service and engagement submitted by the faculty member as a part of their annual report, which should thoroughly document all activities; and,
- public sources of information relating to the faculty member's service and engagement activities.

Minimum Standards for a Satisfactory Rating

To earn a rating of Satisfactory or higher, the expectations of a faculty member are a function of their faculty classification and rank, as follows:

All faculty members are expected to:

- attend all department and college assembly meetings, as scheduled, unless explicitly excused beforehand by the Chair
- serve on at least one department, college, or university committee. (Discretion will be used in this standard since the many of the committee memberships are elected.);
- engage in substantive activities to further the goals of the Dixon School (e.g., coordinate the accounting conference, edit and publish the department newsletter, organize events related to the Hall of Fame Banquet, serve as faculty advisor for an approved student organization).
- perform other activities beneficial to the University, College, or School, such as:
 - attend the annual Beta Alpha Psi Meet the Firms event
 - attend the Dixon School Annual Banquet
 - serve as marshal at graduation
 - participate in Majors Week.
- maintain professional qualifications as appropriate.

Faculty members in Tracks E and F are additionally expected to:

- maintain membership in appropriate professional organizations
- serve as editor, editorial board member or reviewer for research outlets (duties as appropriate for rank)
- attend graduation when required to perform a Ph.D. student hooding
- engage in active service as a committee member or perform similar work, such as serving on the:
 - college or program instructor/lecturer promotion committee
 - college Undergraduate Program Review Committee
 - faculty senate
 - student conduct board
- engage with specific employers or community organizations to facilitate school, college and student engagement with those organizations
- other college or university committees as agreed to with the Director.

Faculty members in Tracks A – D are additionally expected to:

- attend other events, such as Welcome to the Majors/Majors Week, as needed.
- deliver “talks” to professional associations or business groups.
- engage in active service as a committee member or perform similar work, such as serving on the:
 - college or program instructor/lecturer promotion committee
 - college Undergraduate Program Review Committee
 - faculty senate
 - student conduct board
- engage with specific employers or community organizations to facilitate school, college and student engagement with those organizations
- other college or university committees as agreed to with the Director.

Exemplary Activities

The following are examples of service activities that benefit the School, College, University, profession, and/or business community. These activities are not necessarily weighted equally. The Director will consider the effort expended, the substance/depth of the activity, and the outcome achieved. (NOTE: The following examples can be used as guidance for expectations if faculty members and the Director do not reach agreement on specific goals.)

Exemplary Internal Service/Engagement Examples:

- developing or sustaining a signature program for 30-50 high achieving students in the program
- developing or sustaining a community-focused conference (perhaps in conjunction with other organizations)

- fund raising for the Dixon School (such as scholarships, sponsorships of events or courses)
- serving on additional School, College, or University committees as agreed upon with the Director
- developing/maintaining a young alumnus or “friends of the Dixon School” organization
- serving on School, College, or University committees that meet regularly and perform a critical service or accomplish a major task (curriculum re-design)
- serving as a faculty advisor to one of the Dixon School student organizations

Exemplary Professional Service Examples:

- serving with distinction as a member of a journal’s Editorial Review Board, especially for Premier and High-Quality Research journals
- serving with distinction as an Editor or Special Issue Guest Editor, especially for Premier and High-Quality Research journals
- serving with distinction as an Editor-in-Chief, especially for Premier and High-Quality Research journals
- successful professional presentations, especially national/international associations (e.g., AAA, CSEAR meetings, AICPA, GFOA, IIA)
- invited talks/visits (other than job talks) for professional organizations or other universities
- non-elected participation in consequential activities of a professional association (e.g., consortia organizer, track-chair), especially at the national/international level
- serving with distinction in an elected leadership position on governing boards in professional associations, especially at the national/international level
- serving with distinction as an elected officer in professional association, especially at the national/international level.
- coordinating successful professional or academic conferences.
- Voluntary, consequential, service with accounting related associations (i.e., AICPA, FICPA, PCAOB, etc.) within the profession or UCF related entities (i.e., UCF’s Small Business Development Center).

Repetition of these activities, when possible, will provide additional justification for a higher rating.

Examples of Different Ratings Outcomes

Examples for Track A-D Faculty:

Example 1: Faculty member regularly attends School and College faculty meetings, and participates in and/or chairs a School, College, or University-level committee that meets regularly. Faculty member attended the Meet the Firms, the Spring Banquet, and works with the foundation to raise scholarships for the Dixon School and serves with distinction developing the School’s weekly and annual newsletters. Evaluation is Satisfactory.

Example 2: Faculty member meets the requirements for a Satisfactory evaluation, develops multiple successful extra-curricular student competitions involving, and funded by, industry partners. Evaluation is Above Satisfactory.

Example 3: Faculty member meets the requirements for a Satisfactory evaluation, successfully chairs a School or College committee (or serves on multiple committees) with heavy workloads, and/or serves with distinction on high-profile/heavy workload University-level committee(s). Successfully takes on important on-going tasks within the School and/or College (e.g., coordinates the Annual Accounting Conference and organizes three “success lunches”/year where high-GPA students interact with the members of the accounting profession to learn about job opportunities). Evaluation is Outstanding.

Additional/Alternative Examples of university service for Track E & F Faculty

Example 1: Faculty member regularly attends School and College faculty meetings, and participates in and/or chairs a School, College, or University-level) committee. Faculty member attends events such as the Fall or Spring graduation, Meet the Firms, the Spring Banquet. Attends and performs, with distinction, a substantive role at a AAA meeting , and serves as an *ad hoc* reviewer for AAA meetings and academic journals. Evaluation is Satisfactory.

Example 2: Faculty member meets the requirements for a Satisfactory evaluation, admirably performs several *ad hoc* reviews for Premier or and High-Quality Research journals and/or serves with distinction on an Editorial Review Board. and provides substantive service to at least one AAA committee. Evaluation is Above Satisfactory.

Example 3: Faculty member meets the requirements for Satisfactory evaluation, serves with distinction on the Editorial Review Board of a Premier journal and/or Editor at a Premier or and High-Quality Research journal. Faculty member also actively serves a professional organization in a voluntary elected or non-elected, consequential service role. Alternatively, the faculty member who is not an editor might have a major elected role in a national or international professional service organization that accomplished much during the period of their service. Evaluation is Outstanding.

Note: The examples for Tracks E and F will be considered in conjunction with the faculty member’s rank. For example, service on the Editorial Review Board of a of Premier journal may be outstanding service for an untenured faculty member but might only exemplify above satisfactory achievement for a full professor.

IV. Professional Development Overview ²

If a faculty member assigned to Track A (Table 1) elects with the consent of the Director to substitute Professional Development activities for Research requirements, the following section will apply for the evaluation of the professional development efforts and achievements. The faculty member's primary goal in professional development should be to maintain and extend their subject matter expertise in areas related to the teaching assignment. The evaluation of professional development is not a simple counting of the number or variety of activities; it seeks to measure both efforts expended, and outcomes achieved.

Sources of Information

In the evaluation of professional development, the Director will consider the faculty member's typical and anticipated teaching assignments and any professional development activities and related goals to which the faculty member and Director agreed at the beginning of the evaluation period. The Director will gather information from:

- materials related to professional development submitted by the faculty member as a part of their annual report, which should thoroughly document all activities and
- public sources of information relating to the faculty member's professional development activities.

Minimum Standards for a Satisfactory Rating

To earn a rating of Satisfactory or higher, the faculty member must do all of the following:

- take meaningful steps to maintain currency and relevancy for someone who is teaching the undergraduate courses typically assigned to the faculty member, as defined by AACSB and SACSCOC, which accredit the College of Business Administration and/or the Dixon School; and
- successfully complete a number of activities that demonstrate professional development
- achieving or maintaining professional certification.

Exemplary Activities

The following are examples of professional development activities that sustain and improve subject matter expertise. Activities must be directly related to the teaching assignment or needs of the Dixon School. These activities are not necessarily weighted equally. The

² Standards for evaluation for Professional Development are only available to faculty members assigned to Track A. For those in Track A, Professional Development activities can be substituted for Research requirements.

Director will consider the effort expended, the substance/depth of the activity, and the outcome achieved.

- publication in academic³ or practitioner focused outlets
- invited presentation at an academic or professional conference
- attendance at an academic or professional conference
- board membership
- editing and/or reviewing articles or books for possible publication
- reviewing textbooks
- publishing case studies
- serving as an expert witness.

Examples of Different Ratings Outcomes

Example 1: Faculty member maintains currency and relevancy per SACSCOC and AACSB, receives credit for 40 hours of CPE to maintain licensure, attends and presents a 90-minute session at a one-day teaching conference. Evaluation is Satisfactory.

Example 2: Faculty member maintains currency and relevancy per SACS and AACSB, receives credit for 40 hours of CPE to maintain licensure, and attends and presents at a teaching conference, works closely with the UCF FCTL to develop a new pedagogical technique that is implemented in the Dixon School or the College.

Example 3: Faculty member maintains currency and relevancy per SACSCOC and AACSB, publishes a peer-reviewed paper related to the teaching assignment in a national practitioner-focused journal, makes two invited presentations at national conferences related to the teaching assignment, and serves as a paid expert witness in an area related to the teaching assignment. Evaluation is Outstanding.

³ Publication of academic research may take more than a single year; therefore evidence of substantive research efforts, such as a completed working paper or a revise-and-resubmit request from a journal, will count as an exemplary activity in one year. Such activities are expected to have led to publication in the second year.

Appendix B

Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures Track Assignment Procedures and Standards

Standards

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

Procedures

1. Track assignments and changes in track assignments will be made in accordance with the most current Collective Bargaining Agreement. Every third year, each faculty member will request a track assignment (number of courses within the track range) that will last for a period of three years. This request must be made in writing by December 1 of the year preceding the fall semester in which the new track assignment is to begin. Requests for an assignment should be made by submitting the Faculty Track Assignment Application (shown below). Endowed Chair and Professorship holders will be evaluated in accordance with College policy. Faculty will be notified of the approved track assignment within 45 days of the receipt of the application by the Director and the Dean. Track assignments for untenured faculty are made by the Director and the Dean.
2. After a comprehensive review of the application, the Director, in consultation with the Dean, will make the final decision on track assignment. The Director will notify the faculty member of the assignment prior to making the final written assignment. If a faculty member is assigned to a track other than the track for which application was made, upon receiving that faculty member's written request, the Director will have a conference with the faculty member regarding the approved assignment. Upon written request, a faculty member may appeal the track assignment to the Dean.
3. The Director, in consultation with the faculty member, will decide on the distribution of courses between the fall and spring semesters. For example, a faculty member assigned to the "F" track (3 courses per year) could teach a 1-2 load, a 2-1 load, a 0-3 load or a 3-0 load. In making this allocation the Director will balance the faculty member's research and teaching goals with Dixon School's teaching needs and objectives.

4. A faculty member may request reassignment to a different track during the course of a three-year assignment period. This request can be made by submitting a new *Faculty Track Assignment Application* to the Director by December 1 of the year preceding the fall semester in which the proposed new track assignment would begin. The process for reviewing and responding to the application will be the same as the process described in item 2 above. Any change in track assignment initiated by the Director will be based on demonstrated performance and Dixon School needs and objectives. The Dean must approve all changes in track assignments.

KENNETH G. DIXON SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTING

TRACK ASSIGNMENT APPLICATION FORM

Date

Faculty Name ___ **(PRINT)**

Faculty Department or School

Current Track Assignment ___ **(No. of courses per academic year)**

Proposed Track Assignment ___ **(No. of courses per academic year)**

Term Proposed Track Assignment Would Begin ___ **(Semester & year)**

Summary Justification for Assignment (Use only the space below)

Required Attachments:

Current Vita

Summary of Research Activities

**UCF College of Business Administration
Faculty Research Summary**

Current Research: <i>Project Title or Description</i>	<i>Target Publication</i>	<i>*Category</i>	<i>**Type</i>	<i>Proposed Submission Date</i>	Co-author(s)	Status

***Category:** Premier, High-Quality, Other Peer-Reviewed, and Practice Oriented

****Type:** D=Discipline-based Scholarship, P=Contributions to Practice, L=Contributions to Learning/Pedagogy

The following decision has been reached regarding the proposed three-year track assignment.

Faculty Name ___ (PRINT)

Approved as Proposed

Track Assignment ___ (No. of courses per academic year)

When Track Assignment Will Begin ___ (Semester & year)

Approved as Modified Below

Track Assignment ___ (No. of courses per academic year)

When Track Assignment Will Begin ___ (Semester & year)

Signature *Director*

Dean Signature

Date Comments:

I acknowledge receiving my track assignment:

Faculty Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix C College AACSB Standards

SCHOLARLY ACADEMIC (SA):

The SA classification is divided into three sub-categories:

SA-Doctoral

SA-Masters

SA-Undergraduate

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

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

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

SA-Doctoral: Three academic publications during a rolling 5-year period. Normally, this requirement is met during the preceding five-year period by **three publications in high-quality peer-reviewed academic journals** related to their area of teaching responsibility.

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

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

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

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

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

PRACTICE ACADEMIC (PA):

A PA faculty member will generally have the following preparation:

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

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

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

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

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

Administrators shall be deemed to maintain their PA qualification for the duration of their tenure as an administrator

SCHOLARLY PRACTITIONER (SP):

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

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

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

INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTITIONER (IP):

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

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

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

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