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Introduction

The Faculty Workload Option Plan is a work assignment and evaluation system designed for faculty performance appraisal and merit distribution within the School, intended to capitalize on each faculty member's professional strengths and at the same time promote a strong School.

Advantages of the Plan include:

Faculty members, in consultation with the director, will have an opportunity to choose the option that best matches their training, professional goals, and interests.

Faculty members will be able to capitalize on their professional strengths and will be evaluated and rewarded relative to those strengths.

Faculty members will be judged against standards within their own selected track, which reflect their own teaching, research, and service performance. Evaluations will be based on the approved standards for the option selected by the faculty member.

At a time when there is increasing emphasis in universities for both quality and quantity of teaching and research, this Faculty Workload Option Plan should help the School attain these seemingly conflicting objectives more readily.

Implementation of the plan should result in an increase in the School's teaching effectiveness and research output. Further, the School’s prestige and ability to obtain both internal and external resources should be enhanced.

PART I - WORKLOAD OPTIONS

Allocation of Faculty Effort by Option

Each year, the director will assess each faculty member's performance based on teaching, research and service. Overall evaluations will be determined by weighting performance on each of the components (teaching, research, service). The faculty member's formal academic assignment for each of the preceding activities will be determined on the basis of the respective target weights for each faculty member’s assigned track. The table below contains the targeted assignment weights for teaching, research and service for each assignment option.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Activity</th>
<th>Track A 8-Courses per year</th>
<th>Track B 7-Courses per year</th>
<th>Track C 6-courses per year</th>
<th>Track D 5-Courses per year</th>
<th>Track E 4-Courses per year</th>
<th>Track F 3-Courses per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Activities</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Activities</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Activities</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All faculty members at, or above, the rank of assistant professor must apply for assignment to one of the above tracks under the terms of the College’s Workload Option Plan “Workload Assignment and Procedures Criteria” document. Untenured Assistant Professors will generally be assigned to Track E (4-Courses per year) through the year when their tenure status is decided.

Faculty and the director will jointly decide on the distribution of courses between the semesters. For example, a faculty member who is assigned to the “F” track (3 courses per year) could teach a 1-2 load, or a 3-0 load. While it is expected that most faculty members' time will be allocated in the proportions given above, it is recognized that circumstances exist which may warrant variations in the percentages under each track. In such cases, the appropriate percentages will be determined through consultation between the faculty member and director. Furthermore, performance expectations will be adjusted accordingly.

Both the director and the faculty can jointly agree to modify annual assignments during the life of the three-year FWOP agreement under terms of the College’s Workload Option Plan “Workload Assignment Procedures and Criteria” document. As specified in this document, applications must be submitted by October 31 of year preceding the desired change.

**Evaluation Time Frame**

The annual evaluation process will consider teaching and service activities for the current year and research over the preceding three-year period (including the current year.) Faculty who have been members of the School for less than three years will have the option of using this three-year period, or a pro rata evaluation of research during the period of time at UCF.

**Implementation**

This plan will be implemented for the 1998-99 academic year with the exception of journal classifications. Journal classifications will follow the previous plan for the 1998-99 academic year. The new journal ranking will become effective June 1, 1999. For journal articles submitted by January 1, 1999, and accepted by the journal to which they were originally submitted, faculty will have the option of having these journals rated according to the categories specified in the previous plan.
**Assessment of Overall performance**

Each faculty member will be given an overall performance assessment based on the ratings earned in teaching, research, and service activities. The overall rating will be determined using the percentages specified in the target assignment weights table. While input is solicited from the Annual Evaluation Advisory Committee in each dimension of the evaluation (Teaching, Research, and Service,) the ultimate performance appraisal is the sole responsibility of the director.

The overall evaluation rating and the rating for each of the three areas of professional activity will be based on the following 11 categories:

0.00-1.00 = U  (Unsatisfactory)
1.01-2.00 = C  (Conditional)
2.01-2.33 = S- (Satisfactory minus)
2.34-2.66 = S  (Satisfactory)
2.67-3.00 = S+ (Satisfactory plus)
3.01-3.33 = AS- (Above Satisfactory minus)
3.34-3.66 = AS (Above Satisfactory)
3.67-4.00 = AS+ (Above Satisfactory plus)
4.01-4.33 = O- (Outstanding minus)
4.34-4.66 = O  (Outstanding)
4.67-5.00 = O+ (Outstanding plus)

The weighted average of the points earned across teaching, research, and service activities will be used to determine an overall rating. For example, the overall evaluation rating for a faculty member in Track C who has received a rating of 3.0 points (S+) in teaching, 4.00 points (AS+ in research, and 4.33 points (O-) in service is calculated as follows: .60 (3.00) + .30 (4.00) + .10 (4.33), which equals 3.43 points. This number translates into an overall evaluation rating, of AS (above satisfactory).

**Modifications of the Faculty Workload Option Plan**

The School of Accounting Faculty Workload Option Plan must be a dynamic one. Understandably, it may require revisions from time to time. Periodically, the plan should be re-evaluated by a committee of School faculty. Any suggested revisions to the School Faculty Workload Option Plan will be presented to the School faculty for review and approval. At a minimum, the plan should be reviewed every three years by an elected ad hoc committee of the School faculty.
PART II – ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION OF TEACHING
RESEARCH, AND SERVICE

Assessment of Teaching Performance

The teaching component of each faculty member's assignment will be rated as either Outstanding plus (O+), Outstanding (O), Outstanding minus (O-), Above Satisfactory plus (AS+), Above Satisfactory (AS), Above Satisfactory minus (AS-), Satisfactory plus (S+), Satisfactory (S), Satisfactory minus (S-), Conditional (C), or Unsatisfactory (U), each year by the director in consultation with the School’s elected Annual Evaluation Advisory Committee. Expectations of classroom teaching effectiveness will be the same for all faculty members regardless of selected workload option.

Evaluation of teaching performance will be based on the teaching assessment factors recommended by the College of Business Teaching Committee. A list of potential factors is shown below. All faculty members are encouraged to use as many assessment instruments as possible in order to gauge their classroom effectiveness and in order to seek means by which their effectiveness can be improved.

Where possible, the director should compare each faculty member's performance to the performance of other faculty teaching the same course. At a minimum, comparisons should be made between faculty teaching the same level of course (e.g., undergraduate core course, upper division required major course, upper division elective course, masters level foundation core course, masters level professional core course, Ph.D. core course, Ph.D. seminar). While final assessment will, by necessity, be subjective, such evaluations should be based on careful consideration of several factors and a comparison of teaching performance in equivalent courses.

FACTORS IN EVALUATING TEACHING PERFORMANCE

The review process should consider such factors as:

- Anonymous student evaluations (required for every course taught)
- Peer evaluations by faculty
- Teaching awards
- Exit surveys and interviews of graduating students
- Surveys of alumni
- Surveys of community business executives
- Unsolicited letters of testimonial from students, graduates, and alumni
- Development of new courses
- Innovations introduced into courses taught
- Development of new or revised teaching pedagogy
- Level of courses taught (e.g., undergraduate vs. graduate)
- Type of course taught (e.g., required vs. elective)
- Number of students enrolled in the course (e.g., 250 vs. 20)
- Timeliness and appropriateness of course content
- Timeliness and appropriateness of teaching methodology for the course
Testing techniques

Assessment of Research Performance

The research component of each faculty member's assignment will be rated as either Outstanding plus (O+), Outstanding (O), Outstanding minus (O-), Above Satisfactory plus (AS+), Above Satisfactory (AS), Above Satisfactory minus (AS-), Satisfactory plus (S+), Satisfactory (S), Satisfactory minus (S-), Conditional (C), or Unsatisfactory (U).

The evaluation of research is composed of a quantitative dimension that is supplemented by a qualitative one. The results of the qualitative evaluation could lead to a maximum increase of two evaluation levels on Table 1 (i.e., and increase from AS- to AS+).

Items that can be considered in the qualitative dimension are:

- Significance to long-term theory development (expanding frontiers of knowledge)
- Significance to managerial/industry practice
- Contribution to development of research methodology
- Comprehensive research agenda
- Membership on theses/dissertations committees
- Membership on advisory research councils
- Editor of international/national or regional journal
- Membership on editorial boards
- Editor of national or regional publications
- Editor of conference proceedings
- Track or session chair, discussant or reviewer for professional conferences
- Reviewer for international, national or regional journals
- Guest lecturing at other colleges, universities, institutes
- Book reviews for journals
- Conducts seminars, presentations, colloquia for faculty
- Serves on research committee of college or university
- Research mentor for other faculty members
- Reviews work on research of colleagues at this or other universities
- Research communications to the business community
- Attends professional development seminars
- Receives international/national or regional research award
- Contribution of research to faculty member’s own discipline
- Single authored paper
- Citations of published paper(s)

The quantitative dimension of the research component is based on Table 1. This table lists the equivalent category I publications and quality requirements over a three year period, needed to receive an S-, S, S+, AS-, AS, AS+, O-, O, and O+ evaluation rating under each track. For example, a faculty member who chooses Track C, must publish the equivalent of 1.5 category I publications of which at least 1 publication must be a category II, in order to receive an Above
Satisfactory (AS) rating in research. No distinction is made between single and co-authored publications. The only acceptable substitutions in the quality requirement for journal composition are academic-research books, a chapter in an academic research book, or research grants that generate the UCF Office of Sponsored Research overhead rate on Federal grants. It is also recognized that these three acceptable substitutes must not comprise the entire quality requirement over the tenure evaluation period.

The six categories of journals noted in Table 1 are explained in the following section. It is important to realize that the research requirements by work assignment tracks are listed for a three-year evaluation period. A publication is counted for evaluation purposes as of the date on the final acceptance letter. In addition to considering the number and quality of journal articles, the assessment of research performance will consider other related activities, which are listed in Table 2.

### Journal Categories

The School of Accounting classifies journals in using the following categories:

- PREMIER
- CATEGORY I
- CATEGORY IIA
- CATEGORY II
- CATEGORY III

Journal classifications are developed by the School’s Research Committee and voted upon for approval by the faculty.

### Assessment of Service Performance

The service component of each faculty member's assignment will be rated each year as either Outstanding plus (O+), Outstanding (O), Outstanding minus (O-) Above Satisfactory plus (AS+), Above Satisfactory (AS), Above Satisfactory minus (AS-), Satisfactory plus (S+), Satisfactory (S), Satisfactory minus (S-), Conditional (C), or Unsatisfactory (U). Service is expected of all faculty members. However, the type and amount of service activity can be expected to vary based on the professional focus of a given individual. It is not the purpose here to suggest that specific service activities can be related to specific ratings. Rather, it is expected that all faculty will perform service activities consistent with their chosen option, and that individual rating are associated with a record of consistent effort and quality contributions.
Linkage with Promotion and Tenure

The results of a faculty member’s annual evaluation in the 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 above rating in any or all annual evaluations, will automatically result in a positive tenure or promotion decision. In general, to be recommended for tenure by the School of Accounting, faculty at any rank are expected to have published at least one Category I article (actual Category I, not its equivalent) in the initial three-year performance period, and one additional Category I article prior to tenure. Additionally, faculty are expected to demonstrate similarly high levels of competent performance in teaching and service. New hires that receive credit towards tenure may include their Category I publications published during the period for which they were given credit.
Table 1. University of Central Florida School of Accounting Journal Rankings
(Adopted March 10, 1999, Modified March 19, 2002)

Premier:

Accounting, Organizations and Society
Contemporary Accounting Research
Journal of Accounting and Economics
Journal of Accounting Research
The Accounting Review

Category I-A:

Accounting and the Public Interest
Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory
Behavioral Research in Accounting
International Journal of Accounting Information Systems
Journal of Accounting and Public Policy
Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance
Journal of American Taxation Association
Journal of Information Systems
Journal of Management Accounting Research
National Tax Journal

Category I:

Abacus
Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal
Accounting Horizons (basic research articles only)
Accounting, Management and Information Technologies
British Accounting Review
Critical Perspectives on Accounting
Issues in Accounting Education (basic research articles only)
Journal of Accounting Literature
Journal of Business, Finance & Accounting
Review of Accounting Studies

Category IIA:

Accounting and Business Research
Accounting and Finance (New Zealand)
Accounting Forum
Accounting Horizons (other than basic research articles)
Advances in Accounting
Advances in Accounting Information Systems
Advances in Management Accounting
Advances in Taxation
International Journal of Accounting
Management Accounting Quarterly
Management Accounting Research
Research in Accounting Regulation
Research in Governmental and Non-profit Accounting (RIGNA)

Category II:

Academic Journals:
Accounting Educators' Journal (basic research articles)
Accounting Historians Journal
Advances in Accounting Behavioral Research
Advances in Accounting Education, Teaching and Curriculum Innovations (basic research articles only)
Advances in International Accounting
Advances in Public Interest Accounting
European Accounting Review
International Journal of Intelligent Systems in Accounting, Finance and Management
Issues in Accounting Education (other than basic research articles)
Journal of Accounting Education (basic research articles only)
Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation
Journal of International Financial Management and Accounting
Journal of Accounting and Computers
Pacific Accounting Review
Research on Accounting Ethics

Professional Journals:
CPA Journal
CMA—The Management Accounting Magazine
Journal of Accountancy
Journal of Cost Management
Journal of Taxation
Internal Auditor
Strategic Finance (new name for IMA’s Management Accounting)
Public Finance and Accountancy
Tax Adviser
Taxes—The Tax Magazine

Category III:

Academic Journals:
Accounting Education
Accounting Educator’s Journal (other than basic research)
Advances in Accounting Education, Teaching and Curriculum Innovations (other than basic research)
Journal of Accounting Education (other than basic research)
Journal of Cost Analysis
Research in Accounting in Emerging Economies

Professional Journals:
Accountancy (Great Britain)
CA Magazine
Estates, Gifts and Trusts Journal
Government Accountant’s Journal
Internal Auditing
International Tax Journal
Journal of Corporate Taxation
Journal of Partnership Taxation
Management Accounting (U.K.)
Managerial Auditing Journal
National Public Accountant
Ohio CPA Journal
Practical Accountant
Review of Taxation of Individuals
Studies in Accounting and Finance
Tax Executive
Tax Ideas
Tax Notes
Taxation for Accountants

NOTE: We recognize that there are other acceptable journals for academic and professional accounting research. These include practice-oriented work that is published in professional journals and academic work published in journals of related disciplines. These works will be evaluated by the Chair of the School of Accounting in consultation with the School’s research committee.
UCF School of Accounting
Definitions for Accounting Journal Research Categories

**Premier** consists of the five internationally recognized academic peer-reviewed journals that the school has previously identified.

**Category I-A** consists of academic peer-reviewed journals internationally recognized as being of very high quality. This includes all AAA section journals and those journals included in Brown and Huefner (1994) as meeting an elite quality threshold.

**Category I** consists of academic peer-reviewed journals internationally recognized as being of high quality. This includes several leading international journals and AAA publications that meet a high quality threshold.

**Category II-A** consists of a small set of academic peer-reviewed journals internationally recognized as quality research outlets. This includes several important national and international journals. In most cases, these journals are the second-best outlets for academic work in specialty areas.

**Category II** consists of two types of journals: (1) other academic peer-reviewed nationally recognized journals and (2) premier professional journals. The professional journals listed are ranked highly in Brown and Huefner (1994) and cover several academic specialty areas.

**Category III** consists of two types of journals: (1) most of the professional journals previously included in Category two and some previously included in Category three and (2) a few academic peer-reviewed journals. We eliminated journals that were regional or narrowly focused. We referred to Cabell’s Journal Publication Directory for guidance.

In developing the journal categories and/or the journal listings within each category, we relied on the following information:

2. Hull and Wright (1990) article in *Accounting Horizons*.
3. American Accounting Association journal affiliation.
5. Instructions in the proposed FWOP regarding journal rankings.
6. Our recollections of discussions in School of Accounting faculty meetings.
7. The collective judgment of the committee members.
8. Input from researchers at peer institutions.
Table 2. Other Scholarly Work Equivalencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>EQUIVALENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research/academic book-Published by a major or international or national publisher</td>
<td>Two real category Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal or Co-Investigator/External(^3) $200,000 minimum research-contract or research-grant(^2)</td>
<td>Two category Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal or Co-Investigator/External(^3) $60,000 to $200,000 research-contract or research-grant(^2)</td>
<td>One category I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education textbook-published by a major international or national publisher (customized-text excluded)</td>
<td>One category I (in Tracks A, B, and C only) One Category II (in Tracks D, E, and F only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal or Co-Investigator/External(^3) $15,000 to $60,000 research-contract or research-grant(^2)</td>
<td>One category II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of a book of academic papers-published by an international or national publisher</td>
<td>One category II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original chapter in research/academic book-published by a major international or national publisher</td>
<td>One real category II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book of readings/casebook/trade-book/textbook revision</td>
<td>One category III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal or Co-Investigator/External(^3) $5,000 to $15,000 research-contract or research-grant(^3)</td>
<td>One category III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monograph/report/case/one or more chapters in higher education textbooks</td>
<td>One category III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presented papers or proceedings from an international national/regional meeting which were peer reviewed, and had a low acceptance rate</td>
<td>One category III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Category equivalencies are not necessarily direct replacements for category I journal articles in the tenure and/or promotion process.

\(^2\) No double counting is permitted for papers and proceedings at the same meeting or for grants and reports from those grants.

\(^3\) External grants require the generation of overhead at the rate specified by the UCF Office of Sponsored Research for Federal grants. No double counting is permitted for obtaining a research grant and publishing articles based on the same grant.