Department of Biology
Research Faculty

ANNUAL EVALUATION STANDARDS & PROCEDURES

Edited 2025

Guiding Principles

The purpose of annual evaluations is to facilitate and assess faculty success in instructional activities; research, scholarship, and creative activities; service activities; other assigned activities; and overall performance. Institutional excellence is dependent upon the individual performance of each faculty member as well as the collective performance of the faculty. The success and reputation of the University of Central Florida are highly dependent upon the talents that exist among the faculty and how effectively those talents are harnessed and blended to achieve the university's mission.

The work of faculty is not easily described or measured, and AESPs exist to protect academic freedom and improve accuracy, fairness, and equity in the evaluation of faculty. There will always be an element of subjectivity in the determination of annual evaluation ratings. Evaluators are expected to operate with trust and respect. When assigned by administrative supervisors (usually the department Chair), annual evaluation ratings shall be evidence-based and informed by faculty activity reporting and other forms of documented evidence. Evidence shall be evaluated for *quality* and *impact* toward the achievement of the university's mission.

The basis of the annual performance evaluation will be information obtained through the Faculty Annual Report, student evaluation forms, annual assignment forms, student success data, and other information available to the supervisor and/or provided by the faculty member. Faculty members may choose to meet with the supervisor at the start of the evaluation period to clarify how certain unique activities they plan to undertake will be evaluated.

The performance ratings in each area of assigned activities are combined to arrive at an overall evaluation rating. The possible performance ratings in each area of assigned activities are outlined below and fall into the following classifications:

- Outstanding – indicates that the faculty member exceptionally exceeded expectations.
- Above Satisfactory – indicates that the faculty member exceeded expectations
- Satisfactory – indicates that the faculty member achieved a success consistent with expectations.
- Conditional – indicates that the faculty member was deficient in achieving a success level consistent with expectations.
- Unsatisfactory – indicates that the faculty member was deficient in achieving success for the second year in a row or the faculty member was egregiously deficient in their performance.

Additional information about AESPs is found in the current UCF BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, primarily in Article 10.

Unless otherwise stated in their assignments and job descriptions, research faculty are assumed to spend most of their assignment in research activities, including obtaining external funding and reporting and disseminating research results. Research faculty will engage in collaborative research that might include mentoring of students or postdoctoral associates. Additionally, not all non-tenure earning Research Scientist assignments are the same (e.g., some assignments may include teaching or service, while others do not) and will be reflected in the individual Research Faculty members assignment of duties. Each individual will be evaluated within the context of their assigned activities. For Research faculty that engage in Teaching and/or Service activities as part of their Assignment of Duties as reflected in their FTE assignments, these activities will be part of the AESP.

RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE WORK ACTIVITIES

The fundamental purpose of evaluation in Research is to evaluate overall productivity in research. Research productivity will be evaluated over the previous 3-year time-period, excluding periods of approved leave (e.g. parental leave, FMLA leave). The measures for faculty members with different FTE devoted to research will have expectations that scale with the assigned FTE.

Section 1: Basic Expectations

1. Annual production of scholarly products (see below) commensurate with Position Description of the Research Scientist.
2. Funding commensurate with research needs.

Section 2: Evaluation Criteria

For each of the sections below, evidence should be presented for quantity, quality, and impact on the field. Based on the evidence provided in the Annual Report, each section below will be scored on a scale from 1-5, which is to be associated with ratings as indicated here:

1 – Unsatisfactory
2 – Needs Improvement
3 – Satisfactory
4 – Above satisfactory
5 – Outstanding
N/A - if one of the Sections 2.1-2.3 is not applicable

Within each section 2.1-2.3, relevant items are listed that will be considered when the Chair assigns a score. Scores 1-5 will be given in each section where relevant effort is

reported, and a rating N/A where no efforts are reported. It is not necessary to demonstrate contributions in every section 2.1-2.3 to obtain a better than Satisfactory evaluation. Rather, the Chair will consider the overall quantity, quality, and impact of contributions that fall within the scope of Section 2.1-2.3.

The enumerated lists below are not exhaustive. The Chair can use discretion in recognizing contributions not explicitly listed below.

It is assumed the Chair can also exercise discretion in assigning scores, especially in instances where high efforts and/or impacts have been demonstrated (e.g. publishing in prestigious journals such as Science, Nature, PNAS). Similarly, awards and other recognition, or positive media coverage and high visibility of research efforts are expected to enhance the score assigned by the Chair.

2.1 Scholarly Products.
a. Papers accepted or published in peer-reviewed journals listed in the Web of Science or in other indexing organizations pertinent to the research focus of the faculty member.
b. Publication or documented progress on publication of refereed scholarly books as either author or editor.
c. Authored, co-authored, or edited chapters in a scholarly book.
d. Impact of scholarly work, measured by number of citations received in the evaluation period reported in the Web of Science.
e. Invited presentations in research conferences and workshops.
f. Invited seminars at other research institutions.
g. Filing of patents.
h. Disclosure of inventions.
i. Contributed presentations in research conferences and workshops.
j. Published software packages of scientific merit (e.g. R-package)
k. Lead or participate in document deliverables for funding or management agencies

2.2 Research Funding.
a. Active grants or contracts as P.I. or co-P.I./co-I will be recognized. The rating will depend on various factors considered by the Chair, including size and impact of the grant.
b. Submission of external proposals as a P.I. or co-P.I./co-I.
c. Participation in external grants and contracts as non-P.I. or non-co-P.I./co-I (e.g., Senior Personnel). This would also include awards of fellowships, grants, and consulting contracts outside of the university that enable research.
d. Award of facility time or permits for use of regulated national laboratories, supercomputers, field sites, federal lands, facilities, field stations, museum collections requiring site use proposals, etc.
e. Securing an external award or donation of equipment or other resources for the

faculty member's research group.
   f. Receipt of internal seed funding for research, personnel costs, or equipment.

2.3 Student Mentoring
   a. Mentoring graduate students and postdocs in research.
   b. Mentoring undergraduate students in research.
   c. Publications with graduate students.
   d. Publications with undergraduate students.
   e. Presentations (oral or poster) with graduate students as presenting author.
   f. Presentations (oral or poster) with undergraduate students as presenting author.
   g. Securing permitting and other permissions for graduate or undergraduate student research.

Overall Evaluation of Research:
The overall evaluation of research activity depends on meeting the basic expectations listed above and also on the scores/ratings assigned by the Chair for Sections 2.1-2.3. The evaluations are then determined as follows:

To receive a rating of **Satisfactory** a faculty member needs to meet all basic expectations in Section 1. If a faculty member fails to meet minimum requirements for Satisfactory due to uncommon circumstances (e.g. global pandemic), the chair will evaluate the faculty member's file to determine if satisfactory is warranted.

To receive a rating of **Above Satisfactory** a faculty member needs to meet all basic expectations in Section 1, and from Sections 2.1-2.3 a score of Above Satisfactory (4) or better in at least one of the categories and a score/ranking at the level of Satisfactory (3) in one additional category.

To receive a rating of **Outstanding** a faculty member needs to meet all basic expectations in Section 1, and from Section 2.1-2.3 score at the level of Outstanding (5) in at least one of the categories, at the level of at least Above Satisfactory (4) in one other category, and at the level of at least Satisfactory (3) in the remaining category.

SERVICE

Service will be evaluated based on the quantity and quality of the service (the service must contribute to the desired goals of the activity) within the context of a Research Faculty's Assignment of Duties/FTE. Service will be rated in 5 categories: 1 – unsatisfactory; 2 – Needs improvement; 3 – Satisfactory; 4 – Above Satisfactory; 5 – Outstanding.

Faculty service can be split among several categories. Note that the items listed below are a non-exhaustive list of service activities (but serve to show examples of typical service activities):

A) University Service:
1. Member of department committee
2. Chair of department committee
3. Member of a College or University committee or similar working group
4. Chair of College/UCF committee or similar working group
5. Participate in new student orientation and/or recruitment
6. Advisor to UCF recognized student organization
7. Engagement in Dept/COS/UCF philanthropic activities (attend fundraiser, write proposals, etc.)
8. Attend UCF graduation
9. Liaison to a departmentally taught lab course (e.g., Genetics Lab faculty liaison).
10. Recipient of major COS/UCF service award (including FCTL, Faculty Excellence)

B) Extramural Service:
1. Assistance given to educational organizations (review board, science fairs, workshops)
2. Presentations to schools, clubs, or organizations
3. Planning, leading, and coordinating workshops or specialized training sessions
4. Consultant for, or review of, textbooks, lab books, etc.
5. Engaged in/developing high impact outreach promoting the Department
6. Recipient of a major external service award
7. Development of apps (can count under either Research or Service)
8. Review a journal manuscript
9. Review an external grant proposal
10. Advisor, consultant, or expert witness for an organization
11. Officer in an organization or professional society
12. Organized a professional society meeting
13. Member of or participate in State/National/International advisory or review panels or working group
14. Member of or participate in NSF/NIH or other federal agency review, advisory panel, or working group
15. Writing letters of recommendation
16. Respond to public science inquiries

C) Exceptional Service:
1. Developing and managing major outreach project
2. Member/Associate Editor of journal editorial board
3. Section editor or Editor-in-Chief of a professional journal
4. Serving on Board of Directors of an NGO or scientific society
5. Initiating/developing major curricular changes in the Department
6. Director of a UCF Center or Institute, or Major Departmental Initiative

Overall Evaluation of Service:

Actively serving on one departmental committee is necessary to receive a ranking of **Satisfactory** (for FTE = 0.05). Additional service in other categories can work towards higher quality service. Meaningful participation in service activities beyond a departmental committee are expected to receive a rank of **Above Satisfactory**. Meaningful participation in service activities outside UCF are necessary to receive a rank of **Outstanding**. Quantity and quality of the service demarcates these categories and is dependent upon FTE assignment in Service and Chair's discretion.

Exceptional service can supersede the need to do service above serving on a departmental committee.

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

All assigned courses, including summer and overload courses, are subject to evaluation. A faculty member's primary goal in teaching should be to foster student learning and success in the classroom and independent teaching/research. For teaching faculty, instructional activities also include supervision of directed research, dissertation, thesis, and independent study. For evaluation, the faculty member should provide a variety of evidence demonstrating their effectiveness in promoting student learning.

Section 1: Basic Expectations

The following basic expectations are required for all faculty and need to be met to receive a rating of Satisfactory or above. In cases when a faculty member is not able to meet these expectations for a short period of time due to circumstances beyond their control, the faculty member should inform the supervisor as soon as practicable.

1. Convenes all class meetings (such as face-to-face, mixed mode, and synchronous online) as scheduled (unless there is prior approval) and teaches all classes in the modality they were scheduled. For asynchronous online courses, instructors are expected to contribute a minimum of weekly announcements or other communications.
2. Holds all scheduled office hours in the appropriate modality and location and provides opportunities for student appointments outside of office hours pursuant to unit, college, and university policy.
3. Maintains effective communication with students during a course. This includes addressing student inquiries within 2 business days (except when students have been notified through class announcements).
4. Submits book orders and syllabi on time as required by university and unit policy.
5. Complies with state, university, and unit policies and deadlines pertaining to teaching, including syllabus policies and final grade submission deadlines.
6. To the extent possible, maintain accurate and up-to-date grades on Webcourses that reflect the grade the student is receiving in the class and makes those grades visible and available to students.
7. Holds final examinations in compliance with university regulations and policies.
8. Appropriately supervises and evaluates any TAs and other assistants (graduate or undergraduate) assigned to help with instruction.
9. Upholds a high level of professionalism when communicating with students in and out of the classroom.
10. All courses had clear and measurable learning objectives.
11. The course content was aligned with the stated learning objectives.
12. Assessments (tests, quizzes, assignments) effectively measured student learning outcomes.

13. Course materials and assignments reflect the current state of the subjects covered.
14. Course materials are well organized.
15. The instructor provided timely (usually within one week of submission) evaluation of examination materials and an opportunity to receive constructive feedback that supported student learning.

Section 2: Evaluation Criteria

Each of the evaluation criteria in the next section will be rated as follows:

1   – Unsatisfactory
2   – Needs Improvement
3   – Satisfactory
4   – Above satisfactory
5   – Outstanding

N/A – can be used if an item is not applicable (items rated N/A will not be considered when computing overall evaluation of teaching).

2.1   Evidence of student learning

1. Based on collected data (e.g., grades, grade distributions, pre- and post-tests, standardized assessments), students demonstrated significant progress towards reaching the learning objectives of the class.
2. Peer-evaluations from FCTL or unit administrator indicate an effective learning environment.
3. Student evaluations indicate effective teaching.

2.2   Additional contributions to teaching and student mentoring (items below can be weighted based on occurrences (e.g. number of graduate/undergraduate students mentored or course implementation occurrences). This is a non-exhaustive list of items and serves to show examples of contributions that can be included in this section.

1. Mentorship of undergraduate students in directed research, independent study, honors thesis hours, or volunteer research activities.
2. Management and mentorship of GTAs, UTAs or ULAs.

3. The instructor actively participates in professional development activities focused on teaching and learning and implements what they have learned. This may include self-reflection, implementing student feedback to improve a class, and other activities that contribute to continuous improvement of teaching practices.
4. Teaching courses that include a High Impact Practice (HIP), such as Research Intensive or Study Abroad courses.
5. The instructor actively and successfully participates in the graduate program by co-chairing graduate committees.
6. The instructor actively and successfully contributes to graduate education by serving on graduate student committees.
7. The instructor actively and successfully contributes to undergraduate education by serving on Honors Thesis student's committee.
8. Other Contributions (This category may include designing new classes, developing a new program that contributes to student success, etc.).
9. Successfully remedied areas of concern specifically pointed out in the previous year's evaluation.

Overall Evaluation of Teaching:

To receive a rating of **satisfactory** a faculty member needs to meet all basic expectations in Section 1 and from Section 2 achieve a score of satisfactory or above (3+) on each item of 2.1 and 1 item of 2.2 for each class taught.

To receive a rating of **above satisfactory** a faculty member needs to meet the criteria for a satisfactory rating and achieve a score of 4 on 1 item of 2.1 for each class taught, and a score of at least 4 on 1 item of 2.2 above.

To receive a rating of **outstanding**, a faculty member needs to meet the criteria for a satisfactory rating and achieve a score of 5 on 1 item of 2.1 for each class taught, and a score of 5 on 1 item of 2.2 above.