

Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP)

Burnett School of Biomedical Sciences (BSBS)

Annual Review

The evaluation of BSBS faculty is based on a balanced review of their assigned responsibilities in teaching, research, and service, which is conducted annually. The goal of the evaluation is to cultivate excellence and provide feedback as aligned with the strategic plans of the College of Medicine (COM) and the University of Central Florida (UCF).

Steps of the Annual Review Process

1. The *Assignment of Duties*, in which percent effort is allocated to teaching, research, and service for each faculty member, is decided by the Director of BSBS, after discussion with the faculty member, with consideration to the needs of the unit and the career trajectory of the faculty member. Additional administrative duties may be added at the discretion of the Director.
2. At the end of the reporting period, the faculty member submits three documents: a) Annual Report, b) Annual Evaluation and c) Goals for Next Year. The *Annual Report* in the format specified by the Director describes performance and accomplishments. The report should contain specific details on teaching, research, and service activities completed during the reporting period. The *Annual Evaluation* form includes a self-populated section on self-evaluation of accomplishments toward goals for the year. A narrative summary should be included that describes the impact of accomplishments in teaching, research, or service and explains any challenges that affected the faculty member's performance. The Goals document briefly describes concrete goals for next academic year in teaching, research, and service.
3. Adverse conditions that have affected a faculty member's overall job performance should be documented by the affected faculty member in their Annual Evaluation form and addressed by the Director during their evaluation of the faculty member's performance.
4. The Director reviews and signs the *Annual Evaluation* for each faculty member, providing performance evaluations and written feedback as appropriate.
5. The *Evaluation* is returned to the faculty member, who is given the opportunity to discuss the report with the Director and plan a strategy to improve performance as needed or address challenges. Plans for the *Assignment of Duties* in the coming year are also reviewed.
6. The *Evaluation* is signed by the Dean of COM and filed with the appropriate administrative departments in COM. A signed copy is returned to the faculty member.

Performance Evaluation

1. Assignments

The assignment of duties and percent efforts dedicated to teaching, research, and service (and administration) are taken into consideration when weighing the relative importance or impact of reported activities.

- A typical assignment for a research-intensive faculty member could be 50-80% research, with corresponding adjustments in teaching and service.
- A typical assignment for an instruction-intensive faculty member could be 80-95% teaching, with corresponding adjustments in research and service.

The above efforts could change based on research productivity, changes in curriculum, new service duties, and other factors. Adjustments of duties can occur that take into consideration changes in research, teaching, or service efforts based on the faculty member's career trajectory and the needs of the unit.

2. Expectations Based on Rank

Non-Tenure Earning (NTE) Track

For the Instructor/Lecturer (associate/senior), the primary responsibility is effective teaching. Scholarly pursuits are encouraged and can be considered when determining performance. Service activities are recommended that will enhance the career development of the instructor and meet the needs of the unit.

For the teaching-track assistant professor, instructional efforts are their primary focus. The education of undergraduate, graduate, and/or medical students is their purview. Expectations are to build a productive record of scholarly teaching. Promotion to associate professor will require the demonstration of a commitment to sustained performance in teaching activities, scholarship, and service.

For the teaching-track associate professor, substantive scholarship in teaching and education leadership is expected. Accomplishments should be documented by student and/or peer evaluations. Participation in university and professional service is anticipated. For the teaching-track full professor, sustained productivity and excellence in teaching, service, and scholarly activities is expected.

For the research-track assistant/associate/full professor, research efforts are their primary focus. Excellence in research activities is expected, through maintenance of a productive research program with extramural support, and contributions to scholarship that elevate the quality of research and training. When appropriate, mentorship of trainees through career development and research training is an additional factor in evaluation.

Tenure Earning/Tenured (TE/T) Track

For the assistant professor, the emphasis is on establishing their independent research program through senior-author publications and grant awards. The development of their teaching skills through didactic and classroom teaching is also expected. Promotion to associate professor and achieving tenure require a record of performance in research and teaching which meets or exceeds the approved criteria for the School. Service activities should demonstrate engagement with the unit, college, and university communities and the building of a national reputation in their field.

For the associate professor, the pursuit of significant achievements in research and teaching is expected, such as a track record of senior author publications, the mentoring of graduate and post-graduate trainees, sustained and substantive funding, and positive teaching evaluations. While there is no specified time period for seeking promotion to full professor, expectations are that there will be a record of outstanding performance in impactful research and effective teaching along with the demonstration of impactful service activities for the unit, college, or university as well as their profession.

For the tenured professor, sustained excellence in research and teaching activities is expected, through the maintenance of a productive research program and contributions to teaching that elevate the quality of educational pursuits. If assigned by the Director, Full Professors are expected to mentor trainees through career development and contribute to the excellence of the unit, college, and university through leadership roles, such as chairing committees, mentoring junior faculty, or heading collaborative research initiatives.. Full professors are also expected to make significant contributions to their profession through society, editorial, or grant review endeavors.

3. Rating Scale for Evaluation (applicable to current rank).

Expectations for performance in areas is adjusted for the distribution of percent FTE. The below are examples of evaluation criteria for each area. Overall evaluation is a composite of performance in the three areas of research, teaching and service.

For teaching-intensive faculty:

- a. *Outstanding*: **Teaching**: Exceptional performance in the instruction and/or mentoring of students. Teaching effectiveness is demonstrated by developing new courses, new teaching modalities, or other tools that address the educational needs of the unit. This includes achieving student ratings that are consistently at or above the college median and supported by positive comments from students. **Research**: Efforts in mentoring students in research, such as chairing capstone projects, HUT committees, presentations in conferences, or authoring of papers are anticipated. **Service**: Varied service activities that support the unit's growth are also valued as are professional activities.
- b. *Above Satisfactory*. **Teaching**: Good performance in the education and/or mentoring of students, achieving consistent student ratings for classroom instruction that are comparable to the college mean and/or positive student evaluations. Improvement of course content as needed to sustain the quality of classroom instruction. **Research/Service**: Engagement in multiple research and service activities and/or advisement of students.
- c. *Satisfactory*: **Teaching**: Performance that meets expectation in the education and/or mentoring of students, achieving student ratings for classroom instruction that are close to the college mean. **Research/Service**: Acceptable research and service activities.
- d. *Conditional*: Significant shortcomings in teaching performance documented through student evaluations that are consistently below the college median that requires development of a remediation plan. Minimal engagement in research or service activities.
- e. *Unsatisfactory*: Two consecutive years of overall conditional ratings in annual performance without attempts for remediation.

For research-intensive faculty:

- a. *Outstanding*: **Teaching**: Performance at or above the college mean and/or supported by positive comments from students and/or demonstration of efforts for teaching enhancement. Successful mentoring of research trainees that results in presentations or publications and advances the career development of the trainees. **Research**: Evidence of scholarly achievement in the form of senior-author peer-reviewed publications and sustained funding to support their research program. Having an active external grant from state and/or federal organizations or foundations, or other research productivity. **Service**: Impactful service activities at the unit, college, or university and for the profession.
- b. *Above satisfactory*: **Teaching**: Performance at or above the college mean and/or positive student comments. Mentoring of research trainees that results in presentations or publications and advances the career development of the trainees. **Research**: Building of a collaborative research network. Senior author peer-review publications in press or submitted. Receipt of internal grants or small awards (e.g., pilot grants). Submission of external grant proposals to state and federal organizations, or foundations. **Service**: Involvement in multiple service activities at the unit, college, or university level and demonstration of multiple professional service activities.
- c. *Satisfactory*: **Teaching**: Teaching performance near the college mean meeting expectation. Mentoring of research trainees. **Research**: Senior author peer-review publications planned or in preparation. Plans for submission of internal grants or external grant proposals to state and federal organizations, or foundations. **Service**: Acceptable involvement in service activities at the unit, college, or university level and demonstration of some professional service activities.
- d. *Conditional*: Significant shortcomings in teaching and research performance documented through student evaluations that are consistently below the college median that requires remedial action or the absence of grant funding or grant submissions that is indicative of minimal engagement in research. Few or no internal or external service activities
- e. *Unsatisfactory*: Two consecutive years of overall conditional ratings in annual performance without attempts for remediation.

Approved by BSBS faculty vote on 12/09/2024.