

Department of Chemistry

Instructor-Lecturer with Research

ANNUAL EVALUATION STANDARDS & PROCEDURES

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 the 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 department chairs or school directors), 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.

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

A. Operational Definitions of this Document.

- Performance Ratings- a rating assigned to each FTE Category, which are then used to assign an Overall Rating for the Annual Evaluation. The Performance Ratings are defined below:
 - Outstanding – indicates that the faculty member significantly exceeded the success level expected by their supervisor.
 - Above Satisfactory – indicates that the faculty member exceeded the success level expected by their supervisor.

- Satisfactory – indicates that the faculty member achieved a success level consistent with the supervisor’s expectations.
 - Conditional – indicates that the faculty member was deficient in achieving basic expectations.
 - Unsatisfactory – indicates that the faculty member was deficient in achieving basic expectations for the second year in a row or the faculty member was exceptionally deficient in their performance.
- FTE Category– The components of the faculty FTE (e.g., Teaching, Research, Service). Each FTE Category will be assigned a Performance Rating that corresponds with a numerical score: Unsatisfactory, Conditional, Satisfactory, Above Satisfactory, and Outstanding.
 - Basic Expectations – the minimum criteria needed to obtain a rating of Satisfactory on an FTE Category.
 - Merit Criteria– Criteria associated with an FTE category that will be assigned a Performance Rating of Satisfactory, Above Satisfactory, or Outstanding only if Basic Expectations are met.
 - Evidence – *Examples* of activities that are commonly used to justify the Performance Rating of each Merit Criterion. You are not expected to participate in all listed activities, nor is the list of Evidence associated with each Merit Criterion exhaustive.

B. Calculating the Overall Performance Rating for the Evaluation

Each FTE Category has a list of Basic Expectations discussed in **Section C** that must be met to achieve a Performance Rating of Satisfactory rating for that FTE Category. Failing to meet Basic Expectations will result in a Performance Rating of Unsatisfactory or Conditional for that FTE Category.

If Basic Expectations are met, a Performance Rating of Satisfactory, Above Satisfactory, or Outstanding will be assigned to the FTE Category based on assessment of Merit Criteria listed under each FTE Category. The differentiation of Performance Ratings for each FTE Category are discussed below in **Section C**.

If *any* FTE category is assigned a Performance Rating of Unsatisfactory or Conditional, the Overall Performance will be assigned the corresponding score. Otherwise, an Overall rating of Outstanding will be assigned if an Outstanding is assigned in Teaching and Above Satisfactory or above in at least one other FTE category. An Above Satisfactory will be assigned if an Above Satisfactory is assigned in Teaching.

C. Basic Expectations and Merit Criteria by FTE Category

1. Teaching

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. To help with this evaluation, the faculty member should provide a variety of evidence demonstrating their effectiveness in promoting student learning.

1.1 Basic Expectations

The following **Basic Expectations** are required for all faculty and need to be met to receive a rating above Conditional. 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 classes with regularly scheduled 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.
- 2 When teaching online courses, maintains a regular online presence.
- 3 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.
- 4 Replies to student inquiries within a time frame listed in syllabus.
- 5 Submits book orders and syllabi on time as required by university and unit policy.
- 6 Complies with state, university, and unit policies and deadlines pertaining to teaching, including syllabus policies and final grade submission deadlines.
- 7 Provides grades and feedback on assignments in a reasonable time, typically a week following the assignment deadline, and maintains accurate and up-to-date assignment grades on Webcourses that are available to students.
- 8 Holds final examinations in compliance with university regulations and policies.
- 9 Appropriately supervises and evaluates any TAs and other assistants (graduate or undergraduate) assigned to help with instruction by the end of the semester.

1.2 Merit Criteria for Teaching

Performance Ratings of Satisfactory, Above Satisfactory, or Outstanding will be assigned to Merit Criteria **1.2.a** and **1.2.b**, whereas Merit Criteria **1.2.c**, **1.2.d** will be assigned a Performance Rating *only at the discretion of the faculty member*. Evidence commonly used to justify Performance Ratings are listed under each Merit Criterion. Note: It is not required to participate in all activities listed under each Merit Criterion nor are the lists intended to be exhaustive.

Merit Criterion 1.2.a: Course design and opportunities provided for students to learn. (REQUIRED; evaluated over the past year). May be demonstrated by one or more of the following:

- Clear communication of the most important information (facts and other kinds of core knowledge), ideas (theories, approaches, perspectives, and other broad themes in your field), and/or skills (laboratory skills, problem-solving skills, creative skills, writing skills, etc.) that students should acquire from courses.
- Outcomes that can be used as evidence of student knowledge, understanding, and/or skill acquisition.
- Learning experiences and teaching methods that promote knowledge acquisition, understanding, interest, and/or excellence (e.g., adopting practices supported by pedagogical research as relevant to the discipline).
- Coordination of multi-section courses or laboratories.

Merit Criterion 1.2.b: Effectiveness of course delivery and evidence of student learning. (REQUIRED; evaluated over the past year). May be demonstrated by one or more of the following:

- Contextualized Student Perception of Instruction (SPI) scores and/or grade distributions (e.g., class size, level, modality, regular/honors, required/not-required, etc.)
- Peer evaluations of teaching.
- Pre- and post-test evidence of learning gains.
- Innovative course materials.
- Other evidence of student success, as appropriate for the discipline and classes taught.

Merit Criterion 1.2.c: Documentation of efforts made to sustain high quality and/or improve teaching and how these efforts have resulted in changes in teaching and student learning. (OPTIONAL; evaluated over the past year). May be demonstrated by one or more of the following:

- Self-reflection of perceived issues in teaching and attempts to address them.
- Major course revisions, including labs.
- High-quality or inclusive course design badges.
- Incorporating student feedback to make improvements.
- Research/creative work (formal/informal) on student learning that has resulted in changed teaching practices.
- Attendance/presentation at local, regional, national and international pedagogical workshops and/or conferences that resulted in different pedagogical approaches, classroom design, or assignments.
- Awarded or continuing teaching/learning grants
- Awards for teaching excellence

Merit Criterion 1.2.d: Evidence of engagement with students/peers outside of formal instructional activities. (OPTIONAL; evaluated over the past year) May be demonstrated by one or more of the following:

- Individual student supervision and success of students outside of the classroom, such as

effective advising, assistance with career planning and preparation, supervision of student research, community engagement activities, independent studies, Honors Undergraduate Thesis, etc.

- Demonstrated efforts to enhance student engagement and success outside of scheduled classroom time, such as the use of additional resources for success and/or additional review sessions.
- Reviewing undergraduate research reports.
- Developing new programs that contribute to student success.
- Mentoring learning assistants.
- Invitations to facilitate teaching workshops
- Guest lecturing.

1.3 Assigning Performance Rating for Teaching:

- **Outstanding** will be assigned if the faculty member 1) meets Basic Expectations, 2) achieves an Outstanding in two or more of the Merit Criteria.
- **Above Satisfactory** will be assigned if 1) the faculty member meets Basic Expectations, 2) achieves an Above Satisfactory in two or more of the Merit Criteria.
- **Satisfactory** will be assigned if the faculty member meets Basic Expectations for Teaching.
- **Conditional** will be assigned if the faculty member was deficient in achieving basic expectations.
- **Unsatisfactory** will be assigned if the faculty member was deficient in achieving basic expectations for the second year in a row or the faculty member was exceptionally deficient in their performance.

2. Service

Service will be evaluated based on the quantity and the quality of the service (the service must contribute to the desired goals of the activity).

2.1 Basic Expectations for Service Activities

The following Basic Expectations are required for all faculty and need to be met to receive a rating above conditional (2). 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. Faculty will actively participate in assigned committees. Active participation means consistently attending committee meetings, participating in discussions and decisions, and producing deliverables (if applicable).

2.2 Merit Criteria for Service Activities

Performance ratings of Satisfactory, Above Satisfactory, or Outstanding will be assigned to *at least one* of the four Merit Criteria in the FTE Category (**2.2.a, 2.2.b, 2.2.c, or 2.2.d**). Which Merit Criteria are evaluated is *at the discretion of the faculty member*. Evidence commonly used to justify Performance Ratings are listed underneath each Merit Criterion. Note: It is not required to participate in all activities listed underneath each Merit Criterion nor are the lists intended to be exhaustive.

Merit Criterion 2.2.a: Active engagement in service and/or leadership activities **in the departmental unit**. May be demonstrated by one or more of the following:

- Serving on departmental committees
- Serving in leadership positions in the department (including chairing departmental committees)
- Mentoring of peers including departmental faculty, post-docs, and teaching assistants
- Oversight of major departmental facilities

Merit Criterion 2.2.b: Active engagement in service and/or leadership activities **at the college or university level**. May be demonstrated by one or more of the following:

- Serving on college or university committees
- Serving in leadership positions at the college level (including chairing college and university level committees)

- Mentoring of peers including faculty (e.g. facilitating or presenting at professional development workshops at UCF)
- Evidence of engagement in advising organized student groups (e.g. Student Chapter of ACS, Forensic Student Association, Unknighted Chemistry Graduate Student Association)
- Involvement in interdisciplinary and interdepartmental activities. Examples include service on promotion committees, search committees, thesis/dissertation committees, mentoring activities, etc.
- Attendance at commencement ceremonies

Merit Criterion 2.2.c: Active engagement in service and/or leadership activities **in professional organizations**. May be demonstrated by one or more of the following:

- Mentoring of peers (e.g. facilitating or presenting at professional development workshops)
- Serving in external leadership/service positions in professional associations (e.g. local ACS section)
- Editing/reviewing for scholarly journals.
- Reviewing external grant proposals
- Organizing a conference, symposium, or workshop.

Merit Criterion 2.2.d: Active engagement in service and/or leadership activities **in the community**. May be demonstrated by one or more of the following:

- Media interviews or public lectures.
- Outreach to K-12 and other groups in the community (e.g. STEM Day).
- Mentoring of K-12 teacher(s).

2.3. Assigning Performance Rating for Service Activities

- **Outstanding** will be assigned if the faculty member 1) meets Basic Expectations, 2) achieves an Outstanding in one or more of the Merit Criteria.
- **Above Satisfactory** will be assigned if 1) the faculty member meets Basic Expectations, 2) achieves an Above Satisfactory in one or more of the Merit Criteria.
- **Satisfactory** will be assigned if the faculty member meets Basic Expectations for Service.
- **Conditional** will be assigned if the faculty member was deficient in achieving basic expectations.
- **Unsatisfactory** will be assigned if the faculty member was deficient in achieving basic expectations for the second year in a row or the faculty member was exceptionally deficient in their performance.

3. Research

Lecturers, Instructors, and Visiting Faculty who receive a research assignment are expected to support the research training mission of students in the department thereby ensuring student success. Faculty in these roles will typically have a lower FTE in research than tenured and tenure-earning, research-active faculty members, so the criteria for evaluation are unique to this role. The evaluation will include consideration of research activities over the past three years.

3.1 Basic Expectations for Research

The following Basic Expectations are required for all faculty and need to be met to receive a rating above Conditional. 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.

Basic expectations:

1. Mentoring at least one undergraduate, graduate research student, or post-doc over the past three years.
2. At least one presentation by the faculty member, student, or post-doc they are mentoring at a local, regional, or national meeting over the past three years.

3.2 Merit Criteria for Research

Performance Ratings of Satisfactory, Above Satisfactory, or Outstanding will be assigned to Merit Criteria **3.2.a**, whereas Merit Criterion **3.2.b** will be assigned a Performance Rating *only at the discretion of the faculty member*. Evidence commonly used to justify Performance Ratings are listed underneath each Merit Criterion. Note: It is not required to participate in all activities listed underneath each Merit Criterion nor are the lists intended to be exhaustive.

Merit Criterion 3.2.a: Scholarly products (REQUIRED; evaluated over the past three years). May be demonstrated by one or more of the following:

- Undergraduate/graduate student research/independent study supervision
- Post-doctoral scholar supervision in research
- Honors Undergraduate Thesis, Thesis, Dissertation supervision
- Publications and presentations made by students under faculty supervision
- Awards and recognition won by students, including fellowships
- Publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals.
- Publications submitted and pending review.
- Contributed presentations (oral or poster) at local, national, or international conferences by the faculty member or their mentees.
- Contributed chapters to a scholarly book.
- Invited presentations, seminars, or workshops.
- Other scholarly products (e.g. Faculty Focus articles)

- Awards for research or mentoring excellence (e.g. RIA, Mentor of the Year)
- Awards won by students, including fellowships or internships.

Merit Criterion 3.2.b: Internal and external funding. May be demonstrated by one or more of the following:

- Participation in active internal or external grants as P.I., Co-PI, or Senior Personnel
- Participation in active internal or external grants as non-P.I. or non-co-P.I. (in the past year)
- Submissions of viable proposals as P.I., co-P.I. or Senior Personnel (in the past year)

3.3 Assigning Performance Rating for Research

- **Outstanding** will be assigned if the faculty member 1) meets Basic Expectations, 2) achieves an Outstanding in one or more of the Merit Criteria.
- **Above Satisfactory** will be assigned if 1) the faculty member meets Basic Expectations, 2) achieves an Above Satisfactory in one or more of the Merit Criteria.
- **Satisfactory** will be assigned if the faculty member meets Basic Expectations for Research.
- **Conditional** will be assigned if the faculty member was deficient in achieving basic expectations.
- **Unsatisfactory** will be assigned if the faculty member was deficient in achieving basic expectations for the second year in a row or the faculty member was exceptionally deficient in their performance.

4. Other

Most faculty will not be evaluated in this category. Faculty with a substantial administrative assignment, such as graduate or undergraduate program director, may be evaluated in this category. The supervisor and the faculty member will meet in the beginning of the evaluation period and agree in writing on the criteria that will be used for the evaluation.

5. Example

5.1. Outstanding

I/L: with 0.8 for teaching, 0.1 for service, 0.1 for research

Teaching	Basic Expectations	1.2.a	1.2.b	1.2.c	1.2.d	Teaching Rating
Performance Rating	Yes	AS	AS	O	O	O
Service		2.2.a	2.2.b	2.2.c	2.2.d	Service Rating
Performance Rating	Yes	O	AS	O		O
Research		3.3.a	3.3.b	-	-	Research Rating
Performance Rating	Yes	O	AS	-		O
Overall						Outstanding

Teaching Evidence (evaluation period 23-24)

- 1.2.a. Use of evidence-based instructional practices (e.g. flipped classroom)
- 1.2.b. Contextualization/reflection on SPI ratings
- 1.2.c. Recipient of a teaching award, participation in FCTL workshop(s), earned Inclusive Design Badge
- 1.2.d. Mentoring Learning Assistants, guest lecture at another institution, reviewed undergraduate research reports

Service Evidence (evaluation period 23-24)

- 2.2.a. Committee chair, mentoring teaching post-docs
- 2.2.b. Member of TIP committee
- 2.2.c. Peer review for several STEM education journals, organized workshops and symposia at a national chemistry education conference

Research Evidence (evaluation period 21-24)

- 3.2.a. Directed one HUT, served on two HUT committees, directed 4 URRs, published one paper with undergraduate author, student earned judge's choice award at SSS, Published 5 peer-reviewed articles as corresponding author, one book chapter, contributed 3 Faculty Focus Articles, 5 students presented at national and local conferences
- 3.2.b. Senior Personnel on NSF project, submitted NSF S-STEM proposal as co-PI