

Department of Chemistry

Tenured and Tenure-Earning

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 (1), Conditional (2), Satisfactory (3), Above Satisfactory (4), and Outstanding (5).
- Basic Expectations – the minimum criteria needed to obtain a rating of Satisfactory (3) on an FTE Category.
- Merit Criteria– Criteria associated with an FTE category that will be assigned a Performance Rating of Satisfactory (3), Above Satisfactory (4), or Outstanding (5) 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 (3) for that FTE Category. Failing to meet Basic Expectations will result in a Performance Rating of Unsatisfactory (1) or Conditional (2) for that FTE Category.

If Basic Expectations are met, a Performance Rating of Satisfactory (3), Above Satisfactory (4), or Outstanding (5) 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 Performance Rating of Unsatisfactory (1) or Conditional (2), the Overall Performance will be assigned the corresponding score. Otherwise, the Overall Performance Rating will be marked Outstanding (5) if two or more FTE categories are rated as Outstanding (5), Above Satisfactory (4) if two or more FTE categories are rated as Above Satisfactory (4), and Satisfactory (3) for all other situations.

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 for Teaching (RATING REQUIRED)

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. 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 in the 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 (3), Above Satisfactory (4), or Outstanding (5) will be assigned to Merit Criteria **1.2.a**, and **1.2.b**, whereas Merit Criteria **1.2.c** and **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 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 1.2.a. Classroom teaching (REQUIRED; evaluated over the past year including summer and overload courses)

- All course content and assessments are aligned with learning outcomes that are clear, measurable, and transparent to students.
- Based on collected data (e.g., grades, pre- and post-tests, standardized assessments), students demonstrate success in reaching the learning objectives of the class.
- Evidence of continuous improvement of courses and teaching practices by:
 - Reflection on student evaluations.
 - Participation in teaching professional development (e.g. at the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning and others).
- Course revisions including laboratory
- Guest lecturing.

Merit Criterion 1.2.b. Training graduate students and postdocs in research (REQUIRED; evaluated over the past year).

- Training of graduate students in directed research, independent study, or dissertation/thesis hours.
- Training of post-doctoral associates.
- Chairs or serves on MS and PhD committees.
- Trainee publications
- Trainee conference presentations.
- Trainee awards.
- Regularly attend graduate student seminars.

Merit Criterion 1.2.c. Training undergraduate students in research (OPTIONAL; evaluated over the past year).

- Training of undergraduate students in directed research, independent study, or forensic internships.

- Chairs or serves on Honors Undergraduate Thesis committees.
- Trainee publications
- Trainee conference presentations.
- Trainee awards.
- Reviewing undergraduate research reports or evaluating undergraduate student posters.

Merit Criterion 1.2.d. Other Teaching Contributions (OPTIONAL; evaluated over the past year)

- Introduction of innovative new courses, publication of pedagogic articles, textbooks, and laboratory manuals, developing web-based courses and material
- Coordination of multi-section classes and laboratories
- Awarded or continuing teaching grants
- Awards for teaching excellence
- National and international teaching collaborations.
- Teaching abroad as a UCF representative.
- Other Contributions (Developing a new program that contributes to student success or other department priorities, etc.).
- Job placement or continuing education of supervised trainees.
- Mentoring undergraduate learning or teaching assistants

1.3. Assigning Performance Rating for Teaching

- **Outstanding (5)** will be assigned if the faculty member meets Basic Expectations, and achieves an Outstanding (5) in two or more of the Merit Criteria.
- **Above Satisfactory (4)** will be assigned if the faculty member meets Basic Expectations, and achieves an Above Satisfactory (4) in two or more of the Merit Criteria.
- **Satisfactory (3)** will be assigned in all other cases that the faculty member meets Basic Expectations.
- **Conditional (2)** will be assigned if the faculty member was deficient in achieving Basic Expectations.
- **Unsatisfactory (1)** 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. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work Activities

Measures of scholarly activity will account both for quantity and quality. The evaluation period will include consideration of research activities **over the past three years**.

Associate or Full Professors will be assigned a category at the beginning of the academic year to reflect their expected research activity and teaching load. Evaluations will be based on the Research Tier of the faculty member. The numbers indicate general guidelines for the three Research Tiers, R1-R3:

R1: 1/1 teaching load or less

R2: 2/1 teaching load

R3: 2/2 teaching load

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; otherwise, the faculty member's Research Tier may be changed. Reinstatement to the original Research Tier can occur when the faculty's Research Category is rated Above Satisfactory.

2.1. Basic Expectations for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work Activities

The following Basic Expectations are required for all faculty and need to be met to receive a rating above conditional (2).

2.1.a. Basic Expectations for Assistant Professors

1. After three years employment, publication of at least two peer-reviewed paper and/or peer-reviewed conference proceedings.
2. After the first year of employment, supervision of at undergraduate/graduate/postdoc in research during the evaluation period.
3. Has obtained or is actively working to obtain external funding during the current evaluation period.

2.1.b. Basic Expectations for Associate and Full Professors

Basic Expectations for R1

Maintain an active research group as demonstrated by the following:

1. Publication of at least three peer-reviewed papers/book chapters/books, or submissions of unique manuscripts with 1 published product as first, senior, or corresponding author.
2. Supervision of an active research group, including graduate students, undergraduates and/or postdocs over the past three years.
3. At least 3 presentations (seminars, invited, contributed presentations, etc.) over the past three years.
4. Funding within this evaluation period commensurate with research needs, including funding for graduate students and/or research staff.

Basic Expectation for R2

1. Publication of at least 2 papers as an author over the past three years. It is assumed that all authors on a paper provide necessary contributions for the completion of the work.
2. Supervision of at least one undergraduate/graduate/postdoc over the past three years.
3. At least 2 presentations (seminars, invited, contributed presentations, etc.) over the past three years.
4. Funding or submission of three proposals within the past three years.

Basic Expectation for R3

Three of the following four criteria:

1. Publication of at least 2 papers as an author over the past three years. It is assumed that all authors on a paper provide necessary contributions for the completion of the work.
2. Supervision of at least one undergraduate/graduate/postdoc over the past three years.
3. At least 2 presentations (seminars, invited, contributed presentations, etc.) over the past three years.
4. Funding or submission of three proposals within the past three years.

2.2. Merit Criteria for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work Activities

Performance Ratings of Satisfactory (3), Above Satisfactory (4), or Outstanding (5) will be assigned to Merit Criteria **2.2.a**, **2.2.b**, and **2.2.c**, whereas Merit Criterion **2.2.d** will be assigned a Performance Rating *only at the discretion of the faculty member*. Evidence commonly used to justify Performance Ratings are listed 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. Scholarly Productivity and Quality (REQUIRED; evaluated over the past 3 years)

- Papers accepted or published in peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings listed in the ISI Web of Science or in other indexing organizations pertinent to the research focus of the faculty member.
- Impact of scholarly work, measured by number of citations received in the evaluation period reported in the ISI Web of Science or other indexing organizations pertinent to the research focus of the faculty member.
- Publication of refereed scholarly books or chapters within as either author, co-author, or editor. Rated or ranked as top scientist by publicly recognized academic and research rankings.
- Invited seminars or presentations in research conferences and workshops.
- Contributed presentations in research conferences and workshops.
- Disclosure of inventions and filing of patents.

- Research awards (internal and external)

Merit Criterion 2.2.b. Research Grants and Contracts (REQUIRED; evaluated over the past 3 years)

- Active grants or contracts as P.I. or co-P.I./co-I will be recognized. This includes grants to support graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, undergraduate students, or other research support. The rating will depend on various factors, including size and impact of the grant within the context of others in the sub-field.
- Awarding of new grants or contracts.
- Submission of proposals as a P.I. or co-P.I./co-I.
- Participation in external grants and contracts as non-P.I. or non-co-P.I./co-I. This would also include awards of fellowships, grants, and consulting contracts outside of the university that enable research.
- Award of facility time (e.g., national laboratories, supercomputers, etc.).
- Securing funding or donation of equipment or other resources (e.g., funding for infrastructure).

Merit Criterion 2.2.c. Directing Graduate Students and Postdocs in Research (REQUIRED; evaluated over the past 3 years).

- Peer-reviewed papers published with a student/postdoc in peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings listed in ISI Web of Science or in other indexing organizations.
- Oral or poster presentations by students and/or postdocs at conferences (local, regional, national, or international).
 - Awards won by students and/or postdocs.
- Passed candidacy exam
- Successfully defended dissertation or thesis (faculty member Chair or co-Chair) during evaluation period.
- Students and/or postdocs awards, including fellowships or internships (e.g., at a national lab).

Merit Criterion 2.2.d. Directing Undergraduate Students in Research (OPTIONAL; evaluated over the past 3 years).

- Peer-reviewed papers with undergraduate co-authors published in peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings listed in ISI Web of Science or in other indexing organizations.
- Oral or poster presentations by students at conferences (local, regional, national, or international).
- Awards won by students, including fellowships or internships (e.g., at a national lab).
- Honors Undergraduate Thesis supervision.
- Honors Undergraduate Thesis successfully defended.

2.3. Assigning Performance Rating for Research, scholarship, and creative work activities

- **Outstanding (5)** will be assigned if the faculty member meets Basic Expectations and achieves an Outstanding (5) in two or more of the Merit Criteria.
- **Above Satisfactory (4)** will be assigned if the faculty member meets Basic Expectations and achieves an Above Satisfactory (4) in two or more of the Merit Criteria.
- **Satisfactory (3)** will be assigned in all other cases that the faculty member meets Basic Expectations.
- **Conditional (2)** will be assigned if the faculty member was deficient in achieving basic expectations.
- **Unsatisfactory (1)** 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.

Service Activities

Service will be evaluated based on the quantity (compared to the FTE assigned – 0.05 FTE is equivalent to 2 hours of service per week) and the quality of the service (the service must contribute to the desired goals of the activity).

3.1 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.

3.2. Merit Criteria for Service Activities

Performance Ratings of Satisfactory (3), Above Satisfactory (4), or Outstanding (5) will be assigned to *at least two* of the four Merit Criteria in the FTE Category (**3.2.a, 3.2.b, 3.2.c, or 3.2.d**). Which two 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 3.2.a. Service to the Department.

- Chairing a departmental committee.
- Documented exceptional activity in departmental committees..

- Oversight of departmental facilities.
- Securing donations of major facilities or equipment that is made broadly available.
- Curriculum coordination of multi-section/instructor course.
- Any other non-assigned duties such as recruitment or advising.
- Membership in (not chairing or co-chairing) thesis or dissertation committees.
- Attendance at commencement ceremonies
- Evaluation of URR
- Evaluation of posters
- Attend departmental seminars
- Meet with seminar speaker(s)
- Coordinate/host seminar speaker(s)
- Participate in departmental **(or equivalent)** searches

Merit Criterion 3.2.b. Service to the College or University (this includes serving on college or university committees, leading or participating in special projects that benefit the college or the university and are external to the department, etc.)

- Service on College and/or University Committees.
- Chairing a College and/or University Committee.
- Involvement in interdisciplinary and interdepartmental activities. Examples include service on promotion committees, research cluster, search committees, thesis/dissertation committees, mentoring activities, etc.

Merit Criterion 3.2.c. Service to the profession (this includes referring scholarship by others, organizing conferences or exhibits, serving on committees in professional organizations, etc.).

- Editor or editorial board member of scholarly journals.
- Serving on review panels for funding agencies and user facilities.
- Reviewing proposals for funding agencies (ad hoc, in-person or virtual panels)
- Serving as an officer or committee member for professional organizations. .
- Organizing a conference, workshop, or summer school.
- Organizing a session at an international or local meeting.
- Chairing and/or presiding over conference sessions.
- Refereeing scholarly journal articles, conference proceedings, or scholarly books.

Merit Criterion 3.2.d. Professional service related to science provided to the community (media interviews, public lectures, etc.)

- Outreach to K-12 and other community groups (e.g., STEM Day, public talks, Career Day, Organizing or volunteering in local science affairs or competitions).

3.3. Assigning Performance Rating for Service Activities

- **Outstanding (5)** will be assigned if the faculty member meets Basic Expectations and achieves an Outstanding (5) in two or more of the Merit Criteria.
- **Above Satisfactory (4)** will be assigned if the faculty member meets Basic Expectations, and achieves an Above Satisfactory (4) in two or more of the Merit Criteria.
- **Satisfactory (3)** will be assigned in all other cases that the faculty member meets Basic Expectations.
- **Conditional (2)** will be assigned if the faculty member was deficient in achieving basic expectations.
- **Unsatisfactory (1)** 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. Other Activities

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.

4. Evaluation Examples

| Teaching | Basic Expectations | 1.2.a | 1.2.b | 1.2.c | 1.2.d | Teaching Rating |
|--------------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------------|
| Performance Rating | Yes | 4 | 5 | 5 | -- | Outstanding (5) |
| Research | | 2.2.a | 2.2.b | 2.2.c | 2.2.d | Research Rating |
| Performance Rating | Yes | 4 | 5 | 5 | -- | Outstanding (5) |
| Service | | 3.2.a | 3.2.b | 3.2.c | 3.2.d | Service Rating |
| Performance Rating | Yes | 5 | -- | 5 | -- | Outstanding (5) |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|-------------|
| Overall | | | | | | Outstanding |
|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|-------------|

Teaching Evidence (Eval period: 2023-2024)

- Large section of course and a graduate course on a 1/1 load with consistently high SPI numbers in both courses.
- Significant changes made to graduate course
- Mentored five PhD students, 1 MS student, two postdocs, and seven undergraduate students in this eval period.
- Served on the PhD committees of 13 other PhD students.

Research Evidence (Eval Period: 2021 – 2024)

- 7 papers during this reporting period as author or co-author.
- Papers highlighted.
- He and his group gave 10+ presentations (5 oral and 2 posters)
- He was awarded 3 grants in this funding period with active funding totaling over \$500,000
- Directs the research of five PhD, 1 MS, 7 undergraduate students, and 2 post-docs.

5.

Service Evidence (Eval Period: 2023 – 2024)

- Co-Chair of Department Committee
- Served on several search committees,
- Two honors undergraduate thesis committees,
- 18 PhD committees.
- Reviewer for papers submitted to a number of top tier journals
- Preside a technical session at a conference.

Example when FTE weighting does not apply

| Teaching | Basic Expectations | 1.2.a | 1.2.b | 1.2.c | 1.2.d | Teaching Rating |
|--------------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------------|
| Performance Rating | No | 2 | 5 | -- | -- | Conditional (2) |
| Research | | 2.2.a | 2.2.b | 2.2.c | 2.2.d | Research Rating |
| Performance Rating | Yes | 4 | 5 | 5 | -- | Outstanding (5) |
| Service | | 3.2.a | 3.2.b | 3.2.c | 3.2.d | Service Rating |
| Performance Rating | Yes | 5 | 5 | 5 | -- | Outstanding (5) |
| Overall | | | | | | Conditional |