Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures

Civil, Environmental, and Construction Engineering (CECE) Department

Introduction

It is imperative to establish clear guidelines for our faculty at the start of the evaluation year. The basic philosophy of evaluation is to enhance our faculty's performance in all areas of teaching, research, and service.

Three main principles that serve as the basis of this important process include: (1) quality and impact, (2) contributions, and (3) flexibility. Quality and impact are crucial in evaluating all areas. The second principle relates to recognizing efforts that contribute to the department's goals. The process needs to be flexible, considering qualitative assessments as well as quantitative measures. The evaluation criteria recognize the efforts of productive faculty on a year-by-year basis and who made significant contributions to the department and its programs over the years.

The annual evaluations recognize faculty time allocated to each category in their assignment of duties. The faculty and department chair together will determine the faculty assignment of duties in teaching, research, and service (and other assigned duties for specific cases). This assignment should be completed at the beginning of the evaluation period and documented in Interfolio.

Overall Rating

This document is based on the typical annual assignments for tenured/tenure-earning faculty, non-tenure earning instructor/lecturers, and non-tenure earning research faculty. The typical course load for tenured/tenure-earning faculty is 4 courses per academic year. The typical course load for instructor/lecturers is 6 courses per academic year. The chair can reduce the course load based on faculty research productivity or other special responsibilities assigned to the faculty upon agreement of the chair and the faculty. Faculty with additional assignments in service such as the associate chair, graduate program directors, or undergraduate coordinator will be evaluated appropriately.

Evaluations must use the rating categories of *Outstanding (O), Above Satisfactory (AS), Satisfactory (S), Conditional (C), and Unsatisfactory (U)*. The following pages contain rubrics for faculty's three areas of responsibility: teaching, research, and service. The rubric is used to come up with a category classification of (*O*, *AS*, *S*, *C*, and *U*) for each area of responsibility. The percentage weights, or full-time equivalents (FTEs), of (teaching, research, and service) as per the FTE assignment will be used to come up with an overall rating.

The following are guidelines for the faculty evaluation in a specific academic year in each of the three areas: teaching, research, and service:

- In general, the evaluation of a faculty member will include his/her productivity, impact, and achievements in teaching, research, and service. Emphasis will be placed on quality and impact rather than quantity. The chair retains discretion to consider quality and impact in assigning rating categories.
- A faculty member receiving a Conditional rating in anyone (or more) of teaching, research, or service will receive an overall Conditional rating.
- A faculty member receiving an Unsatisfactory rating in anyone (or more) of teaching, research, or service will receive an overall Unsatisfactory rating.
- The faculty assignment of duties and (FTEs) in teaching, research, and service will be used in part to inform the faculty member's overall rating in the evaluation period.

1) Area of Responsibility: Teaching

M#	U	C	S	AS	O	M#
	Did not meet "S Crtitical" and did not meet any of the following 3 merits: **(Merits met = 0)**	**Did not meet "S Critical," or met "S Critical" and met only 1 out of the following 3 merits:** **(Merits met = 1)**	**[S Critical: Provide a syllabus that follows current university guidelines; hold reasonable amount of office hours; meet classes as scheduled and give final exams; complete ABET data as required; submit grades on time]** + Meet 2 out of the following 3 merits:	Meet "S Critical" + **Meet 3 out of the following 4 merits:**	Meet "S Critical" + **Meet 3 out of the following 4 merits:**	
M1	[Faculty candidate's higher of scaled SPIs or scaled CLOs by grade distribution passes the S threshold according to department's scaled SPI or scaled CLO by grade distribution] + Majority positive student comments	[Faculty candidate's higher of scaled SPIs or scaled CLOs by grade distribution passes the S threshold according to department's scaled SPI or scaled CLO by grade distribution] + Majority positive student comments	[Faculty candidate's higher of scaled SPIs or scaled CLOs by grade distribution passes the S threshold according to department's scaled SPI or scaled CLO by grade distribution] + Majority positive student comments	[Faculty candidate's higher of scaled SPIs or scaled CLOs by grade distribution passes the AS threshold according to department's scaled SPI or scaled CLO by grade distribution] + Majority positive student comments	[Faculty candidate's higher of scaled SPIs or scaled CLOs by grade distribution passes the O threshold according to department's scaled SPI or scaled CLO by grade distribution] + Majority positive student comments	M1
M2	[Participate in engineering education activities (book authoring, revamping labs, new course development, significant FCTL, workshops, or training involvement…etc)]	[Participate in engineering education activities (book authoring, revamping labs, new course development, significant FCTL, workshops, or training involvement…etc)]	[Participate in engineering education activities (book authoring, revamping labs, new course development, significant FCTL, workshops, or training involvement…etc)]	[Faculty advisor of student organizations], or [maintain active PE], or [supervising undergraduate research (e.g., XXX4912], or [Supervising Honors thesis/Graduate Coordinator for MS non-thesis track]	[Faculty advisor of student organizations], or [maintain active PE], or [supervising undergraduate research (e.g., XXX4912], or [Supervising Honors thesis/Graduate Coordinator for MS non-thesis track]	M2
M3	PhD or 2 MS in the "Year Evaluated," or graduate as Chair 1 PhD or 2 MS (last 5 years)	or 2 MS in the "Year Evaluated," or graduate as Chair 1 PhD or 2 MS (last 5 years)	Advise/Mentor as Chair 1 PhD or 2 MS in the "Year Evaluated," or graduate as Chair 1 PhD or 2 MS (last 5 years)	[Advise/Mentor as Chair 2 PhD or 4 MS in the "Year Evaluated,"] or [graduate as Chair 2 PhD or 4 MS (last 5 years)]	Advise/Mentor as Chair 3 PhD or 6 MS in the "Year Evaluated," or graduate as Chair 3 PhD or 6 MS (last 5 years)	M3
				[Award for excellence in teaching (lasts 5 yrs since last win until eligible to apply)], or [educational grants]	[Award for excellence in teaching (lasts 5 yrs since last win until eligible to apply)], or [educational grants]	M4

1) If a course has multiple sections (e.g., graduate courses), use weighted average score for the course based on no. of students/section --Similar to TIP portfolio preparation.

2) The course learning outcomes (CLOs) are student evaluations based on the CLOs and how the CLOs map to the student outcomes (SOs) for each undergraduate program for assessment purposes.

3) As a guide for faculty, the department will publish a scaled SPI and scaled CLO by grade distribution at the end of each academic year.

Faculty Teaching Rubric Guidelines

The following are guidelines for implementing teaching rubric:

- The course learning outcomes (CLOs) are assessed using student evaluations of the CLOs and how the CLOs in each undergraduate course map to the student outcomes (SOs) for each undergraduate program for assessment purposes.
- If a course has multiple sections, such as distance learning graduate courses, then SPI is a weighted average over all sections that takes into account enrollment size in each section is needed to come up with the overall instructor score for this course.
- The SPI and CLO will be scaled by grade distribution for "large" or "small" classes.
- Scaled SPIs and CLOs for the department will be published at the start and end of each academic year to set expectations clearly and so faculty are well informed about this new system.
- The *AS* and *O* categories have four (4) merits. The faculty candidate has to meet 3 out of these 4 merits in each of these categories to be rated as *AS* or *O*.
- *Educational book publishing*. Educational book publishing should count for the last three years after it is published. Educational book publishing includes reference books, manuals, encyclopedia, etc.
- *Curriculum or course development*. This includes developing and introducing a totally new course, teaching a course for the first time even if course is being offered by the department on a regular basis, introducing major revisions to an existing course, introducing new laboratories or writing a course laboratory manual, …etc.
- *Annual assessment and ABET*. Complying with ABET assessments is crucial and required from each faculty to meet the *S* or above categories.
- *Conduct/attend workshops, training.* Examples of significant multi-day workshops and trainings specific to engineering education include ASEE, FCTL, ASCE EXCEED, …etc. This is not intended to indicate a single day or fewer hours of online or in-person training.
- *Awards for Teaching Excellence*. These awards count for 5 years since they were won showing evidence of teaching quality.

2) Area of Responsibility: Research

M#	U	C	S	AS	O	M#
	Did not meet any of the following 3 merits: (Merits met = 0)	**Met only 1 out of the following 3 merits:** (Merits met = 1)	**Meet 2 out of the following 3 merits:**	**Meet 3 out of the following 4 merits:**	**Meet 3 out of the following 4 merits:**	
M1	[Research Awards (RA) of $75K or Research Expenditures (RE) of $50K in the "Year Evaluated"] or [$75K Avg. RA or $50K RE in the last 3 years]	[Research Awards (RA) of $75K or Research Expenditures (RE) of $50K in the "Year Evaluated"] or [$75K Avg. RA or $50K RE in the last 3 years]	[Research Awards (RA) of $75K or Research Expenditures (RE) of $50K in the "Year Evaluated"] or [Avg. of $75K RA or $50K RE in the last 3 years]	[Research Awards (RA) of $150K or Research Expenditures (RE) of $100K in the "Year Evaluated"] or [Avg. of $150K RA or $100K in the last 3 years]	[Research Awards (RA) of $250K or Research Expenditures (RE) of $200K in the "Year Evaluated"] or [Avg. of $250K RA or $200K RE in the last 3 years]	M1
M2	Participate in proposals submitted for a total of at least $500K in the last 3 years	Participate in proposals submitted for a total of at least $500K in the last 3 years	Participate in proposals submitted for a total of at least $500K in the last 3 years	Participate in proposals submitted for a total of at least $500K in the last 3 years (% credit)	Participate in proposals submitted for a total of at least $750K in the last 3 years (% credit)	M2
M3	Publish or have accepted 1 quality journal paper or 1 quality refereed conference paper in the "Year Evaluated"	Publish or have accepted 1 quality journal paper or 1 quality refereed conference paper in the "Year Evaluated"	Publish or have accepted 1 quality journal paper or 1 quality refereed conference paper n the "Year Evaluated"	Publish or have accepted [2 quality journal papers] or [1 quality journal paper + 2 quality refereed conference papers] (Avg over 3 years), see footnote 1.	Publish or have accepted [3 quality journal papers] or [2 quality journal papers + 2 quality refereed conference papers] (Avg over 3 years), see footnote 1.	M3
				[Award for excellence in research (lasts 5 yrs since last win until eligible to apply)], or [Best paper awards], or [Evidence of approved Intellectual Property IP (patent, registereed mark...etc) lasts 5 yrs], or [Evidence of recognition in the "Year Evaluated")], or [Evidence of translating research into practice]	[Award for excellence in research (lasts 5 yrs since last win until eligible to apply)], or [Best paper awards], or [Evidence of approved Intellectual Property IP (patent, registereed mark...etc) lasts 5 yrs], or [Evidence of recognition in the "Year Evaluated")], or [Evidence of translating research into practice]	M4

1) Publications quality. Publications need to be in well-known journals in the field (e.g., high impact factor, high Eigenfactor Score, or some other acceptable measure of quality). Also, papers receiving best paper award are considered high quality papers.

2) Majority of publications need to be with students, postdocs, adjunct or research faculty supervised.

3) Some consideration will be given to PI-ship (funding leadership).

Faculty Research Rubric Guidelines

The following are guidelines for implementing research rubric:

- Publications should be in well-known journals in the field. These journals should have a high-impact metric as stated in footnote 1. The list of these journals should be known to faculty based on their group in the department.
- Number of journal papers published is a three-year average. This three-year average is calculated as follows: (1/3) times the total number of (Journal papers published in the three years + Journal papers accepted in the current year).
- To be counted in the three-year average, journal papers must be published in well-known journals in the field. Publications in interdisciplinary journals are also accepted if they are relevant to the faculty specialty.
- In assessing minimum funding levels for all categories, special consideration should be given to federal funding from competitive sources such as NSF. In this, and other cases with competitive federal funding, smaller amounts than shown thresholds will be considered sufficient to qualify these categories (per chair's discretion). Also, the thresholds mentioned in the rubric are approximate and flexible. Chair's discretion is applied.
- *Refereed journal papers and papers published in high quality conference proceeding/ conference presentations tradeoff.* Higher productivity in journal publications can be used as substitute for lower productivity in papers published in refereed conference proceedings/papers presented at national/international conferences. For example, if a faculty publishes 2 journal papers, this should substitute (or make up for) the lack of this one paper in proceedings at a national/international conference (but this could not be applied otherwise, i.e., lack of journal publications cannot be substituted with higher conference proceedings and/or presentations).
- *National/international recognition.* This includes but is not limited to the following: Keynote speaker at national/international conferences, presenting in national webinars, journal editorship including editor in chief or associate editor, national/international/regional conference chair, fellow in key organizations such as ASCE, field medal, and so on…
- *Intellectual Property (IP).* IP should count for each for 5 years.
- *Awards for Excellence in Research.* These awards count for 5 years until faculty is eligible for next win.

3) Area of Responsibility: Service

	U	C	S	AS	O	
M#	Did not meet any of the following two merits	Met only one of the following two merits	Met both of the following two merits	Met 2 of the following 4 merits	Met 2 of the following 4 merits	M#
M1	Involvement in professional organizations in one's discipline (e.g., membership in professional organizations, or serving on committees or boards for federal or state government agencies, or refereeing papers,or reviewing grant proposals at the international, national, state, or local levels)	Involvement in professional organizations in one's discipline (e.g., membership in professional organizations, or serving on committees or boards for federal or state government agencies, or refereeing papers,or reviewing grant proposals at the international, national, state, or local levels)	Involvement in professional organizations in one's discipline (e.g., membership in professional organizations, or serving on committees or boards for federal or state government agencies, or refereeing papers,or reviewing grant proposals at the international, national, state, or local levels)	Serves in a position of responsibility in at least one professional organization at the national/international level, or journal editorship (editor-in-chief, or associate editor)	Serves in a position of responsibility in at least one professional organization at the national/international level, or journal editorship (editor-in-chief, or associate editor)	M1
M2	Member in department, college, university, or statewide service committees or subcommittees, or involvement in faculty senate or other faculty governance roles	Member in department, college, university, or statewide service committees or subcommittees, or involvement in faculty senate or other faculty governance roles	Member in department, college, university, or statewide service committees or subcommittees, or involvement in faculty senate or other faculty governance roles	Member in at least two department, college, university, statewide committee, or involvement in faculty senate or other faculty governance roles	Serving in at least one department, college, university, statewide committee in a position of responsibility (e.g., chair, coordinator), or involvement in faculty senate or other faculty governance roles in a position of responsbility (e.g., chair, coordinator)	M2
				[Significant peer-review of papers submitted to national or international journals or conferences or proposals], or [significant involvement in tenure/promotion cases for other universities], or [significant external PhD review], or [organization of conferences at UCF or national/international level], or [national panel service such as NCHRP and NSF panels)	[Significant peer-review of papers submitted to national or international journals or conferences or proposals], or [significant involvement in tenure/promotion cases for other universities], or [organization of conferences at UCF or national/international level], or [national panel service such as NCHRP and NSF panels)	M3
				Recognition awards for service (service award/certificate, or active emeritus member status)	Recognition awards for service (service award/certificate, or active emeritus member status)	M4

Faculty Service Rubric Guidelines

The following are guidelines for implementing service rubric:

- Merits 1 and 2 must be met to achieve S category. If only one merit is achieved then the evaluation outcome for service will be C, and if both merits are not met, then the outcome is U.
- For AS and O, additional merits need to be met.
- *Tradeoffs between items within the S, AS and O categories.* Tradeoffs should be possible between items under these three categories. For example, a faculty who is heavily involved in several department committees should be entitled to use this to compensate for the lack of involvement in college or university committees, and so on.
- *Recognition.* This includes service award, active emeritus member status (as long as it is maintained), or certificate among other examples of service recognition.