

EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTORS AND LECTURERS

Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures

Department of Computer Science
For first use in the 2025-2026 academic year

Introduction

These annual evaluation standards provide guidance to Instructors, Lecturers, visiting faculty, and evaluators regarding the assignment of annual evaluation ratings in the areas of teaching and service, and the assignment of an overall annual evaluation rating. The intent of these standards is to spell out the criteria in enough detail that faculty members are aware of expectations, can be reasonably sure of their own evaluation ratings, and can be assured that the standards are applied equally and equitably to all faculty. On the other hand, the standards are intended to leave enough flexibility that an evaluator can take certain special cases into account in the evaluation process.

The evaluation process within the Computer Science for Instructors, Lecturers and visiting faculty is guided by two general principles:

1. Efforts to contribute to the Department's goals are recognized. The time and effort that faculty put forth in the advancement of our mission is extremely valuable. While some efforts (for example writing research papers, receiving a research or teaching grant, or giving an invited lecture or presentation) are clearly prestigious, other efforts (curriculum development, initiatives to improve student learning, offering the best undergraduate courses possible, etc.) just as clearly serve the our goals, and must be recognized as such.
2. Evaluation should be reasonably flexible. To promote a balance of strong research, teaching, and service, the evaluation process must recognize that individual faculty members have differing interests, priorities, and experience levels. As a particular and important case, the process must recognize that junior faculty will very likely fulfill fewer of the evaluation criteria than senior faculty.

To assist the evaluator, faculty members are encouraged to (but is not obligated to) provide a bulleted list of data in their annual reports. These data would include the items the faculty members think are important in each evaluation category. It is then the evaluator's duty to assign ratings for the particular categories.

In assigning ratings in each category, the notions of leadership roles and participatory roles are general (but not sole) delineating factors between an Outstanding rating and an Above Satisfactory rating. Likewise, the ratings of Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory may be determined by a willingness or unwillingness to perform assigned duties.

In general, it is the faculty member's responsibility to properly document abilities and activities that contribute to the evaluation ratings. While the evaluator may be lenient across the board in enforcing this, he or she is only required to weigh abilities and activities that are presented to him or her. In the case of disagreement or grievance, the evaluator may request and must consider any additional evidence presented to him or her.

Basic Assumptions

1. Visiting faculty and faculty at the Instructor or Lecturer rank are not tenure-earning and will normally not have a research assignment. Annual evaluations will be based only on those areas in which there is a formal assignment.
2. Review of performance will emphasize “quality” rather than “quantity.”

This document is divided into three parts viz. Overall rating, Teaching and Service. In each of these we shall outline the standards for evaluation.

OVERALL RATING

The overall rating will be determined based on the following format:

<i>Overall</i>	<i>Teaching</i>	<i>Service</i>
Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding
	Outstanding	Above Satisfactory
Above Satisfactory	Above Satisfactory	At least Above Satisfactory
	Outstanding	Satisfactory
Satisfactory	At least Satisfactory	At least Satisfactory
Conditional	At least one conditional	
Unsatisfactory	At least one unsatisfactory	

TEACHING

Outstanding

The requirements in the satisfactory category must be met, in addition to the following. Below are examples of activities that can earn an outstanding rating. At least one of them is required for this rating.

- Receive a UCF or a national teaching award.
- Produced valuable instructional materials or publications related to teaching effectiveness or classroom activities (author a textbook, a workbook, a course manual, or software that supports instruction).
- Conducting and delivering seminars to enhance student learning, for example, weekly research lectures specifically targeted to student audiences, preparatory sessions for the graduate qualifiers.
- Outstanding student and peer evaluations while maintaining high academic standards.
- Evidence of exceptional teaching effectiveness.
- Participant on an external educational grant.
- Develop new course.
- Leadership in major teaching project (for example, developing an online course or a mixed mode course)
- Give workshops on teaching at the University level or nationally.

Above Satisfactory

The requirements in the satisfactory category must be met, in addition to the following. Below are examples of activities that can earn an above satisfactory rating. At least one is required for this rating.

- Supervising undergraduate research.
- Supervising independent study.
- Developing additional materials to support existing courses, e.g. web component for a course.
- Evidence of significant efforts to improve student learning, e.g. developing innovative pedagogy, attending teaching workshops.
- Above satisfactory student and peer evaluations, while maintaining high academic standards.
- Documented and reported evidence of effectively training teaching assistants assigned to his or her courses (providing mentoring, dissemination of University and Departmental policies, contributing to the teaching assistant's professional development)

Satisfactory

At least two of the three Merit Criteria should be met.

Merit Criterion 1: A majority of taught classes have SPI of 2.8 for larger classes (more than Median of the class size in a Departmental unit) and 3.2 for smaller classes in the Year Evaluated. Adjustments will be made for classes of known high difficulty, first time teaching, or newly revamped classes.

Merit Criterion 2: Participate in educational activities such as book authoring, revamping of labs, new course development, course revamping and course modality changes.

Merit Criterion 3: Participate in academic or professional advising of undergraduate students such as IT advising courses, post foundation-exam, mentoring senior design projects and internship advising.

Conditional

Does not meet the requirements for Satisfactory.

Unsatisfactory

Does not meet the requirements for Satisfactory for more than one year, or:

- Often cancels class, comes late, or cancels office hours.
- Negative impact on student learning.
- Documented problems with teaching.
- Lack of willingness to teach courses based on departmental need.

SERVICE

In the area of service, we expect that service within UCF (and our department in particular) is of the highest priority for instructors and lecturers.

Activities

- serving on department, college, and/or university committees or subcommittees
- serving as a sponsor for student activities and/or groups
- activity in professional organizations in one's discipline
- development of relationships beneficial to UCF with industry and government agencies
- consulting for other universities, colleges, or primary or secondary schools
- serving on committees or boards for federal or state government agencies
- organizing conferences or symposia
- organizing activities that promote public awareness of one's discipline
- sharing one's academic expertise in the local, state, or national community
- covering classes for colleagues when they are on travel or ill
- reviewing textbooks (to improve the next edition)
- refereeing conference or journal papers

Assessment

The following sources will be considered for assessment:

- peer and administrative review of material presented in the annual report
- self-evaluation documents submitted,
- input from colleagues, university leaders, committee members or chairs
- awards and honors
- letters or certificates of public service
- recognition of service from school districts, K-12 teachers, K-12 students or parents

Outstanding	Significant leadership contributions to the department, college, university, computer science community, or community at large in a professional role. (For example, chairing a department or college committee, organizing a department or college activity, representing the University at state or national events)
Above Satisfactory	Significant participatory contributions to the department, college, university, computer science community, or community at large in a professional role. (For example, actively serving on department or college committee, attending prospective faculty teaching presentations and providing input to the committee, representing the department at university events, covering classes for colleagues when they are on travel or ill)

Satisfactory	Performs assigned service duties.
Conditional	Performs some assigned service duties or performs assigned service duties at a less than acceptable standard
Unsatisfactory	Does not perform assigned service duties. (Performance that is less than satisfactory will be given a rating of Conditional in the first year and Unsatisfactory in subsequent years.)