

Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures

Tenured and Tenure-Earning Faculty

Computer Science Division, Dept. of EECS

For first use in the 2013-2014 academic year

These faculty annual evaluation standards¹ provide guidance to both faculty and evaluators regarding the assignment of annual evaluation ratings in the areas of teaching, research, 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 within the Department, can be reasonably sure of their own evaluation ratings, and can be assured that the standards are applied equally and equitably to all faculty within the Department. 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 Division is guided by three general principles:

1. Quality, not quantity, is the most important indicator. While applicable to all three areas, this is particularly true in evaluating research. An effort must be made on the part of the evaluator to assess the overall quality of the publication record or other research related achievements; conversely, the faculty member is responsible for justifying such quality. While objective measures like paper counts certainly have some merit, great care must be taken to put these measures into the proper context.
2. Efforts to contribute to the Department's goals are recognized. The time and effort that faculty put forth in the advancement of the Department's mission are extremely valuable. While some efforts (for example, receiving a research grant, or giving an invited lecture) are clearly prestigious, other efforts (receiving a conference grant, or refereeing papers) just as clearly serve the Department's goals, and must be recognized as such.
3. Evaluation should be reasonably flexible. To promote a well-balanced department having strong research, teaching, and service components, 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, the faculty member is encouraged to (but is not obligated to) provide a bulleted list of data for the comments section of an annual evaluation form. (See the "Comments of the Chairperson" section of the *Chairperson's Evaluation Summary* Form AA-17.) These data would include the items the faculty member thinks are important in each evaluation category. It is then the evaluator's duty to assign ratings for the particular categories.

¹ These faculty annual evaluation standards are adapted from the approved standards of the UCF Dept. of Mathematics. Most of this document is unchanged from the Math department's document.

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. At no time shall a faculty member receive a rating below Satisfactory in a given category if no assignment was made in that category.

In general, it is the faculty member's responsibility to properly document activities and accomplishments 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 activities and accomplishments 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.

OVERALL RATING

This document is based on the typical assignment of tenure-track faculty, which includes three courses per academic year, a significant research assignment, and a much smaller service assignment.

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

<i>Overall</i>	<i>Teaching</i>	<i>Research</i>	<i>Service</i>
Outstanding	At least AS	O	At least AS
	O	At least AS	O
Above satisfactory	O	At least S	At least S
	AS	At least AS	At least S
	At least S	O	At least S
Satisfactory	At least S	At least S	At least S
Conditional	At least one conditional		
Unsatisfactory	At least one unsatisfactory		

Faculty who has additional assignments in service such as the associate chair, graduate coordinator, and undergraduate coordinator will be evaluated appropriately.

To handle unusual and unanticipated circumstances the evaluator may adjust the overall rating of a faculty member upward. The reasons for this should be noted on the evaluation form.

It is important to note that, in the following guidelines, research is formatted differently than teaching and service. The reason is that teaching and service have assigned duties and uniform expectations, whereas research varies widely among faculty.

In the research section specific mention is given to publications. In computer science, there are many ways that authors are listed. Often, students' names are first followed by advisor, and in some subareas often lead author denotes lead responsibility

for the paper. Additionally, for co-authored papers all authors are each given 1 full paper credit.

TEACHING

Outstanding (Leadership)

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.

- Supervise to completion an honors in the major undergraduate thesis
- Receive a UCF or a national teaching award.
- Author a textbook, a workbook, a course manual, or software that support instruction. Authoring a graduate textbook may qualify for multi-year credit.
- Outstanding student or peer evaluations while maintaining high academic standards. This can be based on a number of factors, including grade distributions and tests.
- Evidence of exceptional teaching effectiveness.
- PI/co-PI on an external educational grant. Credit given for the duration of the grant.
- Develop a new course.
- Leadership in a major teaching project.
- Give a workshop on teaching at the University level or nationally.
- Implementation of educational initiatives such as those encouraged in NSF grants

Above Satisfactory (Participation)

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 or M.S. research.
- Supervise a Ph.D. dissertation or M.S. thesis past a milestone.
- Supervising independent study.
- Conducting and delivering seminars to enhance student learning, for example, weekly research lectures specifically targeted to student audiences,
- Submission of educational grant proposals
- Developing additional materials to support existing courses, e.g. web component for 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

Satisfactory

A satisfactory rating in teaching requires achieving all of the following minimum standards:

- Teaches effectively with appropriate content, learning objectives, rigor, and pedagogical approaches.
- Meets classes on a regular basis as scheduled.
- Holds scheduled office hours.
- Replies in a timely fashion to student inquiries.
- Provides effective and accurate advisement when requested.
- Submits book orders on time as required by state legislation.
- Provides clear, detailed course syllabi that meet the university requirements.
- Provides regular evaluative feedback on student assignments.
- Meets with students during the final examination period in compliance with university regulations.
- Submits grades on time.

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, such as answering students' questions in an insulting way.
- Documented problems with teaching.
- Lack of willingness to teach courses based on departmental need.

RESEARCH

As research varies greatly across the department, the following list is in the order of importance to earning high ratings in the research category.

1. Publications

- Accepted papers in refereed journals or refereed conferences
- Research monographs
- Chapters in research monographs
- Submitted refereed journal papers

2. Research Funding

- Award of external funds as PI or co-PI
- Expenditures on multiple-year federal grant as PI or co-PI counts in each of the years that the grant is funded, except for no-cost extension.
- Award of internal funds as PI or co-PI
- Award of an external graduate fellowship to one or more of the PI's students
- Submission of grant proposal(s)

3. Recognitions

- National or international research awards
- Best paper awards
- Plenary speaker in national and international conferences
- State/regional research awards
- UCF research awards
- Distinguished Visiting Researcher at Research I Institution or National Lab
- Citation of works by other scholars
- Patents

4. Lectures/Talks

- Invited lectures in national/international conferences
- Colloquium talks or seminars at other universities
- Contributed talks in national/international conferences
- Colloquium or seminar talks at UCF and at the Computer Science Division
- Invited talks at local, national, or international companies

5. Interdisciplinary Research projects that cross departments and disciplines

Examples for evaluating faculty research

Rating	Papers	Proposals
Satisfactory	2	2 submitted
Above satisfactory	4	1 active grant
Outstanding	6	Expenditure above division median
Outstanding	8	1 active grant

Comments:

1. Above totals are cumulative for three-year rolling periods. The example ratings assume all of the indicated activities are demonstrated (for example, a Satisfactory rating could be achieved with 2 papers plus 2 submitted proposals).
2. Papers need to be published in good quality professional journals or conferences.
3. Talks need to be presented at major professional meetings, including colloquia at ranked departments, national labs, etc.
- ~~3.4.~~ Expectations in research will be scaled by the faculty member's FTE assignment in research.

Performance that is less than satisfactory will be given a rating of Conditional in the first year and Unsatisfactory in subsequent years.

SERVICE

All faculty are expected to participate in departmental events. The following are examples of activities that are considered in evaluating the service component.

Activities

- serving on department, college, and/or university committees or subcommittees chairing any committee
- serving in the faculty senate or in other faculty governance roles
- serving as a sponsor for student activities and/or groups
- mentoring junior faculty and teaching assistants
- recruiting students
- recruiting faculty
- 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
- serving as editor of professional books and journals
- refereeing papers
- reviewing promotion documents or Ph.D. theses
- reviewing grant proposals at the international, national, state or local level
- sharing one's academic expertise in the local, state, or national community

Assessment

- administrative review of material presented in the annual report self-evaluation
- 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

Examples for evaluating service

Ratings of Satisfactory or better require that a faculty member participate actively in any assigned departmental service responsibilities, in addition to the examples below.

Outstanding (tenured)

1. Serving in the faculty senate + organizing a conference + serving on a department committee.
2. Chairing a department committee + refereeing papers
3. Organizing a conference + serving on department or college committee
4. Serving as an editor of a professional journal + serving on department or college committee

5. Serving as an elected member of a professional society + serving on department or college committee

Outstanding (tenure track)

Serving on department or college committee + refereeing papers

Above satisfactory (tenured)

1. Serving on department or college committee + refereeing papers
2. Serving as an editor of a professional journal

Above satisfactory (tenure track)

1. Serving on department or college committee
2. Refereeing papers

Satisfactory (tenured)

1. Serving on department or college committee
2. Refereeing papers

Satisfactory (tenure track)

1. Attending departmental events

Comments:

1. Expectations in service will be scaled by the faculty member's FTE assignment in service.

Performance that is less than satisfactory will be given a rating of Conditional in the first year and Unsatisfactory in subsequent years.