Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP)
Department of Criminal Justice
College of Community Innovation and Education

For the purposes of faculty evaluation, the listed standards are intended to be illustrative and to emphasize an evolution of faculty activities. Both the quality and quantity of activity will be assessed. The items listed below are not intended to be all-inclusive; that is, they do not exhaust all activities that might be performed, nor should it be interpreted that all listed activities are required unless stated otherwise. Furthermore, the classifications throughout this document of various activities as carrying more or less weight in the evaluation process reflect a presumptive judgment that may not always be applicable. In such cases, faculty have the opportunity to rebut to rebut this presumption and argue for a different weight by making their case to the Chair. A faculty member's overall rating will be determined in accordance with the Annual Evaluation Matrix included at the end of this document. Open communication and informal resolutions of evaluation disputes are encouraged under the UCF BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement ("UCF BOT-UFF Agreement"). For further information on grievances, faculty should consult the terms of the most current UCF BOT-UFF Agreement.

All faculty are encouraged to be actively engaged in the Annual Assignment process as outlined in the most current UCF BOT-UFF Agreement . Specific questions concerning expectations for performance should be raised with the Chair at the time of annual assignment. The assignment of specific activities and their value included within the basic categories of performance (teaching, research, service) should be established at the time of the annual assignment, if practical. Issues pertaining to those matters, such as the value to be accorded a proposed research effort or scholarly activity, should be negotiated and resolved at that time. Discussion of these issues is particularly important for research activities that span several years.

The basis of the Annual Evaluation will be information obtained through the Faculty Annual Report, Student Perceptions of instruction forms (SPIs), Annual Work Plans, Assignment forms, Departmental Annual Activity Report and other information outlined in the UCF BOT-UFF Agreement. All evaluations will be done by the Department Chair.

Performance Categories

There are five performance ratings for annual evaluation: outstanding, above satisfactory, satisfactory, conditional, and unsatisfactory. Elaboration of the performance expectations for these categories is given in the Standards for Annual Evaluation section of this document.   Although they are separate documents, faculty seeking tenure or promotion, or both, are advised to read the Annual Faculty Evaluation document in conjunction with the Criteria for Tenure and Promotion. Annual evaluation of performance must consider the annual assignment of duties, a copy of which shall be attached to the evaluation.

Major Steps in the Annual Evaluation

1. Assignment of Responsibilities

Prior to making assignments, the Chair will notify faculty that assignments are being made and encourage them to discuss their activities for the upcoming period and the weights attached to teaching, research, and service assignments. The chair will provide the faculty assignment, in writing, to each faculty member, as detailed in the CBA.

2. Submission of Annual Report to the chair (e-FAR)

Faculty submit their Annual Report (e-FAR) at the end of the reporting period, as specified in the CBA. The report format is provided and summarizes accomplishments in research, teaching, and service during that period. Faculty should consider their specific accomplishments and performances and the relative importance of each to the research, teaching, or service mission of the department.

In addition to the Annual Report (e-FAR) faculty may also choose to upload a narrative summary of the accomplishments and performances that they consider most important to their annual evaluation, including a short justification of its importance to their overall evaluation. The list of scaled standards provides guidance on the relative importance of various accomplishments and performances. The narrative (if included) provides the opportunity for faculty to explain how they believe a specific accomplishment exceeds written criteria. For instance, a publication in a journal with a lower impact factor might have greater importance by virtue of a number of other considerations. Lower than usual course evaluations might be the result of special circumstances such as a new preparation or unforeseen and unavoidable problems. Faculty can use the narrative to describe these mitigating circumstances.

3. Chair Review and Final Ratings

The department chair makes the final performance ratings.

4. Review by faculty and submission to the Dean

Faculty will be given the chair's evaluation and will have an opportunity to discuss this evaluation with the chair and to attach a concise comment to the evaluation, as per the CBA. Faculty are highly encouraged to meet with the chair to discuss ideas and ways to improve performance ratings.

Assignments for Teaching, Research, and Service

The faculty assignments are used as weights in combining the ratings for research, teaching, and service. These weights indicate the relative importance of each area to the evaluation of a faculty member at that rank. The following are "typical" assignments that will be adjusted to reflect the faculty member's individual assignment.

Tenure earning/Tenured professor (Research intensive 2/2 teaching load):
46% research
46% teaching
8% service

Tenured professor (Modified research 3/2 teaching load):
35% research
57% teaching
8% service

Tenured professor (Modified research 3/3 teaching load):
23% research
69% teaching
8% service

Tenured professor (Primarily teaching 3/4 load):
12% research
80% teaching
8% service

Tenured Professors (Non-research engaged tenured professors 4/4 teaching load):
92% teaching
8% service

*Associate Professors on a 4/4 teaching load will meet with the department chair annually to discuss adding a research assignment to their Assignment of Duties.

Instructors and Lecturers (4/4 teaching load):
92% teaching
8% service

While the example assignments listed above are typical for faculty, they may be adjusted for the upcoming evaluation period due to considerations in any area of research, teaching, or service. Thus, if faculty anticipate decreases or increases in their research activity, they may negotiate with the chair to adjust their assignments accordingly. Additionally, if faculty anticipate decreases or increases in their service activities (e.g., through program directorship or department initiative), they may negotiate with the chair to adjust their assignments accordingly.

I.   Teaching Activities

Demonstrated teaching effectiveness is a necessary condition for successful annual review. Candidates should demonstrate the ability to teach across the diversity of programs (undergraduate, graduate) and formats (face-to-face, online/mixed mode) offered by the Department. Evidence of effectiveness in teaching must include student perceptions of instruction (SPI) for all courses taught while at the University.

The Department recognizes that SPI data may not reflect a faculty member's effectiveness in teaching and may be impacted by a number of factors, including but not limited to class size, response rate, type of class, and individual and personal faculty characteristics.

Consequently, student perceptions of instruction will not be the sole basis for judging teaching effectiveness. Evaluation of teaching will be based on student perceptions of instruction, the nature of the course being taught, the portion of FTE assigned to teaching, and other information pertinent to questions of the quality of instruction. Faculty may provide other material including course materials, informal and formal peer evaluations, and grade distributions. These may be attached electronically to the e-far. It is the responsibility of faculty to describe their importance. For instance, faculty may wish to have new preparations, challenging course material, a large class, and other factors taken into consideration. Activities in this category include classroom instruction; online instruction; direction of independent studies, student research projects, theses, and dissertations; academic advising; involvement and participation in workshops, seminars, and other forums which have curricular interests, teaching, or the learning process as their principal theme or focus; and program or course development. Other evidence may include course syllabi, examinations, grade distributions for courses taught, peer reviews, teaching awards, or other information that reflects the quality of instruction provided by the faculty member. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness may also be based on the quality and integrity of course design, continuing efforts to improve pedagogy including the use of evidence-based techniques, evidence of sufficient student learning, indication of ability to guide students' intellectual growth (e.g., mentorship, co-authoring manuscripts), and indication of ability to stimulate students' academic development and engagement. See Appendix 1 for list of Teaching Activities.

Teaching at a major research university includes training and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students in addition to classroom instruction. These activities often occur outside the traditional classroom setting but are nonetheless important to the overall mission of a research university – e.g., the development of a future generation of scholars. Teaching the necessary skills to be successful in this endeavor includes supervising undergraduate honors theses and encouraging undergraduates to participate in faculty research. At the graduate level, supervising master's theses and dissertations, supporting students' efforts to publish their research, and providing guidance on obtaining pre-doctoral and post-doctoral extramural and intramural research support are all aspects of effective teaching. Excellence in these realms can be assessed, for example, by an undergraduate's entry into a competitive graduate training program, research publications of supervised students, and student success at obtaining research funding.

Good teaching (at least a "Satisfactory" evaluation) is expected of all faculty. Deficiencies or weaknesses in teaching will be noted with a "Conditional" or "Unsatisfactory" rating. The quality of performance in teaching, and all that it includes, is important in the determination of the overall rating of each faculty member. The minimum standards to receive a satisfactory rating for faculty include the following:

1. Meets classes on a regular basis as scheduled.
2. Holds scheduled office hours.
3. Replies in a timely fashion to student inquires, normally within 2 business days.
4. Provides accurate and effective advisement when requested.
5. Submits book orders on time as required by state legislation.
6. Provides clear and detailed course syllabi that meet university requirements.
7. Provides regular and timely evaluative feedback on student assignments.
8. Meets with students during the final examination period in compliance with university regulations.
9. Submits grades on time.
10. Evidence that courses are taught with appropriate content, learning objectives, and rigor as documented in the optional supplementary teaching document uploaded to the e-FAR.

The department recognizes that faculty will be engaged in diverse teaching activities with varying involvement in the doctoral program, MSCJ program, undergraduate and graduate certificates, Honors in the Major, Quality Enhancement Activities (QEP), high impact teaching practices, directed research, research collaborations with students, etc.

The following represents the rating scales to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Faculty may also choose to provide a one-page document to be attached to their e-FAR demonstrating their effectiveness in teaching that might not otherwise be reflected in the e-FAR document.

Ordinal Rating Scale for Tenure Earning / Tenured Faculty

a) **Outstanding (4 points):** Clearly exceptional achievements in the instruction and mentoring of students, including but not limited to successful supervision of student research, and student advising. Provides strong evidence of facilitating student learning, including the use of evidence-based pedagogy. Student ratings from that are predominately (i.e. 70% or more) in the top two categories ("Excellent" and "Very Good") of the rating scale, and timely passage of student supervisees through major hurdles such as the publication of research, presentation of conference papers, successful completion of comprehensive examinations, theses, dissertations, etc.
   a. *Example:* Submission of documentation of high impact practices in the classroom and service-learning components in classes. 80% of the overall student ratings a faculty member receives for their courses with SPIs are in the "Excellent" and "Very Good" categories. Served as a mentor to students (committee member on a dissertation), supervised a dissertation, sat on a comprehensive examination committee, and/or published with a student. Receives a TIP or other award for teaching or mentorship of students.

b) **Above satisfactory (3 points):** Conscientious and dedicated performance as an instructor

including but not limited to successful supervision of student research, participation in comprehensive examinations, student advising, and student ratings that are between 60-69% in the top two categories ("Excellent" or "Very Good") categories in the rating scale.

    a. *Example:* 65% of the overall student ratings a faculty member receives for their courses with SPIs are in the "Excellent" and "Very Good" categories. They demonstrate high impact teaching, sat on a comprehensive examination committee, conduct independent studies, and attend teaching workshops.

c) **Satisfactory (2 points):** Acceptable performance as an instructor include meeting the minimum standards above and student ratings that are greater than 50% in the top two categories ("Excellent" or "Very Good") in the rating scale. Acceptable research supervision and/or advisement of students.

    a. *Example:* 55% of the overall student ratings are "Excellent" or "Very Good." Faculty serving on a comprehensive examination committee, working with graduate students, and/or attending teaching workshops.

d) **Conditional (1 point):** Substantial shortcomings in teaching performance and/or research supervision requiring remedial action. A second year at the Conditional level will result in an "Unsatisfactory" rating.

e) **Unsatisfactory (0 points):** A faculty member who fails to perform, or chronically demonstrates poor performance, will receive an evaluation of Unsatisfactory. Poor performance includes consistent "Poor" to "Fair" course evaluation ratings from an average of more than 50% of students in each academic course taught in the category of "Overall Assessment of Instruction" on the Student Perception of Instruction Reports, failure to meet classes in a responsible manner, failure to return papers and other assignments or tests on a timely basis, failure to communicate with students, and failure to serve as a responsible advisor to students. A rating of unsatisfactory requires a remediation plan per the CBA. A second year at the Conditional level will result in an "Unsatisfactory" rating.

Ordinal Rating Scale for Teaching for Instructors and Lecturers (I/L Faculty)

a) **Outstanding (4 points):** Clearly exceptional achievements instructing students. Provides strong evidence of facilitating student learning, including the use of evidence-based pedagogy. Conscientious and dedicated performance as an instructor including but not limited to student ratings that are predominately (i.e. 70% or more) in the top two categories of the rating scale ("Excellent" and "Very Good") in addition to providing significant undergraduate student mentorship.

    a. *Example:* Submission of documentation of a flipped classroom and service-learning components, conducting a teaching and learning workshop, serving as an ADL mentor, creating a shared course shell, and/or sponsoring or serving as a faculty member of a student club or other student organization. 70% of the overall student ratings a faculty member receives for their courses with SPIs are in the "Excellent" and "Very Good" categories. Receives a TIP or other award for teaching or mentorship of students.

b) **Above satisfactory (3 points):** Conscientious and dedicated performance as an instructor including, but not limited to student ratings that are between 60% - 69% in the top two categories ("Excellent" or "Very Good") categories in the rating scale.
   a. *Example:* 62% of the overall student ratings a faculty member receives for a core class in the major are in the "Excellent" and "Very Good" categories, they periodically present to local undergraduate student organizations on topics of interest, attend teaching workshops, and/or demonstrate high impact teaching practices.

c) **Satisfactory (2 points):** Acceptable performance as an instructor including but not limited to student ratings that are 50% - 59% in "Excellent" or "Very Good" category. Acceptable research supervision and/or advisement of students.
   a. *Example:* 55% of the overall assessment student ratings a faculty member receives are in the "Excellent" or "Very Good" category. They are minimally involved in student engagement activities.

d) **Conditional (1 point):** Substantial shortcomings in teaching performance and/or research supervision requiring remedial action.
   a. *Example:* 50% of the overall student ratings a faculty member receives are below the "Excellent" or "Very Good" category. Does not hold scheduled office hours. Does not respond in a timely fashion to student inquires. A second year at the Conditional level will result in an "Unsatisfactory" rating.

e) **Unsatisfactory (0 points):** A faculty member who fails to perform, or chronically demonstrates poor performance, will receive an evaluation of Unsatisfactory. Poor performance includes consistent "Poor" to "Fair" course evaluation ratings from an average of more than 50% of students in each academic course taught in the category of "Overall Assessment of Instruction" on the Student Perception of Instruction Reports, failure to meet classes in a responsible manner, failure to return papers and other assignments or tests on a timely basis, failure to communicate with students, and failure to serve as a responsible advisor to students. A rating of unsatisfactory requires a remediation plan per the CBA. A second year at the Conditional level will result in an "Unsatisfactory" rating**.**

II.   **Research and Creative Activities**

In evaluating faculty research activities, the Department looks for evidence that the research program has or will have significant impact on the field as documented in the e-FAR (and optional supplementary document). Although a certain frequency of publications is necessary for establishing a research reputation, sheer number of publications is neither the only nor the most important index of research productivity. Efforts to secure external research funding are highly encouraged of all faculty with a research assignment, particularly sponsored projects that support doctoral students with a research assignment. Both the competitiveness, prestige, and success of grant proposals will be used in annual evaluations.

Documentation of research productivity will be provided on the electronic Faculty Annual Report (e-FAR) in the form of a list of publications, presentations, grant proposals submitted for review

and grants/contracts awarded during the year. Faculty are also encouraged to provide other documents that will allow assessment of quality and quantity of research activities. These might include letters from editors or reviewers, published reviews of books, and a personal statement that places the year's work in the context of the individual's overall program of research.

A primary mission of the Department of Criminal Justice is to achieve international and national visibility for excellence in research. Consequently, the department expects all tenured and tenure earning faculty to demonstrate a sustained record of scholarly achievement. The evaluation of research excellence involves an examination of a number of standards. Of course, there is the evaluation of productivity. However, evaluation of research excellence also involves examination of research quality, its impact on the broader discipline, the continuity of the faculty. Given the department has differentiated research loads (i.e., 2 – 2, 2 – 3, 3 – 3, and 3 – 4) the research activities will be weighted to reflect the workload allocation to research.

Quantity – In assessing research productivity, primary emphasis is given to the number of publications in refereed journals and/or scholarly books and monographs. Refereed book chapters will be considered positively in the context of a sustained record of refereed publications and where those chapters indicate evidence of national and international recognition. Textbooks can contribute to the scholarship of a field when they make a significant and demonstrable intellectual contribution. However, the contributions of book chapters and textbooks must be documented, and book chapters and textbooks are generally more useful for demonstrating scholarship at senior levels. Presentations at meetings are encouraged as a way of testing ideas in public forums but will not substitute for publications. Faculty members will be expected to provide documentation of the impact of other dissemination and scholarly works.

Impact and quality of research – The quality and impact of a faculty member's research will be an important component of the assessment of scholarly contribution. Where the impact of the faculty's work may be unclear to the Chair, the individual faculty member will have the responsibility of presenting journal reputation, impact factors and citation metrics, and other information for consideration in judgments of quality. Citation analyses can be useful, but those analyses must be done in the context of the citation expectations for top scholars in the candidate's area of research. Again, it is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to provide a context for this information so that the Chair can properly evaluate this information.

Publications appearing in print must be included during the reporting period, while items that are accepted or in press may be used in the count . Faculty will not be given credit for previously reported items or for items that are forthcoming or in progress. See Appendix 2 for a list of Research and Creative Activities.

Candidates seeking promotion should consult the Promotion and Tenure document for the criteria for tenure and promotion.

The following represents the rating scales to evaluate research productivity. Faculty may also choose to provide a one-page document to be attached to their e-FAR further demonstrating their research contributions that might not otherwise be reflected in the e-FAR document.

Ordinal Rating Scale for Research and Creative Activities

a) **Outstanding (4 points):** Clear evidence of scholarly achievement that achieves national or international visibility. Two peer-reviewed publications in journals with significant impact as indicated by an impact factor or other citation metric, such as indexing in ResearchGate, JCR, Psychinfo, etc. Demonstration of lead or sole-authored scholarship. Submission of an external grant proposal or multiple internal proposals for funding count as the equivalent as a publication. Participation in national or international conferences.
   a. *Example:* A faculty member has three peer-reviewed publications in journals indexed in ResearchGate, JCR, Psychinfo, etc., as well as one proposal under review at NIJ. The faculty member has several conference presentations during the current reporting period at ASC and ACJS (or ASA, APA, etc.).

b) **Above satisfactory (3 points):** Clear scholarly achievement with the potential of achieving national or international visibility. At least one publication in a journal with significant impact as indicated by an impact factor (citation metric), such as indexing in ResearchGate, JCR, Psychinfo, etc. Publication of book chapters and/or encyclopedia entries. Participation in national or international conferences.
   a. *Example:* A faculty member has one publication in a peer-reviewed journal article and one funding proposal under review. The faculty member also has a conference presentation during the current reporting period at a national or regional organization.

c) **Satisfactory (2 points):** Scholarly achievement but little evidence of an active research agenda.
   a. *Example:* The faculty member has published once in the last 2 years. They also have a conference presentation during the current reporting period.

d) **Conditional (1 point):** A deficient record of scholarship characterized by unacceptable quantity and/or quality of research.
   b. *Example:* The faculty member has not published, participated in externally sponsored research, or presented at a National conference for two years.

e) **Unsatisfactory (0 points):** A faculty member who does not complete activities necessary for a Conditional evaluation will receive an Unsatisfactory evaluation in Research and Creative Activities. Additionally, research misconduct will result in a rating of Unsatisfactory.

III.   Service Activities

All faculty are expected to provide service to the Department, the College, the University, and professional and community organizations. Faculty are expected to share in the governance and necessary activities of the department through committee assignments, teaching of service courses, and so on. However, involvement in service activities differs according to rank. Assistant Professors in their first term are only expected to provide service at the Department level. As a faculty member's career progresses, the nature of service activities is expected to change, with participation in activities at the Department, College, University, and profession levels. Faculty at the rank of Professor should be involved in leadership roles in service to the department and the

profession. Professors are more likely than the other ranks to obtain high profile-positions as journal editors, editorial board members, executive board members of professional organizations. These activities bring recognition to UCF and should be encouraged.

Service activities are listed in groups that represent domains of activity (e.g., department / college / university, community, and discipline). A few distinctions are made in terms of the value of individual activities. It is required that all faculty attend regularly scheduled departmental meetings, so participation in this activity is a necessary condition for an evaluation other than unsatisfactory. Also, some items count double or more. Apart from this, distinctions across evaluation levels of unsatisfactory, conditional, satisfactory, above satisfactory and outstanding reflect the breadth and impact of service activities demonstrated.

The minimum standards to receive a satisfactory rating for service include the following:

1. Holds membership in at least one department committee.
2. Regularly attends and where it potentially will be unclear, demonstrates that they provided a meaningfully contribution to the committee(s) assigned (included in the optional supplementary material uploaded to the e-FAR).
3. If tenured, provides evidence of contributions to at least one other form of institutional and/or community service (e.g., at least one college, university, or profession committee, serves on an editorial board).

The following represents the rating scales to evaluate service contributions. Faculty may also choose to provide a one-page document to be attached to their e-FAR further demonstrating their service contributions that might not otherwise be reflected in the e-FAR document.

Ordinal Rating Scale for Service for All Faculty

(Credit for Service on Committees requires regular attendance and participation

a) **Outstanding (4 points):** Exceptional service contributions to the university, college, department and profession includes substantial contributions to committees and service on committees in professional organization associated with the faculty member's discipline.
   a. *Example:* A faculty member demonstrates breadth and impact of their service contributions. This includes serving on a university committee or task force and/or is a faculty sponsor of a campus student organization (directs a program, or a major regional campus initiative). They also serve on a number of other committees. An outstanding evaluation on service requires active participation that leads to clear contributions in terms of breath and impact, not merely membership. Outstanding service also includes manuscript (for recognized journals) and/or grant review.

b) **Above satisfactory (3 points):** Above average contributions to the university, college, or department and/or discipline through participation on committees and/or service on committees in professional organizations.
   a. Example: The faculty member serves on the graduate program committee and the College of Community Innovation and Education P&T committee and participates

in a way that leads to clear contributions, reflected in breath and impact, not merely membership.

c) **Satisfactory (2 points):** Active contributions to service including membership on university, college or department committees or participation in professional organizations.
   a. Example: The faculty member serves on the Undergraduate Affairs Committee and participates in a way that leads to clear contributions, not merely membership.

d) **Conditional (1 point):** A deficient record of service including but not limited to a failure to participate in essential activities expected of faculty (e.g. failure to attend committee meetings).
   a. Example: The faculty missed at least half of their committee meetings and they are not engaged as indicated by participation in discussions or timely responses to email votes.

e) **Unsatisfactory:** To achieve an Unsatisfactory in Service Activity, faculty fail to meet the standards necessary to achieve a rating of Satisfactory across two or more evaluation periods, and do not respond to the needs of the university, the profession, and the community by engaging in service activities.

IV.   Other Assigned Duties

In some instances, duties other than those already discussed that result in course release may be a significant part of evaluating a faculty member's performance. In such cases, the faculty member will have an additional activity category, identified as "other duties," beyond teaching, research and service. The faculty member, in consultation with the Chair, will negotiate the appropriate weights across the four activity categories for use in the overall evaluation.

V.   Overall Rating Computation Department of Criminal Justice

Each faculty member's overall rating will be based upon points scored in each applicable category. These individual scores will be weighted based upon the faculty member's annual assignment of duties. Once the scores are weighted, the faculty member's overall rating will be determined according to the matrix presented below.

Weights based on teaching load	Teaching	Scholarly Activity	Service	Other*
4-4 teaching load	92%	0%	8%	*
3-4 teaching load	80%	12%	8%	*
3-3 teaching load	69%	23%	8%	*
2-3 teaching load	57%	35%	8%	*
2-2 teaching load	46%	46%	8%	*

*The weights for faculty assuming "Other" responsibilities will be adjusted to reflect agreed upon weights.

Overall Rating after Weighting	Outstanding	Above Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Conditional	Unsatisfactory
Total Points	4.0 – 3.6	3.5 – 2.6	2.5 – 1.6	1.5 – 0.6	0.5 – 0.0

VI. OVERALL RATING

The overall rating of a Department faculty member will be determined by the Department Chair in a written annual evaluation in accordance with the UCF BOT-UFF Agreement. Performance in all categories will be weighted according to the faculty member's assignment to determine an overall assessment of performance in each category. Unassigned activities compensated by sources other than the University (except academic books or textbooks for which the author may receive royalties) generally will not be included in the merit evaluation.

Not all individual circumstances pertaining to performance throughout the year can be anticipated in advance. Faculty members whose annual assignments vary from the norm or who require unique interpretation of performance standards are urged to negotiate an acceptable arrangement with the Department Chair as soon as it is apparent that such stipulations are necessary or desirable.

VII. GRIEVANCE PROCESS

Open communication and informal resolutions of evaluation disputes are encouraged under the latest applicable UCF BOT-UFF Agreement. For further information on grievances, faculty should consult the terms of the latest UCF BOT-UFF Agreement.

Appendix 1   Teaching Activities

High Impact Teaching
- Creates a new course in face-to-face, mixed mode, or fully online.
- Develops innovative courses, programs, and/or teaching approaches not previously offered or utilized in the department, including but not limited to courses developed for the Honors College.
- Incorporates cultural diversity into course content through course syllabi, course readings, course assignments and/or guest lecture presentations.
- Fosters student interaction through the use of engagement strategies in at least one class, such as student presentations, debates, and team papers.
- Conducts a UCF study abroad or student/faculty exchange program.
- Participates in at least one teaching workshop/seminar to improve teaching through the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning or other appropriate institute or professional conference.

Student Mentorship and Supervision
- Contributes to student development through participation in student academic activities, such as McNair, LEAD, RAMP, independent studies and directed readings.
- Serves as the member of a committee for graduate student research projects (e.g., Thesis, Dissertation, and Honors in Major Thesis).
- Serves as the member of a committee for undergraduate student research projects (e.g., Thesis and/or Honors in Major Thesis).

Teaching and Student Mentorship Recognition
- Receives departmental, college, or campus recognition, teaching awards, or curricular grants for the creation of innovative classroom materials, such as, cases, projects, exercises, or computer software.
- Receives professional organization recognition, teaching awards, or curricular grants for the creation of innovative classroom materials, such as, cases, projects, exercises, or computer software.
- Receives departmental or student recognition or awards for excellence in participation in student academic life.

Faculty Mentorship and Scholarship of Teaching
- Mentors adjuncts and other colleagues in facilitating student learning through one-on-one meetings and/or the sharing of syllabi and course materials.
- Serves as a mentor for a faculty member or PHD student for ADL.
- Serves as an instructor in a university sponsored teaching workshop.
- Conducts a workshop or presents a paper at a regional or national professional meeting on teaching related topics.
- Conducts research on the scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL).
- Presents (at a conference) or publishes research on the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Appendix 2   Research and Creative Activities

Peer-Reviewed Publications
- Peer-reviewed journal article
- Publishes a law review article in peer-reviewed law review
- Chapter in a peer-reviewed book
- New commercial textbook or university press book
- Publishes an edited book
- Publishes a new edition of a book
- Publishes an article (either solely authored or multiple-authored) in a state, regional, or national professional journal, newsletter, or magazine
- Mentors and collaborates with students on publications and presentations

Non Peer-Reviewed Publications
- Non-reviewed article in a recognized journal
- Publishes a law review article in non-reviewed law review
- Chapter in a book
- Publishes an edited book
- Publishes a chapter in a non-peer reviewed, edited book (other than a non-substantive introduction)
- Publishes an encyclopedia entry, book review, or book essay

Sponsored Research
- Receives a grant from a federal agency or foundation
- Receives a contract from a state or local agency
- Submits a grant proposal through the university to a federal agency or foundation
- Submits a grant proposal through the university to a state or local agency
- Applies for internal research funding
- Supports student stipends and tuition waivers in grants and contracts

Conferences and Research Presentations
- Delivers an invited presentation to a prestigious audience
- Gives an invited talk to a professional group or organization
- Gives an invited talk to a university group
- Presents a paper or poster at a national professional conference
- Presents a paper or poster at a regional professional conference
- Communicates on a scholarly topic in a professional capacity, such as invited presentations or talks before local professional group

Recognitions
- Receives recognition of distinction from a National organization for research and scholarly accomplishments
- Receives recognition of distinction from a regional, state, or local organization for research and scholarly accomplishments

- Wide dissemination of public scholarship to inform policy, practice, and public opinion. This may come in the form of informing policymakers, practitioners, members of the media, and/or the public. Forms of dissemination and communication may include: Public Writing, Creative Products, Social Media Engagement, News Media Engagement, and/or Federal Advisory Committees.

Appendix 3   Service Activities (Department/University, Community, Discipline)

Department/College/University
- Serves on university or college committees.
- Actively participates in Institutional effectiveness activities by serving on a committee.
- Chairs or heads a departmental or university committee or other major task force.
- Actively participates on significant university committees, such as program review, curriculum or tenure and promotion.
- Attends a commencement ceremony.
- Serves as a member of ad-hoc departmental, college and university committees or task forces.
- Participates in departmental and college activities, such as a representative at Majors Fair, registration, recruiting, and orientation.
- Serves as advisor to student organizations.
- Serves on departmental committees as an active member.
- Receives departmental, university or student-organization recognition as an outstanding contributor to student life at UCF.

Community
- Contributes expertise in theory and practice to community organizations.
- Develops community partnerships.
- Volunteers for local community organizations or activities.
- Performs public activities, which bring favorable attention to UCF (e.g., certain consulting activity, serving on boards of and/or participating in community organizations).
- Wide dissemination of public scholarship to inform policy, practice, and public opinion, including dissemination to policymakers, practitioners, members of the media, and/or the public. Forms of dissemination and communication may include: Public Writing, Creative Products, Social Media Engagement, News Media Engagement, and/or Federal Advisory Committees.

Discipline
- Serves as editor of a regional or national (recognized) journal.
- Organizes conferences or develops symposia for national or international professional organizations.
- Serves on editorial board(s) for regional, national, or international journal(s)
- Serves as a reviewer for regional, national or international journals.
- Serves as an external reviewer of faculty materials from other universities for purposes of promotion and tenure.
- Holds a membership and participates actively in a professional organization.
- Serves in an administrative capacity in professional organizations.

- Grant review.