



UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
& COMPUTER SCIENCE

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Annual Evaluation Standards & Procedures (AESP)

The Chair of ECE Department will use the primary performance measures outlined in this document for annual faculty evaluations.

The objective of this section is to provide the ECE faculty with the annual evaluation procedure, productivity measures and expected faculty performance, which will move the Department forward and help it to be recognized nationally.

1. Annual Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Workloads:

The following procedures apply to all full-time faculty members in the ECE Department.

Procedures

Each ECE faculty member (tenured, tenure-track, or visiting faculty and instructors/lecturers) will prepare the required Faculty Annual Report (FAR), describing his or her accomplishments in teaching, research, service and activities during the evaluation period. Per CECS, an up-to-date curriculum vitae (CV) is required with the FAR.

The FAR and CV will be due on the date set by the College (but no sooner than fourteen (14) days after the end of the evaluation period and no sooner than fourteen (14) days after receipt by the employee of all University provided materials required to produce the report, including student evaluations and department or unit and college averages for these evaluations). The established due date shall be consistent with the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement. The Chair will use these summary reports, CVs, Office of Research's funding reports, SPOIs, and other relevant information related to accomplishments in teaching, research and service activities (from peers and students) to assign a set of ratings that describes the performance of each faculty member. In doing so, the Department Chair will apply the criteria outlined in this document.

For the annual evaluation, the Chair of the Department will have face-to-face meetings with all Assistant Professors, and upon request, with Associate and Full Professors, to review the outcomes and answer any question. These will be done before the end of the first two months of the following academic year. The face-to-face meetings will be to discuss:

- Productivity during the evaluation period
- Rating of teaching, research and service
- Overall rating
- Next year's plan and goals
- Open time to discuss any other issues, needs or concerns

The Chair will complete a written review on the evaluation form for each faculty member of the Department within 60 days after the due date of the FAR and CV. This review should provide feedback on research, teaching and service, and provide explanations on scoring for each section. Additionally, upon receipt of the completed

evaluation form, a face-to-face meeting can be requested by a tenured faculty member. Each faculty member will be asked to sign the evaluation form and may choose to respond in writing to the annual review. This response also becomes a part of that faculty member's file. Each faculty member shall be offered the opportunity to discuss the evaluation with the Chair prior to its being finalized and placed in the faculty member's evaluation file.

Annual evaluations may be used to determine faculty salary increases for the following year if such raises are provided.

Faculty Workload Models

CECS work load (i.e., FTEs) is (for most faculty members who are teaching 2+2 courses) 50% in instructional activities, 25% in research, and 25% in service. Consistent with the established CECS' workload policy, the ECE faculty agrees to the subsequent FTE percentages of instructional activities, research and creative activities, and service activities in order to recognize individual faculty's choices of workload models and foci (which were done prior to the beginning of the evaluation period). The following table outlines the FTE allocation for variant duty assignments.

Workload Table

Type of faculty members	Teaching FTE (F_T)	Research FTE (F_R)	Service FTE (F_S)
teaching 2+2 courses	0.5	0.25	0.25
teaching 3+3 courses	0.75	0-0.10	0.25- F_R
teaching 1+2 or 2+1 courses (with buy-out)	0.375	0.375	0.25
Teaching 1+1 courses (with buy-out)	0.25	0.5	0.25

Specifically, a faculty member may have more instructional activities (e.g., 3 courses per semester), or standard instructional activities (e.g., 2 courses per semester), or other assigned/administrative duties. For faculty members with a 3+3 course teaching load, the standard workload percentages are 75% for instructional activities, 25% for combination of research and creative activities and service activities. For those with administrative and other assigned duties, the chair will adjust their weights at the beginning of that assignment and inform the faculty member. This will take place six weeks in advance of the start of the semester if practicable (otherwise, it can be done after the fact upon a mutual agreement).

2. Expected Performance Measures: All faculty members

Faculty evaluations will be based on expected productivity measures in teaching, research and service outlined in this section.

a. Teaching Activities:

Table 1. Teaching Effectiveness Criteria:

UNSATISFACTORY	CONDITIONAL	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE SATISFACTORY	OUTSTANDING
<p>No Teaching Activity & No Steps to Correct</p>	<p>Fewer Teaching Activity</p>	<p>Presence of Teaching Activity</p>	<p>Substantive Presence of Teaching Activities and Outcomes</p>	<p>Significant Presence of Teaching Activities and Outcomes</p>
<p>A faculty member who fails to meet the requirements for "Satisfactory" and fails to perform, or chronically demonstrates poor performance will receive an evaluation of UNSATISFACTORY, in their second (or further) consecutive year of conditional performance</p> <p>Poor performance includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> receiving poor teaching evaluation for courses taught during the evaluation period in the category of "Overall Assessment of Instruction" on the Student Perception of Instruction Reports., failing to hold class in an assigned manner, or failing to return papers, other assignments or tests on a timely basis, or failing to provide course content to students, or failing to serve as a discipline area advisor to students. 	<p>An evaluation of CONDITIONAL in Teaching will be assigned if a faculty member fails to meet the requirements for "Satisfactory"</p> <p>Poor performance includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> receiving low course teaching evaluations for the courses taught during the evaluation period in the category of "Overall Assessment of Instruction" on the Student Perception of Instruction Reports., failing to hold class in a responsible manner, or failing to return papers, other assignments or tests on a timely basis, or failing to adequately provide course content to students or Not fulfilling to serve as a discipline area advisor to students. 	<p>The faculty member offers assigned courses according to the specified delivery mode (e.g. face-to-face, online, mixed mode.)</p> <p>In order to achieve a SATISFACTORY evaluation in Teaching, faculty must maintain professional conduct in fulfilling teaching duties and also demonstrate competence in teaching by completing at least three of the tasks listed in the Evidence of teaching Activities (ETA) or Evidence of Teaching Outcomes (ETO) in Table 2 below. The ETO can be counted in the ETA, but the ETA cannot be counted in the ETO.</p>	<p>The faculty member offers assigned course according to the specified delivery mode (e.g. face-to-face, online, mixed mode.)</p> <p>To achieve an ABOVE SATISFACTORY evaluation in Teaching, faculty must maintain professional conduct in fulfilling teaching duties and also demonstrate competence in teaching by completing at least three of the tasks listed in the ETA and at least one of the tasks listed in the ETO. The ETO can be counted in the ETA, but the ETA cannot be counted in the ETO.</p>	<p>The faculty member offers assigned course according to the specified delivery mode (e.g. face-to-face, online, mixed mode.)</p> <p>To achieve an OUTSTANDING evaluation in Teaching, faculty must maintain professional conduct in fulfilling teaching duties and also demonstrate competence in teaching by completing at least four of the tasks listed in the ETA and at least two of the tasks listed in the ETO. The ETO can be counted in the ETA, but the ETA cannot be counted in the ETO. The significance is assessed by comparing the activities to accomplishments by his/her peer group.</p>

Table 2. Teaching Activities and Outcomes: In addition to fulfilling assigned classroom duties

Evidence of Teaching Activity (ETA)	Evidence of Teaching Outcomes (ETO)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Currently supervising, as committee chair, Ph.D. Dissertation, M.S. Thesis or B.S. Honors Thesis 2. Contribute to Educational Journals and Conference publications which improve the quality of teaching 3. Involvement in Educational grants/partnerships/ projects such as NSF CCLI, STEP, IGERT, CRCD, REU, RET, etc., which improve the quality of teaching 4. Curriculum development that includes course revisions, new courses, new preparations, lab development and seminar development 5. Delivery of multi-media/FEEDS courses and creative instructional methods 6. Participate in student team competitions, independent studies, as well as directing projects and student teams/organizations 7. Establish partnership with Industry/educational organizations to improve the quality of teaching 8. Serve on Ph.D. and M.S. committee(s) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Dissertation supervision, and M.S. Thesis to completion as Committee Chair. 10. SPI Report: Above the ECE average commensurate with the same (undergraduate or graduate) level course. 11. Receiving direct Educational grants/partnerships/projects such as NSF CCLI, STEP, IGERT, CRCD, REU, RET, etc. as PI or Co-PI. 12. Receiving competitive UCF, regional, national and international teaching award or awards. 13. Publication of articles as author or co-author in Educational Journals and/or presentation of Conference papers which seek to improve the quality of teaching. 14. Publication of textbooks and/or book chapters 15. Leadership in curriculum development that includes course revisions and development, new preparations, lab development and seminar development 16. Other significant teaching outcome such as graduate fellowship awards, student awards, etc. received by student advisees.

b. Research Activities:

Table 3 provides the overall criteria for research effectiveness. Table 4 provides further definition of research activities and outcomes.

Table 3. Research Effectiveness Criteria

UNSATISFACTORY	CONDITIONAL	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE SATISFACTORY	OUTSTANDING
No Research Activity & No Steps to Correct	Fewer Research Activity	Presence of Research Activities	Substantive Presence of Research Activities and Outcomes	<i>Significant</i> Presence of Research Activities and Outcomes
A faculty member who does not complete the activities necessary for a CONDITIONAL evaluation will receive an UNSATISFACTORY rating in the area of Research and Creative Activities.	A faculty member will receive a CONDITIONAL evaluation in Research and Creative Activities if s/he demonstrates fewer than two items in the list of Evidence of Research Activity (ERA).	In order to achieve a SATISFACTORY evaluation in Research, a faculty member must demonstrate at least two participatory items in the list of Evidence of Research Activity (ERA) e.g. the faculty member attended a technical conference and submitted one technical proposal to an external funding agency.	In order to achieve an ABOVE SATISFACTORY evaluation in Research, a faculty member must demonstrate a solid contribution in at least two of the items in the list of Evidence of Research Outcome (ERO) e.g. the faculty member has authored one book chapter and one refereed publication in a top technical journal.	In order to achieve an OUTSTANDING evaluation in Research, a faculty member must demonstrate significant contribution in at least two ERO items . Singular examples would be significantly above average monetary funding award and/or current performance as PI on such an award from federal agencies or industry. The significance is assessed by comparing the activities to accomplishments by his/her peer group.

Table 4. Research Activities and Outcomes.

Evidence of Research Activity (ERA)	Evidence of Research Outcomes (ERO)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17. Submission of articles on research topics in peer-reviewed journals 18. Submission as PI/Co-PI of research funding proposals to external agencies. 19. Submission of book proposals and other professional publications. 20. Involvement with research and industry partnerships. 21. Involvement with interdisciplinary research as PI or co-PI. 22. Attending technical conferences, short courses, workshops 23. Supporting students for conferences 24. Involvement in invention, patent disclosure, software, copyright, and other related works. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25. Publication of articles on research topics in peer-reviewed journals (faculty are encouraged to publish in major journals published by professional engineering societies such as IEEE Transactions and other IET peer-review journals, etc.) 26. Award and/or current performance on an award as PI or Co-PI of research funding from external funding agencies. 27. Research expenditure (compared to his/her peer group) 28. Leadership in research partnerships or multidisciplinary research team 29. Publication of authored or co-authored books or book chapters. 30. Refereed, IEEE/IEE or other high-impact conference publications (compared to his/her peer group) 31. Conferences/workshops/tutorials as keynote or invited speaker. 32. Competitive regional, national or international research awards. 33. Receiving a patent innovation, producing innovative hardware and/or software inventions. 34. Being elected as a Distinguished Member or Fellow of a professional organization (e.g., IEEE, National Academy of Science or Engineering (NAE/NAS) membership) during the evaluation period.

C. Service Activities:

Table 5 provides the overall criteria for service effectiveness. Table 6 provides further definition of service activities and outcomes.

Table 5. Service Effectiveness Criteria

UNSATISFACTORY	CONDITIONAL	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE SATISFACTORY	OUTSTANDING
No Service Activity & No Steps to Correct	Fewer Service Activity	Participation of Services	Leadership Position & Presence of Service Activities and Outcomes	Leadership Presence & Significant Presence of Service Activities and Outcomes
A faculty member who does not complete the activities necessary for a CONDITIONAL evaluation will receive an UNSATISFACTORY rating in the area of Service.	A faculty member will receive a CONDITIONAL evaluation in Service if s/he demonstrates fewer than two items in the list of Evidence of Service Activity (ESA)	In order to achieve a SATISFACTORY evaluation in Research, a faculty member must demonstrate at least three items in the list of Evidence of Service Activity (ESA)	In order to achieve an ABOVE SATISFACTORY evaluation in Service, in addition to at least three items in ESA, a faculty member must demonstrate at least one of the items in the list of Evidence of Service Outcome (ESO)	In order to achieve an OUTSTANDING evaluation in Service, a faculty member must demonstrate service outcomes well above the Above Satisfactory level, e.g. at least 3 items in the list of Evidence of Service Activity (ESA) and at least two items in the list of Evidence of Service Outcome (ESO). The significance is assessed by comparing the activities to accomplishments by his/her peer group.

Table 6. Service Activities and Outcomes.

Evidence of Service Activity (ESA)	Evidence of Service Outcomes (ESO)
35. Actively contributing member of a professional organization 36. Actively contributing member of a department committee 37. Actively contributing reviewer for professional conference 38. Actively contributing reviewer for professional journal. 39. Actively contributing member of a college committee 40. Actively contributing member of a university committee. 41. Mentor to a new faculty member 42. Advisor to student organization	43. Officer of a professional organization 44. External reviewer or panel member at state or national levels such as NSF panel or publicities (TV interview, etc.) on his/her academic work 45. Chair or member of major college, or university committee 46. Chair or member of departmental committee 47. Organizer/Chair of a professional conference 48. Member of a professional conference committee 49. Editor, associate editor, guest editor for professional journal. 50. Member of editorial board for professional journal

3. Overall Performance

The individual's teaching, research and service ratings will be based on the performance measures when compared to Department average productivity in each category. The Department Chair determines the ratings of the individual's teaching, research and service categories according to criteria in 5 classes (Outstanding (O), Above satisfactory (AS), satisfactory (S), conditional (C), and unsatisfactory (U)). Each class is assigned to a numerical number as follow: 4 for O, 3 for AS, 2 for S, 1 for C, and 0 for U. These ratings are denoted as T (for teaching), R (for research), and S (for service). As per the CBA Section 10.1 (c), each faculty member must receive a minimum rating of S in each area of assignment in order to receive an overall rating of S or above.

Because CECS expects/encourages excellence in both teaching and research (with more emphasis on research toward the overall performance assessment), weights are added to these categories in the calculations (but not change FTEs). A set of weights are created to reflect these. Set $W_T=3$, $W_R=5$, $W_S=1$. The overall score (OS) of a faculty member's performance is to be computed by weighting average of each individual's three categories as follow

$$OS = \frac{W_T F_T T + W_R F_R R + W_S F_S S}{W_T F_T + W_R F_R + W_S F_S}$$

The overall performance is determined based on the overall score as follows:

- OS \geq 3.5 for overall Outstanding performance (O),
- 3.5 > OS \geq 2.5 for overall Above Satisfactory performance (AS),
- 2.5 > OS \geq 2 for overall Satisfactory performance (S),
- 2 > OS \geq 1 for overall Conditional performance (C).

and OS < 1 for overall Unsatisfactory performance (U).

For example, for a teaching focused faculty earning O in teaching, AS in research, and O in service will result in a total score of 4; another example, for a research focused faculty earning AS in teaching, O in research, and O in service will result in a total score of 3.5.

4. Typical Examples

In this section, we list various typical cases for several categories with $W_T=3$, $W_R=5$, $W_S=1$.

Workload	FT	FR	FS	T	R	S	Overall score	Overall rating
teaching 2+2 courses	0.5	0.25	0.25	4	3	4	3.58	O
teaching 2+2 courses	0.5	0.25	0.25	4	3	3	3.5	O
teaching 2+2 courses	0.5	0.25	0.25	3	4	4	3.5	O
teaching 2+2 courses	0.5	0.25	0.25	3	4	3	3.41	AS
teaching 2+2 courses	0.5	0.25	0.25	3	2	2	2.5	AS
teaching 2+2 courses	0.5	0.25	0.25	2	3	3	2.5	AS
teaching 2+2 courses	0.5	0.25	0.25	2	3	2	2.41	S
teaching 2+2 courses	0.5	0.25	0.25	2	1	2	1.58	C
teaching 3+3 courses	0.75	0.1	0.15	4	2	2	3.55	O
teaching 3+3 courses	0.75	0.1	0.15	3	4	4	3.22	AS
teaching 3+3 courses	0.75	0.1	0.15	3	1	1	2.55	AS
teaching 3+3 courses	0.75	0.1	0.15	2	1	2	1.82	C
teaching 3+3 courses	0.75	0	0.25	2	-	2	2	S

5. Final Remarks:

In addition to the quantitative measures described in the tables 1-6, the Department’s Chair will take into account the quality of the work presented. Whenever a question of quality arises, the Department’s Chair must take the effort to seek out faculty and other professionals who can provide insight into the quality of the publications.

The faculty member under evaluation can provide supplemental information such as frequency and impact of citations of published papers, textbooks and other materials produced with their annual report.

The Chair may seek the help of other faculty in ECE, the college or outside of UCF to assess the quality of the work presented by a faculty member in his/her annual report.

The Chair will also distinguish the faculty rank in terms of expected performance. While the evaluation criteria will be the same for each rank as shown in Tables 1, 3 and 5, the Chair compares an individual’s accomplishments and the departmental averages. Full Professors are expected to perform above the expectations for an Associate Professor; likewise, Associate Professors are expected to perform above those at the Assistant Professor level. Visiting and instructors will follow the evaluations and standards and procedure outlines here with the proper FTE assignment.

In cases where faculty evaluation is contested, the UCF grievance procedure in place at that time will be

followed.