



## University of Central Florida

### Florida Space Institute Annual Evaluation Standards & Procedures

#### **Mission of FSI**

The mission of FSI is primarily to support space research, development, and education activities within UCF and other FSI member institutions in Florida, and secondarily to support the development of Florida's space economy – civil, defense, and commercial.

This mission is accomplished through several different avenues including, but not limited to, (i) participating in space science and engineering projects including flight instruments on civil, defense, and commercial spacecraft; (ii) participating in the education and training of the next generation of space scientists and engineers; (iii) fostering collaboration between various entities in Florida on the development of space-related projects; and (iv) fundamental research related to space science and engineering.

#### **Evaluation Process**

The process for annual professional employee evaluation includes 3 components or “parts” that to a certain degree overlap across evaluation years. They are as follows:

- 1) Part A includes the expectations for the coming year. This section is completed jointly by the employee and his or her supervisor and is the point at which the current evaluation period and the next evaluation overlap. At the conclusion of the evaluation process (the completion of Part C by the supervisor), the Part A for the next evaluation period is completed jointly by the employee and the employee's supervisor. Part A can (and should) be modified by the employee and the employee's supervisor at any time during the evaluation period if duties and responsibilities of the employee change.
- 2) Part B is the employee's activities report for the evaluation period. It is expected to correlate reasonably well with Part A for the evaluation period. This part is completed by the employee at the end of the evaluation period.
- 3) Part C is the supervisor's evaluation of the employee's performance during the evaluation period. This part is filled out by the supervisor and reviewed and signed by the FSI Director prior to review of the evaluation with the employee. As part of this evaluation review process, the Part A for the next evaluation period should be jointly completed by the employee and the employee's supervisor.

In the event that there is disagreement between the employee and the employee's supervisor regarding the evaluation that cannot be mutually resolved, the employee shall have 20 working days to submit a petition, with supporting documentation, to the FSI Director. At that point, the employee's petition shall be provided to the employee's supervisor and the supervisor shall have

20 working days to provide a rebuttal to the FSI Director. Then the FSI Director shall decide the matter and that decision shall be final. For those employees who report directly to the FSI Director, appeals or disagreements regarding the evaluation are made to the Vice President for Research. However, the two processes cannot be pursued simultaneously. If a faculty member chooses to pursue the departmental appeal procedure, a grievance may not be filed until the departmental process is complete.

### ***FSI Evaluation Criteria***

The FSI Director or designee will use the Employee Expectation, Activity, and Evaluation Form (EEAEF) to assign a rating, as appropriate, for each category (i.e. FSI Projects and Activities, Proposal Activities, Information Dissemination, etc.). All categories may not apply equally (or at all) to each individual, depending on his or her duties. Thus, ratings are irrelevant in a category for which an employee has no assignment. Generally, employees at different rank will have different assignments. The expertise and experience of employees will also factor into their assignments. Employees at the same rank may have very different assignment assigned effort, for example, if one is more expert in basic scientific research while another is more expert and experienced in educational programs.

Assigned effort in each category will be determined at the beginning of the year by the employee's supervisor according to the employee's work plan. Assigned efforts in each category will be made available to employees through their supervisors. Employees have the opportunity to discuss the assigned effort with their supervisors and suggest changes. If the employee does not agree with the assigned effort ultimately decided by the supervisor, the employee may petition to the FSI Director. For those employees who report directly to the FSI Director, appeals regarding assigned efforts are made to the Vice President for Research. These assigned efforts should be discussed with the employee at the beginning of the academic year and at any time such that changes are made due to redirection in responsibilities or focus. Guidelines outlined in this document will be used by the evaluator to assign ratings for the various categories. In addition to the category ratings, an Overall Employee Performance rating will be given on the EEAEF.

***Overall evaluation.*** The overall evaluation is reported by the employee's supervisor on the EEAEF Section VII Part C and is determined as follows. The overall evaluation will be based on the scaled sum of the evaluation in each category for which the faculty member has an assignment. The scaled sum will be calculated by assigning a numerical score of 1-5 to the adjectival evaluations in each activity category of Unsatisfactory through Outstanding, respectively, and scaling by the assigned effort in that category. The scaled sum will be converted to an overall evaluation as follows: < 1.5: Unsatisfactory; 1.5-2.49: Conditional; 2.5-3.49: Satisfactory; 3.5-4.49: Above Satisfactory; 4.5 and higher: Outstanding. However, regardless of the numerical score, in order for the overall score to be at least Satisfactory the faculty member cannot have Unsatisfactory or Conditional ratings in any evaluation category in which the assigned effort was at least 10 per cent.

The procedure described above is illustrated with the following example.

***Evaluation within a category of assigned effort.*** The following sections describe the criteria for each evaluation in the different categories of effort. Because there is not a continuum of performance metrics in each category, the examples below for each rating in each category are based on the assumption of a significant assignment in that category. The level of assignment

assumed is given below for each category. If a faculty member has a significantly different assignment in that category, then the criteria for each rating are to be adjusted accordingly. For example, a satisfactory rating in the evaluation category of Information Dissemination requires one publication assuming a nominal assignment of 40% in that category. If a faculty member has an assignment of only 20% in that category, then a satisfactory rating would not require a publication but would be achieved by progress toward a publication that will result in a publication in a two-year time period instead of one year. Because the criteria cannot be finely divided (that is, there is no such thing as half a publication, for example), the employee and the evaluator will agree at the time the assignments are made for the following year what will constitute each rating in categories for which the assignments are significantly greater than or less than the examples given below.

***Evaluation Categories: FSI Projects and Activities and Externally Funded Projects and Programs***

Although these categories are evaluated separately, referring to creative activities for external sponsors and to projects internal to FSI, the evaluation criteria are the same for the two categories. The ratings below assume a 40% assignment in this category.

**Unsatisfactory** ratings will be assigned to faculty members who have not met their assigned duties and obligations for projects as evidenced by failure to meet requirements for deliverables and lack of participation in assigned project activities.

**Conditional** ratings will be assigned to faculty members who have not met the objectives of the majority of their assigned projects.

**Satisfactory** ratings will be assigned to faculty members who have performed their duties in a correct and appropriate manner in all or essentially all projects in which they have a role or duties, but have not made contributions that exceed the minimum expectations or requirements.

**Above Satisfactory** ratings will be assigned to faculty members who have performed their duties in a correct and appropriate manner in all projects in which they have a role or duties and have performed outstanding work in one or more of their activities. Outstanding work includes, but is not limited to, adding value to the project by making a contribution above and beyond what is called for in the project description or statement of work that significantly enhances the quality of the final project work.

**Outstanding** ratings will be assigned to faculty members that have made outstanding, measurable, and recognized contributions to more than one project or activity. Outstanding ratings may also be assigned for faculty who have made exceptional progress in executing their projects and activities. Examples of this include, but are not limited to, (1) broadening the scope of a project's deliverables to include new items that significantly enhance the value of the final product and/or significantly enhance the visibility profile of FSI; (2) successfully dealing with unanticipated challenges in executing project work; and (3) broadening the scope of a project to include new components and successfully completing those components.

***Evaluation Category: Proposal Activities***

Factors considered for proposals are: principal authorship, contributing authorship, supporting roles in team proposals, quality of proposals submitted, monetary value of proposals awarded, submission and funding of proposals in innovative or breakthrough areas that support future growth and expansion of FSI capabilities. Additionally, diversity in funding sources and the ability to obtain new sponsors are also factors that will be considered.

The desired result of a proposal submission is an externally funded research project. Proposals that are submitted but not funded may have some tangible benefits; however, it is the

funded proposals that are the life blood of FSI due to our reliance on external funding for the majority of our operations.

Because proposal activities for a single proposal can last more than a year or can easily cross the date boundary for annual evaluations at UCF, proposal activities include both proposal preparation as well as proposal submission and ultimately success in receiving awards for proposals. Thus, a single proposal may appear in annual evaluations for more than one year if effort was invested in it during more than one evaluation period. Because the success of a proposal is usually not known until at least several months after the last work on it has been done, credit will be given for proposal success in the evaluation period in which the proposal is selected for funding. There is no penalty for unsuccessful proposals.

The ratings below assume a 20% assignment in this category.

**Unsatisfactory** ratings will be assigned to faculty members who during the reporting period have no external research funding and no proposal submissions.

**Conditional** ratings will be assigned to faculty members who during the reporting period have no external research funding and only participated in one or fewer proposal submissions for external funding.

**Satisfactory** ratings will be assigned to faculty members who during the reporting period have participated in at least two proposal submissions for external funding or have sufficient external funding to support their research activities. A single major proposal preparation or submission activity will also count for a satisfactory rating. A major proposal is one that, if successful, will support more than one FTE employee at FSI or establish a major new research area within FSI.

**Above Satisfactory** ratings will be assigned to faculty members who have external funding to support their research activities and who have participated in greater than two proposal submissions for external funding. A single major proposal preparation or submission activity will count for participation in two normal proposal submissions. A major proposal is one that, if successful, will support more than one FTE employee at FSI or establish a major new research area within FSI. Obtaining funding from a new funding source (one that has not previously funded the faculty member) or otherwise diversifying the funding portfolio will also lead to a rating of Above Satisfactory.

**Outstanding** ratings will be assigned to faculty members who have met the criteria for Above Satisfactory as outline above and have participated in additional proposal activities or who have received funding that enables the faculty member to expand her or his research activities. The expansion of research activities may include, but is not limited to, hiring post-doctoral research associates, providing new support to FSI scientists to participate in the faculty member's research program, supervising one or more additional graduate students, or engaging in a new research area.

### ***Evaluation Category: Information Dissemination***

There are various types and forms of publications that contribute to forwarding FSI's goals. These include journal articles, book chapters, and archival publications. Additionally, reports for sponsors which are published by the sponsoring agency and material published by FSI members on publicly accessible websites also count toward establishing FSI's reputation. Dissemination of research results is critical to growing FSI's reputation as well as to the successful completion of creative and research activities by sharing results with the broader community.

While there are a variety of publication outlets, those which are peer reviewed will generally receive more weighting than those which are not. Evaluations of publications will be based on the number of submitted papers, the quality of the journals they are submitted to, and the acceptance rate of these publications. The impact of a published article is generally not evident

until one or more years after its publication. The impact of prior publications will be included in the evaluation of Information Dissemination by the number of citations of past works in the evaluation year. For example, citations made in 2012 for an article published in 2009 will count toward the evaluation for Information Dissemination in 2012.

The ratings below assume a 40% assignment in this category.

**Unsatisfactory** ratings will be assigned to faculty who don't have any peer-reviewed journal publications, peer reviewed publications, articles submitted for publication, publications accepted for conferences, or conference presentations during the reporting period.

**Conditional** ratings will be assigned to faculty who do not have any peer-reviewed publications during the reporting period and have submitted no more than one publication to a peer-reviewed journal and have not presented more than one result at nationally recognized conferences during the reporting period.

**Satisfactory** ratings will be assigned to faculty who during the reporting period have one peer-reviewed journal publication or have more than one publication in a conference proceeding or other non-refereed journal and who have made more than one presentation at a nationally recognized conference.

**Above Satisfactory** ratings will be assigned to faculty who during the reporting period have at least three peer-reviewed journal publications and/or three papers submitted for publication to peer-reviewed journals and who have made at least ~~one~~ three presentations at a nationally recognized conferences. A publication in a particularly high-impact journal that reaches a broad audience (such as *Science* or *Nature*) may count for more than one publication in a more standard peer-reviewed journal. In addition, publications in non-peer-reviewed venues (such as conference proceedings or publications for the general public) may also be considered to count toward a rating of Above Satisfactory. A significant impact of previously published work indicated by a number of citations during the period of performance at least three times the impact factor of the journal in which the work was published may be used in place of one publication or submission for a rating of Above Satisfactory. For example, a paper published in 2009 in a journal with an impact factor of 3 that was cited 9 times in 2012 will count toward one publication or submission for the 2012 evaluation period.

**Outstanding** ratings will be assigned to faculty who during the reporting period exceed the standard for a rating of Above Satisfactory by one or more of the following achievements: (1) publication or submission of an additional paper to a peer-reviewed journal; (2) presentations at three or more internationally recognized conferences; or (3) significant impact of previously published work indicated by citations in the evaluation period of four times the impact factor of the journal.

### ***Evaluation Category: Professional Development***

Factors considered for professional development and service include the following four categories: service activity, teaching activity, attendance at professional conferences and meetings, and educational development (see below for descriptions). The ratings below assume a 40% assignment in this category.

1. *Service activity* includes participation on UCF or external professional committees, professional society involvement, journal editorship, and board memberships. For those who do not have formal joint appointments this would also include serving on dissertation or master thesis committees.

2. *Teaching activity* includes faculty who are the instructors of record for UCF undergraduate and graduate classes, and committee membership in those departments as it relates to their teaching load. This may also include supervision and mentorship of students at FSI for those who do not have formal joint appointments.

3. *Attendance at Professional Conferences and Professional Meetings* includes attendance at meetings and conferences related to the faculty members research fields of interest or related to research projects the faculty member is involved with or would like to be involved with.

4. *Educational Development* consists of courses taken as a learner including college courses, short courses and workshops.

**Unsatisfactory** ratings will be assigned to faculty who, during the reporting period, have no service activities, no attendance at professional conferences and professional meetings and no educational development.

**Conditional** ratings will be assigned to faculty who, during the reporting period, have participated in no more than two activities in no more than one of the four categories of professional development listed above.

**Satisfactory** ratings will be assigned to faculty who, during the reporting period, have participated in at least one activity in two different categories of professional development listed above, or who have participated in more than two activities in a single category.

**Above Satisfactory** ratings will be assigned to faculty who, during the reporting period, have participated in at least one activity in each of at least three different categories of professional development listed above.

**Outstanding** ratings will be assigned to faculty who, during the reporting period, have participated in at least 5 different activities in at least three different categories of professional development listed above.

#### ***Evaluation Category: Partnership Activities***

FSI fosters, sponsors, conducts, and enables space research through partnerships between and among universities, units within universities such as departments and other centers, industry, colleges, and public school districts. Partnership activities involve establishing, maintaining, and participating in active relationships with these organizations outside FSI to further the mission and goals of the Institute. A minor partnership activity is one in which the participation of units external to FSI is only pro forma and does not make a significant tangible contribution to the overall FSI project. An active partnership is one in which the partner to FSI makes a contribution to the overall project that is necessary for the success of the project. The ratings below assume a 30% assignment in this category.

**Unsatisfactory** ratings will be assigned to faculty who, during the reporting period, have no active involvement in partnership activities.

**Conditional** ratings will be assigned to faculty who, during the reporting period, have no more than one minor partnership activity.

**Satisfactory** ratings will be assigned to faculty who, during the reporting period, are actively participating in at least one active partnership.

**Above Satisfactory** ratings will be assigned to faculty who, during the reporting period, participate in at least two active partnerships.

**Outstanding** ratings will be assigned to faculty who are participating in more than two active partnerships or who have established a major new partnership that will result in multiple joint activities between FSI and the new partner.

For all of the evaluation categories described above, there may be instances of significant and valuable contributions to the mission of FSI that are not captured by the specific activities and products listed above. Faculty shall provide details of such contributions in their annual reports with a suggestion for which category they belong in, and the evaluator shall take these contributions into account when determining an evaluation for that category.

Notwithstanding the above, the employee shall maintain the absolute right to submission of a formal grievance using normal University grievance procedures.

A copy of the FSI annual Employee Expectation, Activity and Evaluation Form (EEAEF) is included below as Attachment A.

**FLORIDA SPACE INSTITUTE**  
Annual Employee Expectation, Activity & Evaluation Form

May 8, 20\_\_ through May 7, 20\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Division: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

The following format is to be used to summarize work activities and evaluate progress. Please use the given format. Comments and statements in each category should be concise and brief. Employees are unlikely to have activities to report in every area. If no activity occurs in a given area, indicate by specifying no activity.

**Instructions for completing this form:**

**Within each section of this form (I-VII) are three parts that are completed as follows.**

**Part A:** Completed by employee and supervisor at the start of evaluation year.

**Part B:** Completed by employee at the conclusion of evaluation year.

**Part C:** Completed by supervisor after completion of **Part B** by employee.

**Summary of overall expectations and priorities for the coming year**

1. Anticipated responsibilities and levels of effort for the coming year (required) – giving appropriate consideration to the evaluation categories in parts B & C. Simply meeting these expectations implies “Satisfactory” performance. (The employee and supervisor may request revision of Part A during the year if circumstances warrant):
  
2. Employee Comments (optional) – include Center or Division goals and objectives, assignments you would prefer, preferences for research and other FSI responsibilities and activities you consider important to your personal and professional development:

Expectations and priorities  
for coming year established: \_\_\_\_\_  
Employee’s Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Supervisor/PI review \_\_\_\_\_  
Supervisor’s Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

FSI Director: \_\_\_\_\_  
FSI Director \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_



**I. FSI Projects and Activities** - Include in this section all major activities that you have performed that are not part of externally funded contracts. Include operations, internal committees, testing and all other activities here. Indicate approximate percentage of effort.

**Part A. Anticipated responsibilities and activities**

Effort

**Part B. Activities and accomplishments for this year:**

**Part C. Supervisor comments:**

**Supervisor evaluation for this category:**

<b>U</b> (Unsatisfactory Performance)	<b>C</b> (Does Not Meet Expectations)	<b>S</b> (Meets All Expectations)	<b>AS</b> (Exceeds Expectations)	<b>O</b> (Greatly Exceeds Expectations)

**II. Externally Funded Projects/Programs** - (From sources external to FSI budget; grants or contracts) - Title, sponsoring agency, employee's involvement, contract funding. Indicate approximate percentage of effort.

**Part A. Anticipated responsibilities and activities**

Effort

**Part B. Activities and accomplishments for this year:**

**Part C. Supervisor comments:**

**Supervisor evaluation for this category:**

<b>U</b> (Unsatisfactory Performance)	<b>C</b> (Does Not Meet Expectations)	<b>S</b> (Meets All Expectations)	<b>AS</b> (Exceeds Expectations)	<b>O</b> (Greatly Exceeds Expectations)

**III. Proposal Activities** - List separately to indicate title, type of proposal (letter, formal), agency submitted to, status or result, employee's involvement and dollar amount involved. Indicate approximate percentage of effort.

**Part A. Anticipated responsibilities and activities**

Effort

**Part B. Activities and accomplishments for this year:**

**Part C. Supervisor comments:**

**Supervisor evaluation for this category:**

<b>U</b> (Unsatisfactory Performance)	<b>C</b> (Does Not Meet Expectations)	<b>S</b> (Meets All Expectations)	<b>AS</b> (Exceeds Expectations)	<b>O</b> (Greatly Exceeds Expectations)

**IV. Information Dissemination** – List in this section all activities related to publications, presentations, short courses, workshops and other information dissemination. Indicate approximate percentage of effort.

- i. **Publications of books, papers and reports** - Author(s), Title, Publisher, Conference or Agency published by, location, date. Indicate if peer reviewed, or if invited publications. (Include FSI documents also.)

**Part A. Anticipated responsibilities and activities**

Effort

**Part B. Activities and accomplishments for this year:**

**Part C. Supervisor comments:**

**Supervisor evaluation for this category:**

<b>U</b> (Unsatisfactory Performance)	<b>C</b> (Does Not Meet Expectations)	<b>S</b> (Meets All Expectations)	<b>AS</b> (Exceeds Expectations)	<b>O</b> (Greatly Exceeds Expectations)

- ii. **Presentation of Professional Papers** - Author(s), Title, Conference or Agency where presented, location, date, regional, national or international.

**Part A.** Anticipated responsibilities and activities

Effort

**Part B.** Activities and accomplishments for this year:

**Part C.** Supervisor comments:

**Supervisor evaluation for this category:**

<b>U</b> (Unsatisfactory Performance)	<b>C</b> (Does Not Meet Expectations)	<b>S</b> (Meets All Expectations)	<b>AS</b> (Exceeds Expectations)	<b>O</b> (Greatly Exceeds Expectations)

- iii. **Other Presentations** (no publications) - Include here summary on presentations in workshops, numbers of such presentations and total length of presentations.

**Part A.** Anticipated responsibilities and activities

Effort

**Part B.** Activities and accomplishments for this year:

**Part C.** Supervisor comments:

**Supervisor evaluation for this category:**

<b>U</b> (Unsatisfactory Performance)	<b>C</b> (Does Not Meet Expectations)	<b>S</b> (Meets All Expectations)	<b>AS</b> (Exceeds Expectations)	<b>O</b> (Greatly Exceeds Expectations)

**V. Professional Development**

- i. Educational Development - Courses taken as a learner, including college courses, short courses and workshops).
- ii. Conferences and Professional Meetings Attended (no presentations)
- iii. Other Professional Development and Service Activities - (Committees, professional society memberships, teaching, consulting, public service, etc.). Indicate level of involvement.

**Part A. Anticipated responsibilities and activities****Effort****Part B. Activities and accomplishments for this year:****Part C. Supervisor comments:****Supervisor evaluation for this category:**

<b>U</b> (Unsatisfactory Performance)	<b>C</b> (Does Not Meet Expectations)	<b>S</b> (Meets All Expectations)	<b>AS</b> (Exceeds Expectations)	<b>O</b> (Greatly Exceeds Expectations)

**VI. Partnership**

- i. Internal - Indicate any steps taken to enhance collaboration on projects and between FSI and with departments and institutes at UCF. Indicate approximate percentage of effort.
- ii. External - List any new and continued relationship building efforts with parties external to FSI/UCF. Include importance of the relationships to FSI’s mission and vision. Indicate approximate percentage of effort.

**Part A. Anticipated responsibilities and activities**

Effort

**Part B. Activities and accomplishments for this year:**

**Part C. Supervisor comments:**

**Supervisor evaluation for this category:**

<b>U</b> (Unsatisfactory Performance)	<b>C</b> (Does Not Meet Expectations)	<b>S</b> (Meets All Expectations)	<b>AS</b> (Exceeds Expectations)	<b>O</b> (Greatly Exceeds Expectations)

**VII. Overall**

**Part B. Employee’s comments on this year’s activities:**

**Part C. Supervisor’s Overall Evaluation (Initial appropriate box)**

<b>U</b> (Unsatisfactory Performance)	<b>C</b> (Does Not Meet Expectations)	<b>S</b> (Meets All Expectations)	<b>AS</b> (Exceeds Expectations)	<b>O</b> (Greatly Exceeds Expectations)

**Supervisor’s Comments:**



Evaluation completed by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Supervisor's Signature Date

Reviewed and approved by: \_\_\_\_\_  
FSI Director's Signature Date

Employee's Comments:

Evaluation received: \_\_\_\_\_  
Employee's Signature Date

Distribution:

- Employee
- Employee's Supervisor
- Employee's Personnel File
- FSI Director