

HMI Department AESP

Revised from the college approved 05-08-12 document in use since the 2012-13 AY and revised and approved document by HMI faculty on 4-18-19.

Introduction, Objectives, and Procedures

The Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP) is a work assignment and evaluation system designed for all full-time faculty, including tenured professors, tenure earning professors, lecturers, and instructors, in the Department of Health Management and Informatics.

Objectives

The objectives of the plan are to:

- Allow faculty members to capitalize on their professional strengths and be evaluated relative to those strengths.
- Promote high-quality research, teaching, and service by faculty members.
- Ensure the fair and consistent evaluation of each faculty member's professional performance of assigned duties.

Rating Procedures

Each year, the department Chair will assess each faculty member's professional performance based on assigned teaching, research, and service activities. Overall evaluations will be determined by weighting performance on each of the components (teaching, research, service and other assignments, if applicable) by the faculty member's assignment on each. Scoring for each component is described in the respective section of this document.

Assignment Weights by Area

The plan relies on assignments of duties from the In-Unit Faculty Assignment of Duties Form (AA-46) to weight contributions in the areas of teaching, research, service, and other.

Overall Evaluation Calculation

Overall evaluations shall be calculated as the sum of the weights for each evaluated area times the score for each area using a scale of Outstanding = 4, Above Satisfactory = 3, Satisfactory = 2, Conditional = 1, and Unsatisfactory = 0.

The score will be translated into an overall evaluation for the year as shown in **the Table below**.

| Overall Scores | Evaluation |
|----------------|--------------------------|
| 3.01 – 4.0 | Outstanding [†] |
| 2.01 – 3.00 | Above Satisfactory |
| 1.01 – 2.00 | Satisfactory |
| 0.50 – 1.00 | Conditional |
| 0.0 – 0.49 | Unsatisfactory |

Table O1: Overall Evaluations

[†] **The Minimum Criteria Exception:** No faculty member may receive an overall rating of Outstanding if their rating in any single area of effort of five percent (5%) or more is Conditional or below.

Modifications to the Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures

The AESP may require periodic changes as a result of changes in the collective bargaining agreement, faculty governance, changes in department and college missions and goals, and accreditation standards. Such changes will be managed in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement in effect at the time.

HMI Department AESP

Revised from the college approved 05-08-12 document in use since the 2012-13 AY and revised and approved document by HMI faculty on 4-18-19.

Evaluation of Teaching Performance

The department Chair will evaluate the teaching component of each faculty member's assignment and rate this performance using the evaluation scale shown in Table T1. The teaching evaluation will be based only on teaching activities during the current evaluation year. The Chair's evaluation of teaching performance will be based on many factors. Faculty members will submit a teaching portfolio (as part of the faculty member's annual activity report) to the Chair for review and evaluation. Faculty members are encouraged to document as thoroughly as possible their efforts to meet the evaluation standards outlined in this document.

To be rated as "satisfactory" or above, a faculty member must meet the fundamental teaching standards listed below, plus the specified number of additional teaching activities for their teaching assignment as shown in Table T1. The order of these standards does not imply ranking of importance. It is very important that faculty members thoroughly document achievement of teaching standards in their annual activity reports.

Table T1 provides the standards that must be met in order to achieve a rating on teaching of conditional, satisfactory, above satisfactory, and outstanding, for different annual teaching assignments, including summers. Faculty with more than eight courses per year shall be evaluated using the 8-course column criteria.

No provision of this evaluation shall be construed to violate rights of academic freedom provided in the Collective Bargaining Agreement in effect for the period being evaluated.

Table T1: Achievement Standards for Specific Teaching Evaluation Ratings

(Course counts refer to Fall plus Spring assignment.
Each course is 0.1125 effort on Annual Assignment)

| | 8 courses | 7 courses | 6 courses | 5 Courses | 4 courses | 3 courses | 2 courses | 1 course |
|--------------------------|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Outstanding | Fund + 10 AT | Fund + 9 AT | Fund + 8 AT | Fund + 7 AT | Fund + 6 AT | Fund + 5 AT | Fund + 4 AT | Fund + 4 AT |
| Abovesatisfactory | Fund + 8 AT | Fund + 7 AT | Fund + 6 AT | Fund + 5 AT | Fund + 4 AT | Fund + 3 AT | Fund + 2 AT | Fund + 2 AT |
| Satisfactory | Fund + 6 AT | Fund + 5 AT | Fund + 4 AT | Fund + 3 AT | Fund + 2 AT | Fund + 1 AT | Fund + 1 AT | Fund + 1 AT |
| Conditional | Fund + 4 AT | Fund + 3 AT | Fund + 2 AT | Fund + 1 AT | Fund + 0 AT | Fund + 0 AT | Fund + 0 AT | Fund + 0 AT |
| Unsatisfactory | Fail to meet the criteria for Conditional | | | | | | | |

Notes: Fund: meeting all Fundamental Teaching Standards below.

Unsatisfactory Evaluations. A faculty member not meeting the standards in Table T1 for a rating of conditional, will be given a rating of unsatisfactory for the evaluation year. A remediation plan will be developed by the faculty member in consultation with the Chair for implementation in the next evaluation period.

Fundamental Teaching Standards

Items in the Fundamental Teaching Standards list below will be monitored by the Chair and/or Program Directors who report on these issues to the Chair. Faculty must meet all of these fundamental requirements in order to receive an evaluation above unsatisfactory. If during the annual evaluation period a faculty member is not meeting one or more of the requirements, the Chair must notify the person in writing, discuss the deficiency with the faculty, and give the person time to remediate the deficiency prior to the annual evaluation. If the item is not remediated, the faculty member will receive an unsatisfactory teaching evaluation on their annual evaluation. This will then be subject to further remediation efforts by faculty for the next evaluation period (see "unsatisfactory evaluations" in Table T1 footnote).

HMI Department AESP

Revised from the college approved 05-08-12 document in use since the 2012-13 AY
and revised and approved document by HMI faculty on 4-18-19.

Fundamental Teaching Standards

Course Structure and Content

Course syllabi:

- University/college/department guidelines for syllabi content are included.
- Course objectives are clearly stated.
- Evaluation procedures are clearly stated.
- Learning outcomes are clearly stated.

Course content:

- Course content is based on current research and practice in the field. Course materials (text, handouts, cases, etc.) reflect this.
- Prerequisite courses should include necessary prerequisite knowledge for corresponding core courses. When courses are part of a program with accreditation requirements, course will contain accreditation standards.

Course structure and design:

- Teaching/learning methods, technological tools, and course materials appropriate to each course are used to facilitate communication and active learning.
- Practical applications are included in course materials and pedagogy.
- Course web site facilitates instructor/student communication.
- Final exam (or appropriate final project/exercise) is held according to the university calendar and policy unless an exemption is approved by the department Chair.
- Courses provide multiple communication means to students including both synchronous and asynchronous methods.

Assessment of student performance:

- Assessment/evaluation procedures are clearly stated in the syllabus.
- Course contains multiple, timely, and appropriate methods of measuring student performance.
- Course objectives and performance measurement are in alignment.
- Quality and timely feedback is provided to students about their performance.

Evaluation of Student Learning

Assessment of Learning Outcomes

- Instructor collects assessment data in a timely and appropriate manner according to schedule supplied by the department Chair.
- Instructor participates and contributes to the department's review and refinement of the assessment process and outcomes.
- Compliance with program competencies.

Student Evaluation of Instruction¹

- Faculty members will achieve student ratings in the category "Overall Assessment of Instruction" on the Student Perception of Instruction (SPI) Reports of at least 50% in the "Good," "Very Good," or "Excellent" categories (accumulated across all courses taught). SPIs that are suspected of reflecting student retribution due to disciplinary actions for student violations of the Golden Rule will not be counted in the average.

Curriculum Development

- Actively participates in department and/or program curriculum review and development process when asked/elected to do.
- Actively participates in curriculum revision indicated by assessment process results.

Interactions with Students

- Advises students when called upon to do so.
- Classes are held according to the university schedule.
- Responds to student email messages in a timely fashion.
- Office hours are posted, are adequate in number per College policy, and are held when scheduled.

HMI Department AESP

Revised from the college approved 05-08-12 document in use since the 2012-13 AY
and revised and approved document by HMI faculty on 4-18-19.

Additional Teaching Standards (for evaluation period)^{2,3}

Items from the list below are counted per repetition and the total becomes the +x value in Table T1.

Additional Teaching Standards

1. Won teaching award from external organization.
2. Won university teaching excellence award, including Chuck Dziubin award for Excellence in On-line teaching.*⁴
3. Won college teaching award.*⁴
4. Won UCF TIP award.*⁴
5. Undertook a major course revision.
6. Developed a new face-to-face course.
7. Developed a new M or WWW course (2 pts).
8. Incorporated significant new materials that globalize the curriculum.
9. Developed a new study abroad course (2 pts).
10. Conducted an existing study abroad course (2 pts).
11. Carried out other international education initiatives, including international assignments, special lectureships, panel presentations or seminar participation of an educational nature.
12. Carried out community-based educational initiatives, including assignments, special lectureships, panel presentations or seminar participation (including 'virtual' exchanges) of an educational nature.
13. Delivered streamed video course.
14. Taught courses at more than one campus (1 pt/campus/semester).
15. Taught large numbers of students (0.5 pt for every 50 students over 50 students per class).
16. Involved with mentoring or advising student organizations, groups, competitions, etc.
17. Published or provided new online course supplements, templates, workbooks, or software for classroom use.
18. Made online course content available to other faculty (1pt/course/year).
19. Incorporated higher-order learning activities in courses, such as essay exams, individual projects or cases, writing assignments, student projects with companies, assignments requiring computer skills beyond word processing.
20. Developed and implemented a guest speaker series or a seminar or a workshop.
21. Developed significant relationship/involvement with industry or community that benefits teaching.
22. Exhibited quality course design as indicated by the UCF Quality Online Course Badge.
23. Exhibited high-quality course design as indicated by the UCF High-Quality Online Course Badge (2 pts).
24. Received internal or external grants related to teaching.
25. Conducted internal or external seminars or presentations on teaching.
26. Attended an FCTL or outside teaching workshop or training module.
27. Participated in the FCTL summer or winter multi-day workshop.
28. Served as a faculty fellow at FCTL.
29. Participated in a seminar or workshop on teaching.
30. Completed the IDL 7000 course on web course design and development.
31. Was lead Instructor for any number of courses (1 pt per semester).
32. Was compliant with the learning competency tracking system as identified by Program Directors and confirmed by the Chair.
33. Supervised an independent study (1 pt per student per year).
34. Supervised an Honors-in-Major thesis (1 pt per student per year).
35. Served on an Honors-in-the-Major thesis committee (1/2 pt per student per year).
36. Served on a PhD student examination committee (1 pt per exam period).
37. Mentored a PhD student (helped student with seminar or workshop presentation, coauthored a paper, etc.) (1pt/ student/year).
38. Served as member of Ph.D. dissertation committee (1 pt per student in their year of proposal or dissertation defense; ½ pt per student per year otherwise).
39. Served as Chair of Ph.D. dissertation committee (2 pts per student per year).

Notes:

- ¹ In no case will adverse performance determinations be reached based on Student Evaluation of Instruction if fewer than 50% of students enrolled at the end of the semester completed the evaluation or if fewer than five students completed the evaluation.

HMI Department AESP

Revised from the college approved 05-08-12 document in use since the 2012-13 AY and revised and approved document by HMI faculty on 4-18-19.

- 2 The above list is not exhaustive. Other activities may be counted toward the teaching performance evaluation if agreed upon by the faculty member and the department Chair.
- 3 All items count as 1 point unless otherwise noted. Each item in the list may count multiple times per evaluation period unless otherwise noted.
- 4 Winning any of the teaching awards marked with an asterisk (*) during the evaluation year results in a teaching evaluation of outstanding for the evaluation year, conditional on meeting the fundamental requirements.

Adverse Teaching Indicators

The items listed below may, at the Chair's discretion, result in an overall teaching score of "conditional":

1. Student evaluations of instruction provide an overall score of 2 or below for a course.¹
2. Failure to match learning activities to the level of the course.

Evaluation of Research Performance

Research activities shall be rated as Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Conditional, or Unsatisfactory for faculty with research assignments. Faculty with no research responsibilities shall not be rated in this area.

Success in research will be demonstrated by publishing articles in peer-reviewed **journals** and/or by accomplishing equivalent activities from the Additional Research Activities table in this section.

However, faculty on some research tracks have expectations for higher quality publications and limitations on their ability to substitute equivalent activities.

Table R1: Achievement Standards for Research Evaluation Ratings

| % research in annual assignment (annual average) | >5 -20% | > 20 - 30% | >30 - 40% | >40 - 50% | > 50% |
|--|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Outstanding | 1A + 1 AR | 1 A + 2 AR | 2 A + 3 AR | 2 A + 4 AR | 2A + 5 AR |
| Above Satisfactory | 1 A | 1 A + 1 AR | 2 A + 2 AR | 2 A + 3 AR | 2 A + 4 AR |
| Satisfactory | 1 AR | 1.5 AR | 1 A + 2 AR | 2A* + 2 AR | 2A* + 3 AR |
| Conditional | .5 AR | 1 AR | 1 A + 1 AR | 1 A + 2 AR | 1 A + 2 AR |
| Unsatisfactory | Failure to meet criteria for conditional | | | | |

Key to Table R1

A = Required # of peer-reviewed articles. Accepted but not yet published articles can count but cannot be used again in any future year.

AR = Additional research activities, which may include an accepted peer-reviewed article.

*** First year tenure-track faculty may submit other research activity in place of the 2 papers minimum requirement at Chair's discretion. Activities must be those that lead to publications or grants. Examples may include submitting papers for publication, submitting grant applications, demonstrating papers and grant applications in an advanced state of preparation, or presenting conference papers that may become published journal articles."**

Table R2: Additional Research Activities List

| Research Activity | Research Points |
|--|-----------------|
| 1. One accepted or published peer-reviewed article. If a paper is accepted in one evaluation period and published in another the faculty member may select the year in which it will be counted, but it may only count once. | 1.00 |

HMI Department AESP

Revised from the college approved 05-08-12 document in use since the 2012-13 AY
and revised and approved document by HMI faculty on 4-18-19.

| | |
|---|------|
| 2. Peer-reviewed article is in a journal with an impact factor ≥ 2 or is in top 10 journals in the field (1 pt per article in addition to the pt in #1). | 1.00 |
| 3. One peer-reviewed conference paper appearing in Proceedings. | 0.50 |
| 4. One research report, white paper, invited paper, or other non-peer-reviewed paper. | 0.50 |
| 5. Book, only author | 4.00 |
| 6. Book, co-author 2 authors | 3.00 |
| 7. Book, co-author > 2 authors | 2.00 |
| 8. Monograph | 2.00 |
| 9. Book Chapter | 1.00 |
| 10. Funded external grant, contract award, or patent licensing royalty in which % of effort or funding to the individual = \$150,000 or more for the life of the project. (Individual receives this OR for each year the project runs.) | 5.00 |
| 11. Funded external grant, contract award, or patent licensing royalty in which % of effort or funding to the individual = \$100,000 - < \$150,000 for the life of the project. (Individual receives this OR for each year the project runs.) | 4.00 |
| 12. Funded external grant, contract award, or patent licensing royalty in which % of effort or funding to the individual = \$50,000 - < \$100,000 for the life of the project. (Individual receives this OR for each year the project runs.) | 3.00 |
| 13. Funded external grant, contract award, or patent licensing royalty in which % of effort or funding to the individual = \$25,000 - < \$50,000 for the life of the project. (Individual receives this OR for each year the project runs.) | 2.00 |
| 14. Funded external grant, contract award, or patent licensing royalty in which % of effort or funding to the individual is < \$25,000 for the life of the project. (Individual receives this OR for each year the project runs.) | 1.00 |
| 15. External grant, contract or patent proposal submitted but not accepted for \$100,000 or more in funding. Faculty member was PI. | 1.50 |
| 16. External grant, contract or patent proposal submitted but not accepted for \$100,000 or more in funding. Faculty member was Co-PI/ Co-I. | 0.50 |
| 17. External grant, contract or patent proposal submitted but not accepted for under \$100,000 in funding. Faculty member was PI | 1.00 |
| 18. External grant, contract or patent proposal submitted but not accepted for under \$100,000 in funding. Faculty member was Co-I/Co-PI | 0.50 |
| 19. Internal grant. Faculty member is PI. (Individual receives this OR for each year the project runs.) | 1.00 |
| 20. Internal grant. Faculty member is Co-I or Co-PI (Individual receives this OR for each year the project runs.) | 0.50 |
| 21. Editor of International/national/regional peer-reviewed academic journal. | 2.00 |
| 22. Board Member of International/national/regional peer-reviewed academic journal. | 1.00 |
| 23. Editor of Book (credit given in year of publication only). | 2.00 |
| 24. Editor of conference proceedings (credit given in year of publication only) | 1.00 |
| 25. UCF Research incentive award (RIA)*. | 2.00 |
| 26. External research award/best paper award. | 1.00 |
| 27. Podium presentation of peer-reviewed academic research at international conference appropriate to our disciplines. | 1.50 |
| 28. Poster presentation of peer-reviewed academic research at international conference appropriate to our disciplines. | 1.25 |

HMI Department AESP

Revised from the college approved 05-08-12 document in use since the 2012-13 AY
and revised and approved document by HMI faculty on 4-18-19.

| | |
|--|----------|
| 29. Podium presentation of peer-reviewed academic research at national, regional or state conferences appropriate to our disciplines. | 1.25 |
| 30. Poster presentation of peer-reviewed academic research at national, regional or state conferences appropriate to our disciplines. | 1.00 |
| 31. Podium or poster presentation at local conference or non-peer-reviewed meeting appropriate to our disciplines. | 0.50 |
| 32. Keynote address or invited panel speaker. | 2.00 |
| 33. Publicity over research results (e.g., news report, interview, webcast, webinar) (1 pt for all publicity for one research result). | 1.00 |
| 34. Chair of symposium or track Chair at academic conference at national or regional conferences appropriate to our discipline. | 1.00 |
| 35. Successful completion of other research-related activities as assigned by the Chair during the evaluation period. | Variable |

Note regarding papers and presentations: Unless specifically stated, credit can be earned only once for each scholarly result (e.g., book, paper, presentation, etc.). For books and papers, credit can be granted for either "acceptance" or for "publication," but not for both events. For presentations, credit can be granted for either "acceptance" or "presentation," but not for both events.

** automatic outstanding*

Examples (the term "accepted article" implies an "accepted peer-reviewed article")

1. A tenured/tenure track faculty member with a research assignment >5 -20% will need one accepted article to be rated as *above satisfactory*.
2. A tenured/tenure track faculty member with a research assignment > 20 - 30% will need one accepted article and 1 AR to be rated as *above satisfactory*. For AR, the person could have submitted one grant for under \$100,000 or had 1 poster presentation at a national peer-reviewed meeting or have published another article.
3. A tenured/ tenure track faculty member with a research assignment between > 30 - 40% will need a minimum of 2 accepted articles plus 2 points of other research activities to be rated as *above satisfactory*. For AR, the person could have an additional article or 1 national poster presentation, and 1 grant proposal for under \$100,000, submitted.
4. A tenured/ tenure track faculty member with a research assignment between > 40 - 50% will need a minimum of 2 accepted articles plus 3 points of other research activities to be rated as *above satisfactory*. For AR, the person could have a funded external grant in which % of effort or funding to the individual = \$50,000 - < \$100,000 for the life of the project.
5. A tenured/ tenure track faculty member with a research assignment over 50% will need a minimum of 2 accepted articles plus 4 points of other research activities to be rated as *above satisfactory*. For AR, the person could have a book chapter, plus a poster presentation of peer-reviewed academic research at a national or regional conferences, and a funded external grant in which % of effort or funding to the individual = \$25,000 - < \$50,000 for the life of the project.

Evaluation of Service Performance

The service component of each faculty member's assignment will be evaluated for the current evaluation year by the Chair and rated using the scale in Table S1. Service is expected of all faculty members.

Fundamental Service Activities

All faculty members must complete each of the following "fundamental" service activities:

HMI Department AESP

Revised from the college approved 05-08-12 document in use since the 2012-13 AY
and revised and approved document by HMI faculty on 4-18-19.

Fundamental Service Activities

1. Participate in departmental and college faculty meetings unless an unavoidable conflict requiring their presence elsewhere exists.
2. Attend at least one department, college or university graduation ceremony or university commencement exercise during the year.

Rating Standards

Table S1 below shows the criteria for rating in service at various levels.

Table S1: Rating Standards for Service

| Rating | <= 5% Service | >5% Service |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Outstanding | Complete the fundamental service activities above plus <u>4</u> of the additional service activities below | Complete the fundamental service activities above plus <u>6</u> of the additional service activities below |
| Above Satisfactory | Complete the fundamental service activities above plus <u>3</u> of the additional service activities below | Complete the fundamental service activities above plus <u>5</u> of the additional service activities below |
| Satisfactory | Complete the fundamental service activities above plus <u>2</u> of the additional service activities below | Complete the fundamental service activities above plus <u>4</u> of the additional service activities below |
| Conditional | Complete the fundamental service activities above plus <u>1</u> of the additional service activities below | Complete the fundamental service activities above plus <u>3</u> of the additional service activities below |
| Unsatisfactory | Failure to meet the criteria for Conditional | Failure to meet the criteria for Conditional |

Table S2: Additional Service Activities List

HMI Department AESP

Revised from the college approved 05-08-12 document in use since the 2012-13 AY
and revised and approved document by HMI faculty on 4-18-19.

Additional Service Activities

1. Serve as a program coordinator in the department or college (counts as 2 pts).
2. Serve on department, college, or university faculty, staff or student recruiting committee.
3. Serve as a faculty advisor to student organizations, groups, competitions, etc.
4. Serve on department, college, or university committees/task forces (1 pt /committee).
5. Chair or co-Chair a department, college or university committee or task force (2 pts/ committee).
6. Serve as Chair of department, college, or university committees/task forces (serving as Chair results in an additional service credit above the service credit received for serving on the committee).
7. Provide professional service to scholarly and professional organizations, community organizations, and governmental boards, agencies, and commissions at the state, regional, or national level (1 pt/ service).
8. Serve in a leadership position related to accreditation activities.
9. Receive a college, university or national Excellence in Service Award *.
10. Serve in a leadership position related to a UCF activity or initiative.
11. Deliver profession-related talks or speeches to university, local, regional, or national/international groups or organizations.
12. Serve in a leadership role in professional and/or community organizations impacting the discipline/profession.
13. Serve as a member of an accreditation site visit team or review board.
14. Serve as an external reviewer for a promotion and tenure case at another university
15. Serve as a reviewer for a peer-reviewed journal (0.5 pts for each review with no more than 2 pts).
16. Serve as a reviewer for an academic conference.
17. Serve as a reviewer for a grant agency (2 pt per review cycle).
18. Serve as an officer in an organization relevant to the discipline, e.g., American Finance Association (AFA), Financial Management Association International (FMA), etc.
19. Participate in media interviews on topics relative to our discipline (not due to individual's specific research but rather general expertise).
20. Complete other service activities as agreed upon by the faculty member and the Chair.

Notes:

1. The Additional Service Activities list is not considered exhaustive. Faculty members may bring to the attention of the Chair and document activities not included in the above list that may be counted towards the service performance evaluation.
2. All items count as 1 point unless otherwise noted. Each item in the list may count multiple times per evaluation period unless otherwise noted. In some circumstances, one or more of the additional service standards/activities will be allowed to substitute for the minimum requirements. For example, this might be the case if a faculty member's teaching schedule conflicted with faculty meetings.
3. The faculty member and department Chair may determine that certain activities that require extraordinary time commitments may count as more than one service activity.
4. Winning a service award (internal/external) designated with an asterisk (*) during the evaluation year results in a service evaluation of outstanding for the evaluation year.

Evaluation of Performance of Other Activities

Other university duties are occasionally assigned for special activities such as administrative duties or other special projects. Upon receiving such an assignment, the faculty member and their supervisor are expected develop a customized evaluation procedure with criteria for ratings of Outstanding through Unsatisfactory. If the supervisor for this activity is not the Chair, a copy of the plan will be provided to the Chair and the supervising administrator will provide a copy of the evaluation to the Chair upon completion of the assignment and/or each year at the conclusion of the evaluation period.

Revision History

1. Revised: 01-11-12 to correct a table reference typographical error on p. 7

HMI Department AESP

Revised from the college approved 05-08-12 document in use since the 2012-13 AY
and revised and approved document by HMI faculty on 4-18-19.

2. Revised: 05-03-12 in response to feedback from the UCF Office of the Provost
3. Secret Vote: 04-27-17 by HMI AESP Committee (5 yes; 2 no).
4. Tenured Faculty vote on interim document with a few changes: 11-29-18 (9 yes, 1 no, 2 did not vote)
5. Tenured Faculty secret vote on revised document: 4-18-19 (8 yes, 4 not present)