University of Central Florida
College of Engineering
Department of Industrial Engineering and Management Systems
Faculty Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP)

Intended for first use in the 2013-2014 Evaluation Period.

Introduction to the IEMS Faculty Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures

The faculty members of the Department of Industrial Engineering and Management Systems (IEMS) at UCF have worked to develop an Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP) plan that will serve as a guide for the faulty members' efforts and activities in the areas of teaching, research & scholarly activity, and service. The department's AESP is aligned with the University's guidance for AESPs. All faculty members of the IEMS department are expected to perform tasks and activities that will support the AESP.

The activities of faculty members in the areas of teaching, research, service, and other university duties will be evaluated annually using the academic year as stated in the most current UCF BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement. Each faculty member will complete an annual summary of their activities (annual report) related to teaching, research, service and other duties. This summary of activities will be evaluated by the Department Chair using the IEMS AESP criteria as described in the following section. The Department Chair will meet individually with each faculty member to discuss the results of the annual evaluation and any suggestions for improvement and/or activity changes needed to enhance teaching, research, or service.

Upon review of the Faculty Annual Summary of effort and activities the IEMS Department Chair will assign a rating for each category (i.e. teaching, research & scholarly activity, service, and other duties as assigned). Standard Guidelines outlined in this document will be used by the Department Chair to assign ratings for the various categories.

Note: The IEMS committee has developed the recommend approach with the following conditions:

1) We will use these criteria starting with the 2013-2014 evaluation year.
2) We will assess the implementation.
3) We will revise to ensure the usefulness.

Faculty Workload

To the degree consistent with state law and Academic Assignment rules as well as most current UCF BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, IEMS Faculty workload will be assigned consistent with CECS Workload Policy approved on 6/25/2012 as amended below-. The evaluation approach will recognize the different workload models, based on combination of teaching, research & scholarly activity and service. Table 1 provides the basic workload models. These models can be adjusted with agreement of the individual faculty and chair.

Table 1. Example Faculty Workload Models

FACULTY Workload Model	TEACHING Category	Research & SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY Category	SERVICE/OTHER DUTIES ASSIGNED Category
Teaching Intensive	75% (3-3 class assignment teaching load)	0%	25%
Standard	65% (2-2 class assignment teaching load & Chair of additional masters and dissertation students)	25%	10%
Research	25% (1-1 class assignment teaching load)	50% (Course buyout provided by Department or External source)	25%
Coordinator	25% (1-1 class assignment teaching load)	10%	65%

Overall Evaluation: Tenure-Earning and Tenured Faculty

A faculty's overall rating will be evaluated using the criteria defined in Table 2. To be consistent with Article 10 Supplement to the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, a weighted score based on weighting of workload category assignment and evaluation assessment for each category will be added together for the overall evaluation as shown in Table 2. Assessment from 0 to 4 will be assigned to each of the five levels of evaluation as follows:

- A score of zero (0) is assigned for *Unsatisfactory* evaluation.
- A score of (1) is assigned for *C*onditional evaluation
- A score of (2) is assigned for *S*atisfactory evaluation.
- A score of (3) is assigned for Above Satisfactory evaluation.
- A score of (4) is assigned for *O*utstanding evaluation.

Overall evaluation will be the evaluation in which the weighted score falls.

Table 2. Overall Evaluation Criteria

Overall Evaluation	UNSATISFACTORY	CONDITIONAL	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE SATISFACTORY	OUTSTANDING
Weighted Score	0.0-0.49	0.5-1.49	1.5.0-2.49	2.5.0-3.49	3.5-4.0

Each section of the evaluation criteria provides further descriptions and examples for the performance levels.

EVALUATION CRITERIA: TEACHING CATEGORY EFFECTIVENESS

Teaching takes place in both regularly scheduled academic courses and in other discipline area venues. Effective teachers demonstrate expert knowledge in an appropriate area related to their academic discipline. They generate enthusiasm for learning, critical thinking, intellectual inquiry, and academic achievement while incorporating technical and instructional improvements in their chosen academic discipline. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness will include a review of the level and breadth of the professor's activities and outcomes include:

    a. Providing classroom instruction
    b. Chairing thesis and dissertation students
    c. Directing teaching laboratories
    d. Supporting instruction-based industry partnerships
    e. Gaining recognition for teaching excellence
    f. Other instructional activities as defined by State Academic Assignment policy

To achieve a Satisfactory or higher rating, it is the expectation that each faculty member will conduct instructional, examination or laboratory activities for the scheduled number of sessions as published in the university calendar including the final examination period, unless a request to cancel a session during the final examination period has been granted by the department chair. In addition, for each course assignment, all faculty must provide and follow a syllabus that adheres to current university and college guidelines as well as provide an electronic version of the syllabus to the appropriate staff member in the department at the beginning of the semester. Table 3 defines the overall criteria for teaching effectiveness.

Table 3. Teaching Effectiveness Criteria for five Levels of Evaluation

UNSATISFACTORY	CONDITIONAL	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE SATISFACTORY	OUTSTANDING
No Activity & No Steps to Correct	No Activity	Active Participation	Presence of Outcomes	Significant Presence of Outcomes
0	1	2	3	4
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.** Poor performance includes consistently: • receiving less than a 2.5 average course evaluation ratings on a 1 to 5 scale from all of 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, and/or • failing to communicate with students, or failing to serve as a responsible discipline area advisor to students.	An evaluation of **CONDITIONAL** in Teaching will be assigned if a faculty member fails to meet the requirements for "Satisfactory" Poor performance includes consistently: • receiving less than a 3.0 average course evaluation ratings on a 1 to 5 scale from all of 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 communicate with students, or failing to serve as a responsible discipline area advisor to students.	To achieve an evaluation of **SATISFACTORY** in Teaching, faculty must demonstrate competence in teaching by achieving **3.0 course/instructor evaluation ratings** on a 1 to 5 scale from at least 60% of all courses taught during the evaluation period in the category of "Overall Assessment of Instruction" on the Student Perception of Instruction Reports. In addition, faculty must complete at least **one** of the "Other Teaching Duties and Outcomes" listed below.	To achieve an evaluation of **ABOVE SATISFACTORY** in Teaching, faculty must demonstrate competence in teaching by achieving **3.5 course/instructor evaluation ratings** on a 1 to 5 scale from at least 60% of all courses taught during the evaluation period in the category of "Overall Assessment of Instruction" on the Student Perception of Instruction Reports. In addition, faculty must complete at least **two** of the "Other Teaching Duties and Outcomes" listed below.	To achieve an evaluation of **OUTSTANDING** in Teaching, faculty must demonstrate competence in teaching by achieving **3.8 course/instructor evaluation ratings** on a one to five scale from at least 60% of all courses taught during the evaluation period in the category of "Overall Assessment of Instruction" on the Student Perception of Instruction Reports. In addition, faculty must complete at least **three** of the "Other Teaching Duties and Outcomes" listed below.

Intended for first use in the 2013-2014 academic year

Other teaching duties and outcomes include, but are not limited to:

a. Graduate dissertation/thesis student. Each dissertation graduate OR every two thesis students in a given year is a teaching outcome.
b. Chair other non-graduating dissertation/thesis students
c. Serving as a committee member for thesis and dissertation students
d. Implementing substantial course/program development activities
e. Producing non-peer reviewed journal, non-book discipline-specific, educational publications, seminars, and presentations, or participating in professional development activities related to curriculum development and student learning
f. Receiving grants related to curriculum development
g. Receiving teaching awards (e.g., TIP, professional society recognition for teaching)
h. Leading educational programs
i. Directing and maintaining teaching Laboratories
j. Facilitating, initiating or maintaining instruction-supporting industrial partnerships
k. Instructing conference/workshop tutorials
l. Other instructional activities as defined by State Academic Assignment policy

EVALUATION CRITERIA: RESEARCH & SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY CATEGORY EFFECTIVENESS

Research & scholarly activity includes traditional research inquiry, field-based inquiry, historical and policy analyses, other systematic reviews of knowledge, and scholarly publication of such inquiries, analysis or reviews. It encompasses research, scholarship, and creative works. Examples of research activities include:

a. Competing for research funding by formal submission of proposals to potential funding agencies
b. Securing research funding
c. Submission of articles for potential publication
d. Publication of articles in journals, chapters of books, or books
e. Presenting research findings at conferences
f. Supervising grant-funded graduate student research
g. Producing patents.

Table 4 provides the overall criteria for research & scholarly activity effectiveness. Table 5 provides further definition of research activities and outcomes.

Table 4. Research & Scholarly Activity Category Effectiveness Criteria for five levels of Evaluation

UNSATISFACTORY	CONDITIONAL	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE SATISFACTORY	OUTSTANDING
No Activity & No Steps to Correct	No Activity	Presence of Research Activity	Evidence of Research Outcomes	Significant Evidence of Research Outcomes
0	1	2	3	4
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 for a : 10% Workload fewer than one item 25% Workload fewer than two items 50% Workload fewer than four items in the list of Evidence of *Presence of Research Activity.*	In order to achieve a **SATISFACTORY** evaluation in Research, a faculty member must demonstrate *for a :* *10% Workload one item* *25% Workload two items* *50% Workload four items* *Or less frequent activities with greater potential individual impact totaling equivalent workload significance* *in the list of Evidence of Presence of Research Activity*	In order to achieve an **ABOVE SATISFACTORY** evaluation in Research, a faculty member must demonstrate *for a :* *10% Workload one item* *25% Workload two items* *50% Workload four items* *Or less frequent outcomes with greater individual impact totaling equivalent workload significance* *in the list of Evidence of Research Outcome*	In order to achieve an OUTSTANDING evaluation in Research, a faculty member must demonstrate any one or combination of research outcomes that are above the average of those in the above satisfactory category. Singular examples would be significantly above average monetary funding award, lead author in a current year publication in a journal and/or current performance as PI on such an award from federal agencies or industry.

Table 5. Research & Scholarly Activities and Outcomes.

Evidence of Presence of Research & Scholarly Activity	Evidence of Research & Scholarly Activity Outcomes

• Submission of articles on knowledge of teaching and learning topics in peer-reviewed journals
• Submission of articles on Research topics in peer-reviewed journals
• Submission as PI of Research Funding from external
    o federal research agencies
    o state research agencies
    o research foundations
    o industry partners
 	
• Submission of grant applications, book proposals, essays or other relevant work for professional review and consideration.
 	
• Involvement with research and industry partnerships by supporting a research project proposal (e.g., Co-PI).
 	
• Involvement with interdisciplinary research by supporting a research project proposal (e.g., Co-PI). Conference/workshop tutorials as an instructor.
 	
• Supervision of externally funded RA
	• Acceptance and/or Publication of an article on knowledge of teaching and learning topics in peer-reviewed journals. Each article represents evidence of a research outcome.
	• Acceptance and/or Publication of an article on Research topics in peer-reviewed journals (faculty are encouraged to publish in relevant journals published by professional societies). Each article represents evidence of a research outcome.
	• Award and/or current performance on an award as PI of Research Funding from
	    o federal research agencies
	    o state research agencies
	    o research foundations
	    o industry partners
	
	• Award and Performance on externally funded proposals as Co-PI by federal and state agencies as well as research foundations and industry.
	
	• Citation rating in the top 25% or higher of the department
	• Lead in development and maintenance of Research Partnerships with Industry
	• Publication of authored or co-authored books, articles, book reviews, and commentaries.
	
	• Editing of scholarly books and collections of articles (e.g., in journals or anthologies).
	
	• Production of scholarly or other creative materials in alternative media.
	
	• Refereed, high-impact conference publications.
	
	• Conferences/workshops/tutorials as keynote or invited speaker.
	
	• Competitive regional, national and international research awards.
	
	• Patent innovation, innovative hardware and/or software inventions.
	
	• Invited papers in prestigious journals/proceedings.
	
	• Winning awards from professional societies (such as IIE) for research.
	
	• Being named as a Distinguished Member or Fellow a professional organization (e.g., IIE National Academy of Science or Engineering (NAE/NAS) membership)

EVALUATION CRITERIA: SERVICE

Evaluation in the area of Service will include a review of the service activities, recognition, and contributions that the faculty member makes to the university, college, school, profession, and local, state, regional, national and international communities. Service activities include:

- Being a member of professional societies
- Providing Department, College, and University service (e.g., search committee, promotion and tenure committee, assessment committee membership or leadership)
- Providing Program service (e.g., Director of a graduate program)
- Supporting journal activities (e.g., Reviewer/Editor/Editorial Board)
- Supporting professional conferences (e.g., Conference Session Leader)
- Other – Mentoring of New Faculty and/or Advisor to Undergraduate Student/Graduate Student organizations
- Other - External (Editorial Boards, panels, etc.)

Table 6 provides the overall criteria for service effectiveness. Table 7 provides further definition of service activities and outcomes.

Table 6. Service Effectiveness Criteria for five levels of Evaluation

UNSATISFACTORY	CONDITIONAL	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE SATISFACTORY	OUTSTANDING
No Activity & No Steps to Correct	No Activity	Active Participation	Leadership Position & Presence of Outcomes	Leadership Presence & Significant Presence of Outcomes
0	1	2	3	4
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 *for a :* *10% Workload fewer than one item* *25% Workload fewer than two items* *65% Workload fewer than two items and perform the duties of coordinator to the Satisfaction of the Chair in the list of Evidence of Service Activity.*	In order to achieve a **SATISFACTORY** evaluation in Research, a faculty member must demonstrate *for a :* *10% Workload one item* *25% Workload two items* *65% Workload two items and perform the duties of coordinator to the Satisfaction of the Chair in the list of Evidence of Service Activity*	In order to achieve an **ABOVE SATISFACTORY** evaluation in Service, a faculty member must demonstrate *for a :* *10% Workload one item* *25% Workload two items* *65% Workload two items and perform the duties of coordinator to the Satisfaction of the Chair in the list of Evidence of Service Outcome*	In order to achieve an OUTSTANDING evaluation in Service, a faculty member must demonstrate any one or combination of service outcomes that are above the average of those in the above satisfactory category. Singular examples would be significantly above average.

Table 7. Service Activities and Outcomes.

Evidence of Service Activity	Evidence of Service Outcomes
• Active member of a professional organization • Active member of a department committee • Active member of a program committee • Active reviewer for Professional Conference • Active reviewer for Professional Journal. • Active member of a College committee • Active member of a University committee. • Mentor to a New Faculty member • Advisor to Student organization • Involvement with interdisciplinary research. Conference/workshop tutorials as an instructor.	• Leader of a professional organization • Leader of a department committee • Leader of a program committee • Leader for Professional Conference • Leader for a Professional Conference Committee • Editor for Professional Journal. • Associate Editor for Professional Journal • Guest Editor for Professional Journal • Member of Editorial Board for Professional Journal • Consulting Editor for Professional Journal • Leader of a College committee • Leader of a University committee. • Leader of student teams at Conference/workshop tutorials presentations • Guest Editor for Professional Journal • Being named as a Distinguished Member or Fellow a professional organization (e.g., IIE National Academy of Science or Engineering (NAE/NAS) membership)

EVALUATION CRITERIA: OTHER DUTIES AS ASSIGNED

In the IEMS Department, occasionally faculty members may have assignments in addition to or in lieu of teaching, research, and service. For example, these assignments may include: Associate Department Chair, Assistant Department Chair, Undergraduate Program Coordinator, Graduate Program Coordinator, etc. In assigning these positions, it will be the responsibility of the Department Chair to develop a list of expected duties and responsibilities of the associated assignment. The performance criteria of these positions will be developed using the information on expected duties and responsibilities.   The Department Chair will develop benchmarks and metrics to be used in assessing annual performance of persons fulfilling such positions. The Department Chair will share these develop benchmarks and metrics to be used in assessing annual performance at the beginning of the assessment period.