

# Annual Evaluation Standards & Procedures (AESP) Guidelines for Faculty

Faculty must comply with and follow instructions of supervisor regarding teaching scheduling and standards, research procedures and compliance, and service requirements.

## Annual Evaluation Procedures

Annual evaluation of faculty members is conducted by the Supervisor, who draws upon faculty members' annual reports and renders assessments for each of the basic categories of Teaching, Research, Service/Professional development and Other Assigned Duties. From these assessments, an overall evaluation is derived. The following procedure will be employed for the administration of faculty evaluations:

- The faculty member prepares and timely submits the complete and accurate Faculty Annual Report (FAR) according to the categories designated on the report form. The AESP for self-evaluation or a link to the form will be provided by the supervisor or their designee. The supervisor can request additional evidence for any item being considered in an evaluation.

## Standards and Ratings for Full Time Faculty

- Based on the FAR and discussion with the faculty member, the supervisor determines an evaluation in accordance with this AESP document for each faculty member in each relevant category as well as calculating an overall evaluation.

The supervisor will evaluate the performance of each faculty member annually and assign a rating of Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Conditional, or Unsatisfactory to each category and overall.

The overall annual evaluation level for full-time faculty members will be determined according to their percentage of effort in each category (i.e., Instructional Activities, Research and Creative Activities, Service, and Other, if relevant) using a mathematical formula based on each faculty member's distribution of percentage of effort in each category for the given year. The annual percentage of effort assignment for each category will be multiplied according to the following scale (Outstanding = 4, Above Satisfactory = 3, Satisfactory = 2, Conditional = 1, Unsatisfactory = 0). A weighted calculation will be determined using the numerical score for each category and multiplying it by the faculty member's percentage of effort dedicated to that category. The results from each category will be added together to determine the overall evaluation. The resulting total score is then used to determine the faculty member's overall annual evaluation level as described in the chart below. This system aims to provide a comprehensive and weighted evaluation of faculty performance, taking into account their contributions across the different areas.

Outstanding	3.25 - 4.0
Above Satisfactory	2.50 - 3.24
Satisfactory	1.50 - 2.49
Conditional	.50 - 1.49
Unsatisfactory	0.00 - .49

**Evaluation Key:**

Unsatisfactory (U)	Indicates substandard performance for the assignment for a second evaluation period in a row, or extreme substandard performance in a single evaluation period
Conditional (C)	Indicates substandard performance for the assignment.
Satisfactory (S) (Faculty member meets expectations)	Indicates performance that is at expectation for the assignment.
Above Satisfactory (AS) (Faculty member exceeds expectations)	Indicates performance above expectation for the assignment.
Outstanding (O) (Faculty member's performance is exemplary)	Is reserved for exceptional performance for the assignment. It indicates excellence in the profession and adherence to the highest standards of the university and the profession. In order to receive an evaluation of “outstanding”, the faculty member must have at least a “satisfactory” in all categories.

**Instructional Activities:**

University teaching and student learning encompass much more than the hours faculty members spend in the classroom. Teaching also involves keeping up with the field (both technical and changes in pedagogy), planning lectures, creating instructional materials, appropriately utilizing the CANVAS LMS, constructing tests, grading papers, mentoring/interacting with students, participating in tutorials, recitations, and formal teaching committees, working with graduate students, conducting office hours, and participating in professional development programs. Because many aspects of teaching remain invisible to students, their evaluations alone are inadequate to provide comprehensive and convergent evidence of teaching effectiveness. In addition to student assessments, some departments may have obtained evaluations from individuals who both understand the subject matter and recognize the intellectual effort and pedagogical merit involved in various instructional activities.

**Evaluation Guidelines:** Evaluations are earned by faculty and supported by the evidence (both quality and quantity) that a faculty member is performing his or her duties at a certain level. To achieve a “Satisfactory” rating, a faculty member typically *must* perform the appropriate core duties in the teaching that were assigned. An evaluator may consider elements such as number of students and student credit hours supported, number of different courses delivered, and also should consider how effective the communication with students is based on a range of elements including the course syllabus, SPOI results and comments, use of CANVAS, and whether the faculty member is teaching a 3/4 or 4/4 course load.

**Elements to consider:**

**Evidence of Quality and Impact such as (but not limited to):**

1. Courses taught
2. SPOI
3. Thesis or projects directed, where applicable

4. Thesis or projects committee, where applicable
5. Curriculum development and improvement

**Elements that are core duties and typically, where appropriate, are present to achieve Satisfactory performance (based on evidence supplied in the FAR).**

Examples could include:

1. Course syllabi which meet or exceed UCF's content requirements, policy
2. Evidence of student learning as illustrated through course level assessments and other artifacts
3. Presence to deliver course AND be appropriately available to students (e.g. office hours)
4. Participates and cooperates "appropriately" in multi section courses
5. Curricular rigor; evidence based upon items such as alignment between outcomes and assessments, syllabus, course materials, examinations, and examination practice
6. Grading aligns as a fair assessment of mastery of material and is fair to students
7. Grades assignments and exams in a timely manner, within two weeks of assignment submission
8. Adheres to appropriate student learning outcomes to ensure delivery of a quality education: evidenced by examinations and completion of planned course material including assignments, discussions, and other coursework responsibilities
9. Submits final grades consistently and on-time as per the registrar's submission deadlines, maintains approved syllabus and updated accurate gradebook in Canvas, submits assessment reports and other documentation consistently and on time as per deadlines determined by assessment coordinator
10. Appropriate interactions, consistent with university policy and guidelines, with students and appropriate professional behavior in communication with students
11. Executes teaching duties with honesty and integrity

**Elements that may be used by an evaluator to justify an Above Satisfactory or Outstanding rating** that exceeds expectations: This must be considered in the context of the institution and is specifically not a list-based, check-box exercise. If a faculty member is clearly demonstrating effectiveness in all of the areas for consideration under Satisfactory, with respect to their workload, consideration of Above Satisfactory or Outstanding may be appropriate. Evidence presented must support teaching and pedagogical excellence that is distinct from the Satisfactory requirements.

Examples of evidence of Quality and Impact might be:

1. Successful course delivery innovation – has attracted students' interests, increasing retention and curricular progression
2. Superior assignment or other evidence of exceptional performance from the classroom or supervised students
3. An invited classroom evaluation or course review by a peer in a related field including supervisor
4. Demonstration of ongoing and reasonable improvements in courses, and a plan for further improvements, that have been delivered multiple times by the faculty member
5. A review by the Center for Distributed Learning of an online or blended course that results in a Quality or High Quality Online Course designation
6. Development of new courses including special topics
7. Extensive positive revision of established courses as determined by established student learning outcomes, including in relation to mode of delivery
8. Incorporation of innovative teaching practices, such as new technologies, service-learning, international study, design and teaching of Honors courses as approved by supervisor
9. Other special instructional assignments such as conducting workshops

10. Student contact time (greater than the normal number of office hours/course/term, usually assumed to be 1 hour per week per 3 credit hour course)
11. Accessibility/availability to students (advising; Research and Mentoring Program (RAMP) and other sponsoring)
12. Sharing materials and methods, guest lecturing, offering an educational university or community lecture, and demonstrated/quantifiable helpfulness to colleagues (mentoring; sharing ideas; teaching circles, sharing course content, providing pedagogical guidance to other faculty, sharing complete course shells and materials)
13. Earning special course designations or teaching courses with special course designations [e.g. High Impact Practice (HIP), NACE Competencies, etc.) or integrated special partnerships/projects (e.g. Pilot program with the Department of Defense (DoD), Study Away] with supporting documentation
14. One-on-One Activities: advisement, thesis direction, dissertation committee membership, independent studies, student conferences, guest presentations, mentorship of faculty or graduate assistants, and internship supervision
15. Recognition: teaching grants, awards, media articles or interviews, other formal recognition of excellence by the college, university, or an outside entity
16. An invited classroom evaluation or course review by Supervisor or designee
17. Curricular Innovation: New course development, innovation in pedagogy
18. Active Participation in curriculum development for new concentration, or a new degree program
19. During the evaluation period, awarded a UCF TIP (denoting sustained teaching excellence Teaching Incentive Program over prior years), Dzuiban, or Truman Award
20. Wins a teaching award from a regional, national, or international organization in the faculty member's discipline (NOTE: Appropriate documentation must be supplied by the faculty member)
21. Miscellaneous: any exceptional instructional activities faculty member wishes to highlight and submit as evidence with supervisor input

## Research:

The list below offers a rough guideline for evaluation of research activities, but the differences among specialties should be taken into account by the Supervisor during the annual evaluation process. This list may be supplemented by advice to the Supervisor from members of the various specialties, especially in regard to items that may indicate sustained research but do not lead directly or immediately to publications (note — such advice is not to be understood as directly contributing to the evaluation, or substituting for the Supervisor's responsibility in this regard). Judgments of research productivity will be made in light of the portion of faculty members' assignments that are assigned to research and in light of the scholarly genres and expectations in their fields.

It should be noted that, regardless of specialty, publications and funded grant activities are a primary goal of scholarly and creative research. At the same time, it is recognized that the publication cycles of academic presses, peer reviewed journals, literary magazines, and the like may result in a faculty member's productivity being skewed from one year to the next. As a result, the Supervisor will need to take into account faculty productivity in at least the two years immediately prior to the annual evaluation being conducted. For example, in the first case, faculty members who have published several articles in one year may not need to publish any articles in the next year to receive a Satisfactory ranking as long as they have met other of the listed expectations. The Supervisor may take into account a faculty member's forthcoming work (accepted, in press, or under contract, and work under consideration, including grant applications) in a third year of such a cycle in making this judgment.

On research and diverse assignments:

### **Tenure-earning and tenured faculty members**

The criteria below assume a faculty member with approximately 30% of their assignment devoted to research. 30% is considered a normal load for research-active faculty in the Office. The Supervisor will adjust expectations when assigning a higher or lower percentage research assignment.

For faculty members with a higher percentage of assignment dedicated to research than the unit norm, those persons will be expected to produce at least one additional “satisfactory” criterion or its equivalent for each additional 10% of research dedication to earn a "Satisfactory" rating. The same applies for "Above Satisfactory” and "Outstanding" Ratings.

The inverse applies for those tenure-earning and tenured faculty with a lower percentage of assignment dedicated to research than the unit norm for research active faculty; one less ‘satisfactory’ standard or its equivalent will be required for satisfactory, above satisfactory or outstanding ratings for each 10% less than the norm in research. This can also be satisfied by demonstrating appropriate progress on one of the criteria for a "Satisfactory" rating.

### **Non-tenure faculty, instructors and lecturers**

For those with 10% assignment in research (e.g. in the case of instructors/lecturers who have a higher teaching load), the expectation for satisfactory performance in the research category entails that the faculty member will keep current in his/her field. By documenting activity such as ongoing reading of scholarly works, attendance of conferences and colloquia, among other possible indicators, a faculty member with below 10% research assignment can attain “Above satisfactory” rating in research. A faculty member assigned more than none but less than 10% of research will be evaluated as Outstanding in research if the faculty member completed any one of the annual evaluation standards included in the satisfactory, above satisfactory, or outstanding listed below during the evaluation time period.

### **Special Cases**

The Supervisor will consider quality and impact of a substantial authored book (i.e., a monograph with a reputable academic publisher) as it relates to major significance in the annual research review over a three-year period. If faculty members have used work on the book or acceptance of a contract to qualify for their ratings for a year or two years prior to the work’s publication, then those years will be counted as part of the three-year span. If not, the years will be counted forward from the year of the work’s publication.

The Supervisor will evaluate research using qualitative measures like publication venue rankings, journal acceptance rates, professional status of publication sites, and conference standing. Faculty may present a case for an ordinarily "Satisfactory" publication to count as "Above Satisfactory" if it has extraordinary merit or influence. Online and print journals are evaluated equally based on prestige, not delivery format. Interdisciplinary projects not explicitly covered in criteria may be considered if performance standards are agreed upon in advance.

### **Elements to consider:**

**Evidence of Quality and Impact in the field and the logical reasons why each category is included in this research evaluation list** (evidence is not limited to the following):

1. **Refereed Publications:** These undergo peer review, providing external validation of the research quality and significance by experts in the field.
2. **Non-refereed publications:** While lacking formal peer review, these can still demonstrate scholarly contribution and dissemination to relevant audiences.

3. **Books, book contributions:** These represent substantial scholarly work, often reflecting years of research culminating in significant contribution to the field.
4. **Presentations or invited talks:** Recognition by peers through invitations to present research indicates the work's relevance and importance within the discipline.
5. **Funded projects:** External funding represents competitive evaluation and validation of research merit by funding agencies.
6. **Works in Progress with evidence:** Ongoing research with demonstrable progress shows active engagement in scholarly activity, even if not yet published.
7. **Proposals submitted:** The development of research proposals demonstrates scholarly initiative and agenda-setting, regardless of funding outcome.
8. **Editorial position in national/international journals:** Recognition of expertise and standing in the field through appointment to editorial roles.
9. **Students supported/advised:** Mentorship of student researchers demonstrates research leadership and contribution to developing future scholars.
10. **Research activity with students with outcomes:** Productive student collaboration resulting in tangible outcomes shows effective research mentorship and productivity.
11. **Pre-approved activity:** Allows flexibility for innovative or non-traditional research activities that may not fit standard categories but have scholarly merit.

These categories collectively provide a comprehensive framework for evaluating both traditional and emerging forms of scholarly activity while acknowledging that quality and impact should be primary considerations.

**Elements that are core duties and typically must be present, as demonstrated by evidence, to achieve Satisfactory performance: Examples are not exhaustive, but all activity must demonstrate impact and relevance to university and field.**

Examples of Quality and Impact might be:

1. Staying current in the field
2. Adequate progress on clearly defined, multi-year research plan (ideally explicitly laid out, but maybe evident in other ways)
3. Executes research duties with honesty and integrity

**Elements that may be used by an evaluator to justify an Above Satisfactory or Outstanding rating (evidence presented must support Quality and Impact in research excellence that is distinct from the Satisfactory requirements). Examples might be:**

1. Appropriate pursuit/success in developing a funded research program
2. Works/Proposals in progress reflect substantial progress toward completion and promise of likely success
3. Recognizable major publication (s) or significant grant funding with progress on grant commensurate with grant size
4. Substantial industry project with significant impact on research, development, application (where the faculty member secured prior approval followed appropriate procedures, and advances the research and/or educational mission of the University, department, and/or program)
5. Publication in peer-reviewed journals or non-peer-reviewed conference proceeding volume
6. Research awards
7. Approved IRB research project as primary investigator (PI)
8. Research presentation or publication that receives public recognition and/or publicity, or impacts public policy or enhances the University's economic impact
9. Successful publication or presentation at a national conference or significant contribution to a state or regional conference
10. Demonstration of appropriate progress on a book-length manuscript (i.e., progress satisfactory to meeting contract or publisher's deadlines)
11. Presents a peer-reviewed paper at a conference
12. Publishes a substantial article in a non-peer-reviewed journal or a non-peer-reviewed conference proceedings volume

13. Publishes an interview with a prominent author in a peer-reviewed journal
14. Publishes a book review in a top-tier journal or major newspaper (such as the New York Times, Los Angeles Times, Chicago Tribune)
15. Publishes a scholarly article or essay, or publishes a paper in a peer reviewed conference proceedings for areas such as cognitive sciences where such work is equivalent to a peer reviewed journal article
16. Publishes a creative article or essay, or an interdisciplinary or creative project in a peer-reviewed journal. In the case of creative or non-traditional interdisciplinary work, the faculty member should provide the appropriate means of determining quality in the area (e.g., determining acceptance rates for a literary magazine, reviews of performances, etc.)
17. Publishes a book chapter in a peer-reviewed or invited volume
18. Prepares an application and applies for an external grant
19. Is awarded an internal or external grant for research
20. Presents an invited or keynote address at a conference
21. Gives a reading of research at a university or other major venue (e.g., national or international book fair)
22. Receives at least one revise-resubmit response from the submission of a new article or related project to a peer-reviewed journal

## Service

Service comes in a variety of capacities. The basic levels are departmental, division-level (where applicable), and institutional. Institutional service includes University committees but also leadership and advising or professional societies. Service also includes externally-focused service in the form of community relationships or formal efforts to solicit industry engagement in either curricular or research capacities, or unfunded consulting relationship with local, state, or federal government, private entities, or industry. A third broad category is professional service, which may include affiliations with state or national organizations as an organizer, peer reviewer, society fellow, or other activity that advances the discipline or profession and demonstrates recognition of the faculty-member's expertise and authority.

All members should expect to attend Unit meetings, serve on relevant committees, attend UCF graduation ceremonies as decided by the Supervisor, and serve in other roles during any term spent in residence at the University when not excused entirely for a period of time for different circumstances. In addition, faculty may engage in service work for the University, for their discipline, or for their profession. Faculty members should not expect to receive a Satisfactory evaluation for service if they do not meet these minimum expectations.

All tenured faculty members are expected to actively participate in the annual cumulative progress evaluation process concerning the tenure-earning faculty, all tenured faculty are expected to participate in the tenure review process when a colleague applies for tenure and promotion to associate professor, and all professors are expected to participate when a colleague applies for promotion to professor. More senior members are expected to assume leadership and mentorship roles appropriate to their experience and expertise.

Senior faculty should protect junior faculty from excessive service commitments, as taking on too many service responsibilities can prevent new faculty from properly developing their teaching abilities and research portfolio. Since teaching and research typically carry more weight in tenure and promotion decisions, it's important that junior faculty have sufficient time to excel in these areas rather than being overloaded with service work.

Below are the standards for full-time faculty to achieve a rating of satisfactory, above satisfactory or outstanding in service for the annual faculty evaluation. These standards indicate service at the unit, college, university, community, and profession levels.

The standards below assume the typical percentage of assignment for Service as 10%. When the percentage differs by at least 5%, the supervisor will work with the faculty member to adjust service contribution expectations as follows: for each additional 5% allotted to service, one additional item from the satisfactory evaluation list will be required for satisfactory, above satisfactory, or outstanding ratings. Conversely, for each 5% below the unit norm, one fewer item will be required for these ratings.

### **Elements to consider:**

#### **Evidence that demonstrated Quality and Impact include (but are not limited to):**

1. Student organizations supervised
2. Community-related service
3. Industry or other agency service
4. Professional service
5. Demonstrated contribution and impact of contribution to service roles.

#### **Elements that are core duties and typically must be actively present to achieve and provide evidence to earn a Satisfactory performance:**

1. Executes service duties with honesty and integrity and demonstrates collegiality in performing service roles
2. Regular, documented active participation in assigned service duties
3. Participation in department meetings
4. Demonstrable results or progress made on external service activity
5. Significant, demonstrated contribution to internally assigned service roles that enable the unit or organization to fill a gap, solve a problem, or advance in some important way (e.g. contribution to curriculum advisory board relationship)

#### **Elements that may be used by an evaluator to justify an Above Satisfactory or Outstanding**

Evidence of Quality and Impact presented must support service excellence that is distinct from the Satisfactory requirements.

#### **Examples might be:**

1. Significant, demonstrated contribution to internally assigned service roles that enable the unit or organization to fill a gap, solve a problem, or improve productivity
2. Successfully develop or lead co-curricular projects such as speaker-series or other events or competitions
3. Initiate meaningful service contribution to program, department, or University
4. Enable the organization to achieve positive impact on campus community or a professional society that advances the culture of learning among students in the discipline. All rules must be followed when leading organizations
5. Foster significant one-time relationship or potential for extended relationship with external entity that benefits the program, department, or University through research, curriculum, in new or existing areas
6. Provide professional service that raises the profile of the program, department, and university
7. Member of grant review committee for governmental agency or foundation, editorial board, journal reviewer or co-editor
8. Serves on one or more standing committees within the Unit
9. Chairs a committee or search committee within the Unit, College or University
10. Serves on a search committee or other ad hoc committee within the School, College, or University
11. Serves as a program director unless this is assigned/evaluated under "other duties"

12. Administrates or contributes significantly to program assessment
13. Serves on a College committee (for example, Promotion and Tenure, TIP Criteria, TIP Selection, Research Incentive Award (RIA) Selection, Sabbatical, Curriculum, Dean's Advisory)
14. Serves on a university committee (for example, Promotion and Tenure, Curriculum, Graduate College)
15. Serves on Faculty Senate
16. Serves as officer, board member or in some other major role for an organization related to UCF
17. Gives a supervisor-approved talk to a public, private, or charter school related to one's areas of expertise
18. Participates in contest judging for a university, or a public, private, or charter school or education- related community organization in one's field of expertise
19. Serves as an officer for a local, regional, state, national or international discipline-related professional organization, or serves on a State University System or federal level committee
20. Contributes in a discipline-specific significant way to a local, regional, state, national or international professional organization (serves on an awards committee, for example, or helps to organize a conference, or sits on a governing body)
21. Evaluates a manuscript for a professional journal or assesses a book for publication for a press
22. Serves as a manuscript review coordinator for a discipline-related professional journal or conference
23. Serves as an editor of a journal or magazine in the faculty member's discipline
24. Serves as a chairperson for, or a moderator on, a panel at a state, regional, national or international professional meeting
25. Provides a published or broadcast interview on a discipline-related subject to a local or national media outlet
26. Organizes a discipline-related public lecture by a distinguished lecturer from outside UCF at UCF
27. Organizes a supervisor-approved professional conference, seminar, or leads a workshop or organizes a colloquium series
28. Serves in a discipline-related capacity on an advisory professional board or an editorial board or serves on a grant or fellowship selection committee for a state or federal agency or a foundation
29. Receives externally funded grants to benefit the University, College, and/or Unit concerning a service-related issue
30. Mentors students outside the Unit (for example, Burnett Honors College for honors undergraduate thesis (HUT))
31. Represents the Unit at UCF graduation or medallion ceremonies in the evaluation period
32. Serves in a role not listed above that the Supervisor designates as fulfilling service to the Unit, College, University, or profession
33. Served as a reviewer for a discipline-related professional organization
34. Writes student letters of recommendation