

Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures Tenured, Tenure-Earning, Instructor and Lecturer Faculty Department of Materials Science and Engineering

These faculty annual evaluation standards provide guidance to both faculty and evaluators regarding the assignment of annual evaluation ratings in the areas of teaching, research, and service, and the assignment of an overall annual evaluation rating. The intent of these standards is to spell out the criteria in enough detail such that faculty members are aware of expectations within the Department, can be reasonably sure of their own evaluation ratings, and can be assured that the standards are applied equally and equitably to all faculty within the Department. The standards are intended as guidelines, crafted to leave enough flexibility that an evaluator can take certain special cases into account in the evaluation process. This document is additionally expected to guide the evaluation of faculty in the post tenure review (PTR) process.

The evaluation process within the Department of Materials Science and Engineering is guided by these general principles:

1. Quality is the most important indicator. This is particularly true in evaluating research and teaching. An effort must be made on the part of the evaluator to assess the overall quality of the publication record (as indicated by metrics such as impact factor or citations by other authors) or other research related achievements (including, but not limited to number of funded contracts, amount of research funding, diversity of sources of funding, funding as PI versus that as co-PI, and whether or not the funding is competitive, student co-authorship and their role as lead author, awards resulting from research (faculty or students) recognition); conversely, the faculty member is responsible for justifying such quality. While objective measures like paper counts certainly have some merit, great care must be taken to put these measures into the proper context. On teaching, the impact on teaching and mentoring students in the classroom, laboratory and beyond into their careers, as the case may be, has to be considered.
2. Efforts to contribute to the Department's overall performance goals in recruitment of faculty and students, meeting various targets and achieving national and international recognition for the Department, UCF and the faculty member, are recognized. The time and effort that faculty put forth in the advancement of the Department's mission are extremely valuable. While some efforts (for example, receiving a research grant, or giving an invited lecture) are clearly prestigious, other efforts (receiving a conference grant, or refereeing papers) just as clearly serve the Department's goals, and must be recognized as such. Service to the department, college and University in addition to service in Professional organizations, societies, and other entities (other Universities as co-advisor, external evaluators, etc.) also brings visibility and reputation to MSE. Teaching awards and Advising awards contribute to the department, the students and by extension the faculty member as tangible evidence in quality towards our mission.
3. Evaluation should be reasonably flexible. To promote a well-balanced department having strong research, teaching, and service components, the evaluation process must recognize that individual faculty members have differing interests, priorities, and experience levels. The process must recognize that junior faculty will very likely fulfill fewer of the evaluation criteria than senior faculty. Additionally, faculty may have more teaching responsibilities (as reflected by the number of courses taught in a given semester and subsequently in their FTE distributions) than research

or service and this should be given due consideration. For instructors and lecturers with reduced teaching responsibilities (again, as reflected by the number of courses taught in a given semester and subsequently in their FTE distributions) there may be research or service expectations in line with tenured or tenure-earning faculty.

To assist the evaluator, the faculty member is encouraged to (but is not obligated to) provide a bulleted list of data for the comments section of an annual evaluation form. (See the “Comments of the Chairperson” section of the *Chairperson's Evaluation Summary* Form AA-17.) These data would include the items the faculty member thinks are important in each evaluation category. It is then the evaluator's duty to assign ratings for the particular categories.

In assigning ratings in each category the notions of leadership roles and participatory roles are general (but not sole) delineating factors between an Outstanding rating and an Above Satisfactory rating. Likewise, the ratings of Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory may be determined by a willingness or unwillingness to perform assigned duties. At no time shall a faculty member receive a rating in a given category if no assignment was made in that category.

In general, it is the faculty member's responsibility to properly document activities and accomplishments that contribute to the evaluation ratings. In the case of disagreement, the evaluator may request and must consider any additional evidence presented to him or her.

OVERALL RATING

This document is based on the typical assignment of tenure-track faculty, which includes two courses per academic year, a significant research assignment, and a much smaller service assignment.

The overall rating will be determined based on the following format for faculty with the typical assignment. For faculty with a higher teaching assignment, the “Teaching” and “Research” roles are reversed.

<i>Overall</i>	<i>Teaching</i>	<i>Research</i>	<i>Service</i>
Outstanding (O)	At least AS	O	At least AS
	O	At least AS	O
Above satisfactory (AS)	O	At least S	At least S
	AS	At least AS	At least S
	At least S	O	At least S
Satisfactory (S)	At least S	At least S	At least S
Conditional	At least one conditional		
Unsatisfactory	At least one unsatisfactory		

Faculty who have additional assignments in teaching or additional assignments such as the associate chair, graduate coordinator, and undergraduate coordinator will be evaluated appropriately.

It is important to note that, in the following guidelines, research is formatted differently than teaching and service. The reason is that teaching and service have assigned duties and uniform expectations,

whereas research varies widely among faculty. Faculty publication will be considered whenever the faculty member is included as an author or co-author in any order.

TEACHING

In evaluating teaching responsibilities consideration should be given to faculty teaching larger classes without a teaching assistant (i.e., above the department median class size for undergraduate and graduate classes, respectively) or laboratory sections. Faculty should be evaluated only during periods when not excused entirely for a period of time for sabbatical, modified instructional duties, or medical leave.

Outstanding (Leadership)

The requirements in the satisfactory category must be met, in addition to the following. Below are *examples of activities* that can earn an outstanding rating. At least one of them is required for this rating.

- Receive a UCF or a national teaching award.
- Supervise four doctoral students or post-doctoral researchers (two MS are counted equivalent to one doctoral student).
- Author a textbook, a workbook, a course manual, or software that support instruction. Authoring a graduate textbook may qualify for multi-year credit.
- Outstanding student evaluations (above the college median SPI) while maintaining high academic standards. This can be based on a number of factors, including grade distributions and tests.
- Evidence of exceptional teaching effectiveness (e.g., teaching awards).
- PI/co-PI on an external educational grant. Credit given for the duration of the grant.
- Develop a new course, (including short-course, conversion of in-class to online course.).
- Leadership in a major teaching project.
- Give a workshop on teaching at the University level or nationally; write a peer reviewed paper on education and training.

Above Satisfactory (Participation)

The requirements in the satisfactory category must be met, in addition to the following. Below are examples of activities that can earn an above satisfactory rating. At least one is required for this rating.

- Supervise two doctoral students or post-doctoral researchers (two MS are counted equivalent to one doctoral student).
- Supervising independent study.
- Conducting and delivering seminars to enhance student learning, for example, weekly research lectures specifically targeted to student audiences, preparatory sessions for the graduate qualifiers.
- Submission of educational grant proposals.
- Developing additional materials to support existing courses, e.g. web component for course.

- Evidence of significant efforts to improve student learning, e.g. developing innovative pedagogy, attending teaching workshops.
- Mentor students carrying out supplemental instruction (SI) in their classes
- Above satisfactory (above 3.0 SPI) student evaluations while maintaining high academic standards.

Satisfactory

A satisfactory rating in teaching requires achieving all of the following minimum standards:

- Teaches effectively with appropriate content, learning objectives, rigor, and pedagogical approaches.
- Follows guidelines and procedures established in UCF's "Teaching at UCF", "Faculty Teaching Qualifications" and "Critical University Regulations, Policies and Procedures, and Faculty Responsibilities" documents
- Meets classes on a regular basis as scheduled.
- Holds scheduled office hours.
- Replies in a timely fashion to student inquiries.
- Provides effective and accurate advisement when requested.
- Submits book orders on time as required by state legislation.
- Provides clear, detailed course syllabi that meet the university requirements.
- Provides regular evaluative feedback on student assignments.
- Meets with students during the final examination period in compliance with university regulations.
- Submits grades on time.
- Does not have documented and substantiated problems with teaching

Conditional

- Does not meet the requirements for Satisfactory.

Unsatisfactory

- Does not meet the requirements for Satisfactory for more than one year, or:
- Often cancels class, comes late, or cancels office hours.
- Negative impact on student learning, such as answering students' questions in an insulting way.
- Documented and substantiated problems with teaching.
- Lack of willingness to teach courses based on departmental need.

The emphasis this AESP places on quality (see, e.g., #1 on the first page of this document) for faculty ratings of teaching and the various qualitative metrics to evaluate teaching already stated in the AESP document are again highlighted. The faculty ratings for teaching **SHOULD** be consistent with the faculty members' overall contribution to students' learning.

RESEARCH

As research varies greatly across the department, the following list is in the order of importance to earning high ratings in the research.

1. Publications

- Accepted papers in high quality refereed journals, Research monographs
- Chapters in research monographs
- Conference proceedings papers (refereed)
- Submitted refereed journal papers
- Publications with students or staff supported

2. Research Funding

- Award of external funds as PI or co-PI
- Award of multiple year federal grant as PI or co-PI counts as Major in each of the years that the grant is funded, except for no-cost extension.
- Diversity of funding sources
- Number of students and staff supported by research funds
- Award of internal funds as PI or co-PI
- Submission of grant proposal(s)

3. Lectures/Talks

- Invited lectures in national/international conferences
- Colloquium talks or seminars at other universities/institutions
- Contributed talks in national/international conferences

4. Recognitions

- National or international research awards
- Plenary speaker in national and international conferences
- State/regional research awards
- UCF research awards
- Distinguished Visiting Researcher at Research I Institution or National Lab
- Citation of works by other scholars
- Patents

5. Interdisciplinary Research projects/collaborations that cross departments and disciplines

Examples for evaluating faculty research

Rating	Papers	Talks	Proposals	Funding
Satisfactory	2	2	2 submitted	Sufficient to support research activity
Above satisfactory	4	3	1 funded	Sufficient to support 2 GRA's
Outstanding	12	5	3 funded	Sufficient to support four GRA's

Comments:

1. The quantities for papers, talks, and proposals above are three year totals (i.e., for the current and prior two years), whereas the funding level is specific to the current year.
2. The example ratings are guidelines and assume funding and one other column in the above table (i.e., papers, talks or proposals) of the indicated activities are demonstrated (for example, a Satisfactory rating could be achieved with 3 papers plus 1 talk plus a submitted proposal, or an Outstanding rating could be achieved with funding to support five GRA's plus 5 talks and 5 papers).
3. Papers need to be published in peer reviewed professional journals.
4. Talks need to be presented at major professional meetings, including colloquia at ranked departments, national labs, etc.
5. Support of post-doctoral associates and their financial equivalency to GRAs should also be considered.
6. Expectations should be adjusted for faculty excused for a period of time for medical leave or modified instructional duties

Performance that is less than satisfactory will be given a rating of Conditional in the first year and Unsatisfactory in subsequent years.

The above research ratings have several qualitative and quantitative metrics that guide, both, the evaluator and the faculty being evaluated. A holistic approach that includes the faculty member's effort and contribution to enhancing or sustaining their stature in their field of research during the evaluation period, depending on their rank and stage of their career, SHOULD be considered. This includes and is not limited to various qualitative metrics like impact of publications (e.g., impact factor, citations, journal reputation in the field), patents, mentoring of undergraduate, graduate and post-doctoral students and their subsequent placement after UCF, source of funding and source of support of students, dissemination of research results at appropriate forums, notoriety gained, recognition from peers, collaborations and partnerships etc.

SERVICE

All faculty are expected to participate in departmental events when not excused entirely for a period of time for sabbatical, modified instructional duties, or medical leave. However, it is recognized that in starting a new research and teaching program, a new (untured) faculty member will have different service expectations as compared to a tenured faculty member with a well-established program. Thus, expectations for the two groups are delineated here.

The following are examples of activities that are considered in evaluating the service component.

Activities

- serving on department, college, and/or university committees or subcommittees chairing any committee
- serving in the faculty senate or in other faculty governance roles
- serving as a sponsor for student activities and/or groups
- mentoring junior faculty and teaching assistants
- recruiting students

- activity in professional organizations in one's discipline
- development of relationships beneficial to UCF with industry and government agencies
- consulting (paid or unpaid) for other universities, colleges, or primary or secondary schools
- serving on committees or boards for federal or state government agencies
- organizing conferences or symposia
- organizing activities that promote public awareness of one's discipline
- serving as editor of professional books and journals
- refereeing papers
- reviewing promotion documents or Ph.D. theses
- reviewing grant proposals at the international, national, state or local level
- sharing one's academic expertise in the local, state, or national community

Assessment

- administrative review of material presented in the annual report self-evaluation
- input from colleagues, university leaders, committee members or chairs
- awards and honors
- letters or certificates of public service
- recognition of service from school districts, K-12 teachers, K-12 students or parents

Examples for evaluating service

Ratings of Satisfactory or better require that a faculty member participate regularly in any assigned departmental service responsibilities, in addition to the examples below. Consideration should also be given to service on special committees as well as service to the faculty's base unit (e.g., NSTC, Cluster Initiatives).

Outstanding (tenured)

1. Serving in the faculty senate + organizing a conference + serving on a department committee as assigned.
2. Chairing a department committee as assigned+ refereeing papers
3. Organizing a conference + serving on department or college committee
4. Serving as an editor/co-editor of a professional journal + serving on department or college committee

Outstanding (tenure track)

Serving on department or college committee as assigned+ refereeing papers+ external service to professional/technical organization + efforts to increase the quality and quantity of student recruitment

Above satisfactory (tenured)

1. Serving on department or college committee as assigned + refereeing papers

2. Serving as an editor/coeditor of a professional journal

Above satisfactory (tenure track)

1. Serving on department or college committee as assigned
2. Refereeing papers

Satisfactory (tenured)

1. Serving on department or college committee as assigned
2. Refereeing papers

Satisfactory (tenure track)

1. Attending departmental events

Performance that is less than satisfactory will be given a rating of Conditional in the first year and Unsatisfactory in subsequent years.

LECTURERS AND INSTRUCTORS

Lecturers and Instructors will be evaluated according to the expectations listed below.

- If two years of conditional evaluations occur, the Lecturer/Instructor will automatically earn an **unsatisfactory** evaluation for the second year.
- If the following requirements are satisfied and the weighted average is at least 2.75 but less than 3.0 (out of 5) on student evaluations for overall teaching effectiveness, the faculty member will receive an overall rating of **conditional**.
 - No substantiated pattern of complaints about teaching.
 - Teaching portfolio such as what was covered throughout the class and samples of materials (Class Syllabus, Samples of Materials such as Examinations, Projects, Home Works/Assignments, etc. assembled into a 3-ring binder).
 - Involvement in assessment and ABET-related activities
- Following 4 items are required for a **satisfactory** evaluation
 - The weighted average of student evaluations for overall teaching effectiveness must be at least 3 (out of 5).
 - No substantiated pattern of complaints about teaching.
 - Teaching portfolio such as what was covered throughout the class and samples of materials (Class Syllabus, Samples of Materials such as Examinations, Projects, Home Works/Assignments, etc. assembled into a 3-ring binder).
 - Involvement in assessment and ABET-related activities
- For an **above satisfactory** evaluation, in addition to the above mentioned items the weighted average of student evaluations must be at least 3.5 (out of 5)
- For **outstanding** evaluations, in addition to the above mentioned items for satisfactory, the weighted average of student evaluations must be above the college median SPI.

Involvement and achievements in the following activities will be considered for granting a higher performance rating.

- Active involvement as faculty advisor in student organizations
- New course and laboratory development
- Feedback from previous students.
- Guiding HIM students and undergraduate research students
- Active involvement in education-related professional societies such as chairing a session, etc.
- Continuing education/outreach educational activities.
- Education-related publication activities
- Teaching of Fundamentals of Engineering Examination material to students
- Publication of textbooks/monographs

The emphasis this AESP places on quality (see, e.g., #1 on the first page of this document) for Lecturers and Instructors ratings of teaching and the various qualitative metrics to evaluate teaching already stated

in the AESP document are again highlighted. The Lecturers and Instructors ratings for teaching SHOULD be consistent with the faculty members' overall contribution to students' learning.