

ANNUAL EVALUATION STANDARDS & PROCEDURES

College of Optics and Photonics

Guiding Principles

The purpose of annual evaluations is to facilitate and assess faculty success in instructional activities; research, scholarship, and creative activities; service activities; other assigned activities; and overall performance. The performance of the college is dependent upon the individual performance of each faculty member as well as the collective performance of the faculty. The success and reputation of the College are highly dependent upon the talents that exist among the faculty and how effectively those talents are harnessed and blended to achieve the college's and the university's mission.

The work of faculty is not easily described or measured, and the AESPs exist to protect academic freedom and improve accuracy, fairness, and equity in the evaluation of faculty. There will always be an element of subjectivity in the determination of annual evaluation ratings. Evaluators are expected to operate with trust and respect. In the College of Optics and Photonics, the annual evaluation of faculty is conducted by the Dean. Annual evaluation ratings shall be evidence-based and informed by faculty activity reporting and other forms of documented evidence. Where possible and reasonable, evidence shall be evaluated for *quality* and *impact* toward the achievement of the university's mission.

The basis of the annual performance evaluation will be information obtained through the Faculty Annual Report, student evaluation forms, annual assignment forms, student success data, and other information available to the Dean and/or provided by the faculty member. Faculty members may choose to meet with the supervisor at the start of the evaluation period to clarify how certain unique activities they plan to undertake will be evaluated.

The possible performance ratings in each area of assigned activities and overall are:

Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Conditional or Unsatisfactory.

It should be noted that the college expects all faculty to be leaders in their field at a national or international level and that a rating of "Satisfactory" indicates that their performance meets this high standard. Some of our faculty will exceed this performance and be rated as "Above Satisfactory" or even in some cases "Outstanding".

A faculty member unable to meet standards required for a Satisfactory rating will be rated as Conditional, and the Dean will work with that faculty member to help them to improve performance.

A rating of Unsatisfactory indicates that the faculty member was deficient in achieving success for the second year in a row or the faculty member was exceptionally deficient in their performance.

Additional information about AESPs is found in the current UCF BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, primarily in Article 10.

This AESP applies to tenured, tenure-track as well as non-tenure-track faculty. Everyone will be assessed based on the FTE in Teaching, Research, Service and Other as identified in their assignment of duties (AOD), in accordance with the guidelines.

Workload policy – College of Optics and Photonics

The AESPs are strongly linked with the college workload policy, given below. Expectations for research evaluation and research student advising are separately delineated for faculty with different teaching loads. Courses taught are each evaluated separately.

Framework:

Faculty are evaluated via AESPs that take into account their annual assignments in (1) research, (2) teaching, (3) service and (4) other duties.

T/TE faculty are nominally expected to teach one course per semester. This is referred to as a 1/1 teaching load. The Dean may assign higher teaching loads under some circumstances, for example to faculty who may be performing below the college mean in research but are performing well in teaching. Faculty are still expected to be active in research and supervise research students so only in very rare circumstances would faculty be assigned more than 2 courses per semester.

In most cases, faculty will not be assigned “other university duties” so the AESPs are created for the following teaching, research and service loads:

(Effort percentages refer to fraction of 9-month assignment. Each course is assigned to 12% effort of 9-month period.)

1/1 teaching load: (2 courses per year)

36% teaching (24% formal coursework, 12% research student advising)

54% research

10% Service

2/1 teaching load: (3 courses per year)

45% teaching (36% formal coursework, 9% research student advising)

45% research

10% Service

2/2 teaching load: (4 courses per year)

54% teaching (48% formal coursework, 6% research student advising)

36% research

10% Service

Occasionally an exceptional assignment to service may supplant part of the teaching or research assignment.

1. INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

ASSESSMENT MATERIALS:

All assigned courses, including any summer and overload courses, are subject to evaluation. A faculty member's primary goal in teaching should be to foster student learning and success. In their annual report, the faculty member facilitates an accurate evaluation by providing a variety of evidence demonstrating their effectiveness in promoting student learning.

Faculty are required to submit the following items related to formal coursework for evaluation. These can be submitted as appendices to the annual report, but it is preferred that the Dean or designee can directly assess the course materials in Webcourses.

1. **Syllabi.**
2. **Course Materials:** Examples of textbooks, readings, and other resources used.
3. **Evidence of varied and appropriate teaching methods:** lecture notes, multimedia presentations, technology integration, active learning activities.
4. **Grade Distributions:** Data on grade distributions, highlighting improvements or trends over time.
5. **Engagement Metrics:** Data on student participation in class activities, such as attendance records, discussion board activity, or engagement in group work.

In addition, the faculty member is encouraged to provide a self-reflection statement that explains the impact of the teaching activities for each course. Where appropriate the faculty may also provide other types of evidence related to courses taught, that could be useful.

The Dean will also assess the student perceptions of instruction scores and comments for each course.

Faculty may also provide evidence of professional development activities related to teaching: List of workshops, seminars, or courses attended focused on teaching and learning with certificates of completion or evidence of participation. However, these should be accompanied by documentation of changes made to teaching practices as a result of these activities, such as revised syllabi, new teaching methods, or updated course materials.

EVALUATION CRITERIA - INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

(i) *The following basic expectations are required for all faculty and need to be met to receive a rating **above conditional**.*¹

1. Convenes all classes with regularly scheduled class meetings (such as face-to-face, mixed mode, and synchronous online) as scheduled (unless there is prior approval) and teaches all classes in the modality they were scheduled.
2. Holds all scheduled office hours in the appropriate modality and location and provides opportunities for student appointments outside of office hours.
3. Is responsive to student emails and within the learning management system. Replies to student inquiries related to formal coursework should be made in a timely manner (typically within 2 or 3 business days.) Such replies are not expected when students have been notified through class announcements.
4. Complies with state, university, and unit policies and deadlines pertaining to teaching, as described in the faculty handbook, including syllabus policies and final grade submission deadlines.
5. Holds final examinations in compliance with university regulations and policies.
6. Provides plans for covering teaching, and obtains authorization to travel from the Associate Dean.
7. Appropriately supervises and evaluates any TAs and other assistants (graduate or undergraduate) assigned to help with instruction.
8. Upholds an acceptable level of professionalism when communicating with students in and out of the classroom.
9. Submits book orders and syllabi on time as required by the university.
10. Maintains accurate and up-to-date grades which reflect the grade the student is receiving in the class and makes those grades visible and available to students.
11. The instructor provided timely (usually within one week of submission) and constructive feedback that supported student learning.

Evaluation: Each of the evaluation criteria in the next section will be rated as either – Conditional (Needs Improvement), Satisfactory, Above Satisfactory, or Outstanding, Questions may be rated N/A, if a question is not applicable (questions rated N/A will not be considered when computing overall evaluation of teaching, should the Dean agree that they are indeed not applicable).

¹ In cases when a faculty member is not able to meet these expectations for a short period of time due to circumstances beyond their control, the faculty member should inform the supervisor as soon as practicable. (For example, a faculty member is unable to log into Webcourses due to a technical issue that is expected to take three days to fix. They should inform the supervisor of the situation right away.)

(ii) Classroom teaching² FTE 12% of 9-month assignment per course

Courses taught will be assessed on the following 5 criteria:

1. Courses had clear and measurable learning objectives, and the content was aligned with the stated learning objectives, and assignments reflect the current state of the subjects covered.
2. Assessments (tests, quizzes, assignments) effectively measured student learning and showed evidence of student success.
3. The instructor was effective in organizing the course.
4. The instructor was proficient in teaching and contributed to the learning experience.
5. For ABET assessed courses, the instructor provided high quality and timely feedback.

Evaluation materials: In addition to the materials below, faculty may add a brief descriptive narrative for each item including an informative narrative to explain grade distribution.

Evaluative Rating: Each of the items will be rated as C, S, AS or O.

Two or more items scored less than satisfactory will result in a rating of **Conditional** or below for instructional activities.

To receive a rating of **Satisfactory** in a course a faculty member needs to meet all basic expectations in Section 1 with no more than one conditional rating.

To receive a rating of **Above Satisfactory** in a course a faculty member needs to meet all basic expectations in Section 1 and achieve an average rating of Above Satisfactory, with no more than one conditional rating, or Above Satisfactory in a majority of criteria, with no conditional ratings.

To receive a rating of **Outstanding** in a course a faculty member needs to meet all basic expectations in Section 1 and is rated outstanding in a majority of criteria with no conditional ratings.

(iii) Student supervision (FTE 12%, 9% or 6%, per workload policy).

Assessed materials:

For each PhD student supervised in the evaluation, the annual report should include:

- Date started in program, and (where applicable) Dates of Completion of Candidacy, Proposal, Defense.
- Publications, first author or other, conference papers presented or coauthored.
- Research or dissertation hours taken in the reporting period.
- Narrative to describe progress, awards, patents, other relevant items

For context, faculty may list students who graduated in the last two years. This will not be

² All courses taught during the evaluation period will be assessed including summer and overload courses

evaluated explicitly but will help the Dean understand the progression of students through the research group.

For each MS and Undergraduate research student supervised in the evaluation, the annual report should include:

- Dates supervised, along with any financial support provided.
- Research, Thesis or similar hours taken in the reporting period.
- Any publications or conference papers.
- Narrative to describe level of student's work, progress in program, other factors.

Feedback from the Associate Dean for Academic programs regarding any issues with student supervision for each student will be taken into account. If so, the Dean will mention this in the annual evaluation, and how it affected the faculty rating.

Evaluation of Student Supervision

Evaluation is based on a mix of quality and quantity.

Overall supervision of students will be evaluated as C, S, AS or O. It is understood that not all students succeed in graduate school or research, so it is expected that among the students supervised by a faculty member, not all may be successful. Faculty will only be ranked below satisfactory in advisement if there is a strong pattern of failure within the group or there have been significant issues with supervision, such as unprofessional behavior.

A score will be determined by adding the total number of students supervised with BS, MS and PhD students weighted as 1, 2, 3, respectively. Co-advised graduate students count as one student for each advisor. BS students should be enrolled in research, thesis or similar credits with the faculty member during the assessment period or should have been paid as an undergraduate researcher by the faculty member for at least one semester in the reporting period. Faculty who are deemed to have exceeded expectations (for example by students progressing ahead of schedule, strong student publications, students winning awards, etc.) will have their score multiplied by 1.5.

It is understood that faculty with higher teaching loads and smaller numbers of students may experience gaps in PhD supervision - sometimes a student leaves unexpectedly, and it is not always easy to recruit new students. Should such a gap occur in a given reporting period, the faculty member should explain this in the annual report, providing supervision data from previous years to back up this narrative. The Dean may take this into account when giving a rating for student supervision.

<i>For a 1/1 workload,</i>	<i>For a 2/1 workload,</i>	<i>For a 2/2 workload,</i>
S – score ≥ 5	S – score ≥ 4	S – score ≥ 3
AS – score ≥ 8	AS – score ≥ 6	AS – score ≥ 4
O – score ≥ 12	O – score ≥ 8	O – score ≥ 6

This applies to faculty who have been in their position for 4 academic years at the time of evaluation. Newer faculty will have expectation reduced proportionately (e.g. a faculty member who has been in the position for 3 years will require scores reduced by $\frac{3}{4}$ in the above table.)

For example: A 1/1 faculty member supervising one PhD student, one MS student and one BS student, and exceeding expectations will receive a score of $1.5 \times (3+2+1) = 1.5 \times 6 = 9$, which results in a rating of AS for supervision

A 1/1 Faculty member supervising 4 PhD students and one undergraduate student, while meeting expectations will receive a score of 13, which results in a rating of O for supervision.

A 1/1 faculty who has completed 3 academic years with 2 PhD students at expectation will receive a score of 6, which would result in an AS rating.

A 2/1 faculty member with one PhD student and no other students would receive a score of 4 or 6, depending on whether their supervision was deemed at or above expectations.

Overall Evaluation of Instruction

Satisfactory:

Faculty may have no more than one course or student supervision rated as Conditional. All other courses or supervision must be rated as Satisfactory.

Above Satisfactory:

Faculty may have no more than one course or student supervision rated as Satisfactory. All other courses or supervision must be rated as Above Satisfactory.

Outstanding:

Faculty is rated Outstanding in a majority of the areas that make up their assignment in instruction, with no conditional ratings.

Should the Dean deem it appropriate, the following activities may influence the overall Instructional Activities assessment:

- The instructor actively participates in professional development activities focused on teaching and learning and implements what they have learned. This may include self-reflection, implementing student feedback to improve a class, and other activities that contribute to continuous improvement of teaching practices.
- Other Contributions (This category may include designing new classes, developing a new program that contributes to student success, etc.)

2. RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE WORK ACTIVITIES – ASSESSMENT MATERIALS:

Faculty are required to submit the following items related to research productivity. These can be submitted as appendices to the annual report with narratives.

1. List of publications, proceedings, patents, presentations and other scholarly works within the last three years.
2. Data on citations in the past three years from Clarivate.
3. List of research-related awards, fellow status, etc. received in the past 3 years. For context, a cumulative list of awards received can also be provided.
4. List of proposals submitted as PI and co-PI, in the last three years.
5. List of funded programs running within the last three years, which funded amounts and start/end dates.
6. List of students (graduate and undergraduate) supervised in the last three years, with any relevant information of whether and how students were funded.

In order for the Dean to determine the rating level for each criterion, faculty are also encouraged to supplement these lists with a short narrative to explain the significance of their contributions, how their funding and proposal writing supports their overall research program, and how their students are progressing in research.

EVALUATION CRITERIA - RESEARCH

Research activity shall be evaluated over a period of the past three academic years.

(i) The following basic expectations are required for all faculty and need to be met to receive a rating above conditional.

1. Submits research works for publication in refereed scientific journals.
2. Submits proposals to federal agencies and other sponsors for research funding.
3. Ensures a safe environment in research facilities by complying with safety requirements and ensuring safety training is completed in a timely manner.
4. Completes research-related trainings and required reports in a timely manner.
5. Advises students in thesis and dissertation research and/or advises postdoctoral scholars' research.

(ii) Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities will be assessed on the following criteria over a three-year period:

1. Dissemination of research (papers, conference talks (regular and invited), citations, dissertations or theses of supervised students) and contribution to student (graduate and undergraduate) and postdoctoral performance in research and training
2. Research funding (proposals submitted, funded grants)
3. Record of submitting reports, completing research-related training.

Note that the following guidelines on required numbers of papers, funding, etc. are only guidelines and quantity measures may be offset by quality measures including but not limited to the significance or impact of papers, visibility of funded projects (e.g. leading a large, multi-PI project), etc. Conference talks, proceedings, book chapters, etc. will also be accounted for.

Faculty who have been hired within the three years prior to the end of the evaluation period will have expectations reduced in proportion to the time served. New assistant professors will not be required to meet funding or publication targets, but should meet the above expectations for supervision and submission of proposals.

General guidelines to meet Satisfactory rating for faculty on a 1/1 teaching load:

1. Publishing 5 or more refereed journal papers or patents during the three-year period, at least 2 of which are in first or second-quartile journals, or are otherwise adjudged by the Dean to be significant works; and
2. Receiving adequate funding to maintain the research effort and funding of graduate students supervised; and
3. Evidence of successful supervision of students and/or postdoctoral researchers over the past three years; and
4. Writing at least 3 proposals during the three-year period.

If the faculty member is not able to achieve, or barely achieves, a rating of Satisfactory in research, the Dean may assign a higher teaching load assuming their rating in teaching is Satisfactory or above.

General guidelines to meet Above-Satisfactory rating for faculty on a 1/1 teaching load:

Meets all the above and:

1. Publishes 10 or more refereed journal papers or patents during the three-year period, at least 5 of which are in first or second-quartile journals, or are otherwise adjudged by the Dean to be significant works; and
2. Receives more than \$1M in research funding over the three-year period and/or is the PI on a major multiple investigators grants and
3. Evidence of successful supervision of students and/or postdoctoral researchers over the past three years, and
4. For associate or full professors, has Clarivate citations over the last three years near or above the median for the college in the rank.

General guidelines to meet Outstanding rating for faculty on a 1/1 teaching load:

1. Publishes 15 or more refereed journal papers or patents during the three-year period, at least 8 of which are in first or second-quartile journals, or are otherwise adjudged by the Dean to be significant works; and
2. Receives more than \$1.5M in research funding over the three-year period and/or is the PI on a major multiple investigators grants and
3. Evidence of successful supervision of students and/or postdoctoral researchers over the past three years, and
4. For associate or full professors, has Clarivate citations over the last three years near or above the median for the college in the rank.

General guidelines to meet Satisfactory rating for faculty on a 2/1 teaching load:

1. Publishing 4 or more refereed journal papers or patents during the three-year period, at least 2 of which are in first or second-quartile journals, or are otherwise adjudged by the Dean to be significant works; and
2. Receiving adequate funding to maintain the research effort and funding of graduate students supervised; and
3. Evidence of successful supervision of students and/or postdoctoral researchers over the past three years, and
4. Writing at least 2 proposals during the three-year period.

If the faculty member is not able to achieve, or barely achieves, a rating of Satisfactory in research, the Dean may assign a higher teaching load assuming their rating in teaching is Satisfactory or above.

General guidelines to meet Above Satisfactory rating for faculty on a 2/1 teaching load:

Meets all the above and:

1. Publishes 8 or more refereed journal papers or patents during the three-year period, at least 5 of which are in first or second-quartile journals, or are otherwise adjudged by the Dean to be significant works; and
2. Receives more than \$0.75M in research funding over the three-year period and/or is the PI on a major multiple investigators grants and
3. Evidence of successful supervision of students and/or postdoctoral researchers over the past three years, and
4. For associate or full professors, has Clarivate citations over the last three years near or above the median for the college in the rank.

General guidelines to meet Outstanding rating for faculty on a 2/1 teaching load:

1. Publishes 12 or more refereed journal papers or patents during the three-year period, at least half of which are in first or second-quartile journals, or are otherwise adjudged by the Dean to be significant works; and
2. Receives more than \$1.0M in research funding over the three-year period and/or is the PI on a major multiple investigators grants and
3. Evidence of successful supervision of students and/or postdoctoral researchers over the past three years, and
4. For associate or full professors, has Clarivate citations over the last three years near or above the median for the college in the rank.

Usually, faculty on a 2/1 teaching assignment receiving an outstanding rating in research will be invited to move to a 1/1 assignment in future years.

General guidelines to meet Satisfactory rating for faculty on a 2/2 teaching load:

1. Publishing 3 or more refereed journal papers or patents during the three-year period, at least one of which is in first or second-quartile journals, or are otherwise adjudged by the Dean to be significant works; and
2. Receiving adequate funding to maintain the research effort and funding of graduate students supervised; and
3. Evidence of successful supervision of students and/or postdoctoral researchers over the past three years, and
4. Writing at least two proposals during the three-year period.

General guidelines to meet Above Satisfactory rating for faculty on a 2/2 teaching load:

Meets all the above and:

1. Publishes 6 or more refereed journal papers or patents during the three-year period, at least half of which are in first or second-quartile journals, or are otherwise adjudged by the Dean to be significant works; and
2. Receiving adequate funding to maintain the research effort and funding of graduate students supervised; and
3. Evidence of successful supervision of students and/or postdoctoral researchers over the past three years.

General guidelines to meet Outstanding rating for faculty on a 2/2 teaching load:

1. Publishes 9 or more refereed journal papers or patents during the three-year period, at least 5 of which are in first or second-quartile journals, or are otherwise adjudged by the Dean to be significant works; and
2. Receives more than \$0.5M in research funding over the three-year period and/or is the PI on a major multiple investigators grants and
3. Evidence of successful supervision of students and/or postdoctoral researchers over the past three years.

Usually, faculty on a 2/2 teaching assignment receiving an outstanding rating in research will be invited to move to a 2/1 or 1/1 teaching assignment in future years

3. SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Service will be evaluated based on the quantity (compared to the FTE assigned – 0.05 FTE is equivalent to 2 hours of service per week) and the quality of the service (the service must contribute to the desired goals of the activity). Service will be rated in four categories based on the *quality* of service as follows:

1 - Unsatisfactory 2 - Conditional 3 - Satisfactory 4 - Above Satisfactory 5 - Outstanding.

Category 1: Service to CREOL (this includes serving on CREOL committees, participating in job candidate interviews for future members of the department, attending Commencement, attending departmental functions, etc.).

Category 2: Service to the University (this includes serving on university committees, leading or participating in special projects that benefit the college or the university and are external to the department, etc.)

Category 3: Service to the profession (this includes referring scholarship by others, organizing conferences or exhibits, serving on committees in professional organizations, etc.).

Category 4: Professional service to the community (media interviews, public lectures, etc.)

Overall Evaluation of Service:

To receive a rating of **Satisfactory** a faculty member needs to achieve a score of Satisfactory on at least 2 of the categories above and meet the overall quantity of service proportional to their service FTE.

To receive a rating of **Above Satisfactory** a faculty member needs to achieve a score of Above Satisfactory on at least 2 of the categories above and a Satisfactory on a third and meet the overall quantity of service proportional to their service FTE.

To receive a rating of **Outstanding** a faculty member needs to achieve a score of Above Satisfactory on at least 1 of the categories above and a rating of Outstanding on at least 2 of the categories above and meet the overall quantity of service proportional to their service FTE.

4: OTHER ACTIVITIES

Most faculty will not be evaluated in this category. Faculty with a substantial administrative assignment, such as graduate or undergraduate program director, may be evaluated in this category. The supervisor and the faculty member will meet in the beginning of the evaluation period and agree in writing on the criteria that will be used for the evaluation.

Should a faculty member have an assignment to Other Activities, then they must provide a narrative to describe their performance in these activities.

OVERALL EVALUATION

The overall evaluation of each faculty member will be based on the evaluation of the four categories of evaluation weighted by the FTE assigned for each category for the regular academic year (summer or overload teaching will not affect the FTE used for teaching).

This will be calculated by assigning a score of 0, 1, 2 or 3 for ratings of C, S, AS or O in each category. These scores will be multiplied by the assignment and the products summed to obtain a composite score. An initial overall rating will be estimated according to:

Composite score:	Less than 1:	Conditional or Unsatisfactory
	1 to 1.5:	Satisfactory
	1.5 to 2.5:	Above Satisfactory
	2.5 or above:	Outstanding

However, for scores close to the boundaries (1.5 or 2.5) the Dean will take into account factors such as very strong performance, or perhaps weak performance, in one or more area, in reaching a final overall assessment. This may result in higher or lower overall assessment than indicated by the initial overall assessment. In this case, such factors will be described in the written evaluation.

To receive an overall rating of Satisfactory or above, the faculty member must have a rating of Satisfactory or above in each of the categories of Teaching, Research, and Service regardless of the score obtained by the weighted average. That is, a rating of Conditional in any one of these categories will result in a Conditional rating overall. Similarly, a rating of Unsatisfactory in any category will result in an Unsatisfactory rating overall.