

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY**  
**ANNUAL EVALUATION STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES**  
**FOR ALL FULL TIME FACULTY MEMBERS**

**Annual Evaluation Procedures**

Annual evaluation of faculty members is conducted by the Department Chair, who draws upon their faculty annual reports (FAR) 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. Faculty will be assessed on their own individual merits based on the standards listed below and not in comparison to each other.

The following procedure will be employed in the Department for the administration of faculty evaluations:

1. The faculty member prepares the Faculty Annual Report (FAR) according to the categories designated on the report form.
2. The faculty member submits the FAR, including all necessary documentation, including any required addenda, to the Chair by the specified deadline. In accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), faculty can also provide material in evidence of teaching quality. This will be taken into account in the evaluation. The chair can request additional evidence for any item being considered in an evaluation. Faculty are expected to support any item presented for the evaluation regarding quality and impact.
3. The annual evaluation shall be consistent with the faculty member's annual assignment and in accordance with the most current Collective Bargaining Agreement.
4. Based on the FAR and any consultation with the faculty member, the Chair determines an evaluation in accordance with this AESP document for each faculty member in each relevant category as well as calculating an overall evaluation.
5. If the faculty member believes the evaluation does not accord with the procedures below or is otherwise not in compliance, it is recommended that they consult with the Chair for resolution, and a grievance may be filed within 30 days of receipt of the evaluation.

**Part I: Standards and Ratings for All Full-Time Faculty**

The Chair of the Philosophy Department will evaluate the overall quality and impact of each faculty member's performance in all areas of assignment and in each individual area of

assignment annually and assign an overall rating of Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Conditional, or Unsatisfactory. The definitions of evaluation ratings appear below and apply both to individual areas of evaluation (teaching, research, service, other) and to overall annual evaluation.

- **Unsatisfactory** indicates substandard performance (i.e., “conditional”) for the assignment for a second evaluation period in a row, or extreme substandard performance in a single evaluation period. Unsatisfactory evaluation may warrant a PIP (Performance Improvement Plan).
- **Conditional** indicates substandard performance for the assignment.
- **Satisfactory** indicates performance that is at expectation for the assignment and is recognition of standard (good) quality, quantity, and impact of work performed in areas of assignment.
- **Above Satisfactory** indicates performance above expectation for the assignment, exceeding standard expectations (“Satisfactory”) for the assignment by demonstrating high quality and impact of work performed.
- **Outstanding** 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. To receive an annual overall evaluation of “outstanding,” the faculty member must have at least a “satisfactory” in all categories in which there is an assignment of at least 5% (per the CBA).

While a set of fairly objective standards has been established by the discipline at large, it is also recognized that a wide range of conditions must be taken into account by the Chair in the evaluation process. The general standards for evaluations are based on the following: quality and impact of performance in the assignment, contribution of assignment, effectiveness, special efforts, one-on-one activities, and recognition of excellence.

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), and the results from each category will be added to determine the overall evaluation. The resulting total will be assigned an overall value according to the following scale:

- |                       |           |
|-----------------------|-----------|
| • Outstanding:        | 3.50-4.00 |
| • Above Satisfactory: | 2.50-3.49 |
| • Satisfactory:       | 1.50-2.49 |
| • Conditional:        | 0.50-1.49 |
| • Unsatisfactory:     | 0.00-0.49 |

Example 1: A faculty member with an outstanding rating on a teaching assignment of 60%, an above satisfactory rating on research at 30%, and a satisfactory rating on service at 10% would be calculated as follows:

- Teaching:  $0.6$  (i.e., 60% assignment)  $\times 4.0$  (outstanding) =  $2.4$
- Research:  $0.3$  (i.e., 30% assignment)  $\times 3.0$  (above satisfactory) =  $0.9$
- Service:  $0.1$  (i.e., 10% assignment)  $\times 2.0$  (satisfactory) =  $0.2$
- TOTAL:  $2.4 + 0.9 + 0.2 = 3.5$

Because the overall evaluation is between a 3.5–4.0, the faculty member receives an outstanding rating.

Example 2: A faculty member with a satisfactory rating in a teaching assignment of 40%, an above satisfactory rating in research at 45%, and a satisfactory rating in service at 15% would be calculated as follows:

- Teaching:  $0.4$  (i.e., 40% assignment)  $\times 2.0$  (satisfactory) =  $0.8$
- Research:  $0.45$  (i.e., 45% assignment)  $\times 3.0$  (above satisfactory) =  $1.35$
- Service:  $0.15$  (i.e., 15% assignment)  $\times 2.0$  (satisfactory) =  $.30$
- TOTAL:  $0.8 + 1.35 + .30 = 2.45$

Because the overall evaluation is between 1.50 and 2.49, the faculty member receives a satisfactory overall rating.

### **Assignment of Percentage of Annual Effort**

Each faculty member's annual assignment of effort will be determined by the department Chair and will depend on each person's assignment of particular duties. While faculty may have different assignments, a typical percentage-based assignment for those on a 3/3 load would be 60/30/10 (teaching/research/service). For instructors and lecturers, who typically have a 4/4 teaching load, their usual percentage-based assignment would be 90/10 (teaching/service). It is possible for an instructor or lecturer to receive a small percentage of research assignment depending on the nature of the research conducted and determined in consultation with the Chair.

For full time tenured, tenure-earning faculty, and non-tenure-earning faculty, each three-credit course taught and large courses of 150 students or more (which may count as two course assignments with the exclusion of summer) will be assigned no less than 10% and no more than 12.5% of the faculty annual effort (i.e., 20-25% per semester). Generally, a lower percentage will be assigned for courses that a faculty member has taught before, do not require any significant revision, or are taught in multiple sections. While a higher percentage will typically be awarded for courses that faculty members are teaching for the first time or revising significantly, for example, for delivery in a new mode of instruction for the first time. Percentages should be discussed with the Chair at the time that the assignment of duties forms are completed if the faculty member wishes to have a different percentage of assignment for a course or courses.

Faculty members who wish to emphasize research productivity may request that the minimum of 10% annual effort per course per term be applied to their research assignments of percentage of annual effort. The effort otherwise assigned in teaching would then be assigned to research.

Each full-time faculty member will be assigned 10% of his/her annual effort for service, with the exception of those whose teaching loads are reduced due to administrative duties or increased percentage of effort in other assigned/approved duties. Tenure-earning faculty will be assigned 5% of annual effort for service, with the remaining percentage of annual effort added to the research assignment.

For example, a typical annual assignment of effort for a tenured faculty member would be Teaching = 60%, Research = 30%, Service = 10%, and for a tenure-earning faculty member it would be Teaching = 50%, Research = 45%, Service = 5%. Faculty assignments may be adjusted in consultation with the chair. Examples include when a faculty member receives a course buyout from an internal or external grant or other funded activity, receives a contract to work on a monograph, or serves as a major program director or performs some other significant service assignment. Such requests are to be made, in writing, in the faculty member's Faculty Annual Report, or sooner if possible, and with any relevant documentation provided.

Per the CBA, faculty members on sabbatical or a Professional Development Plan (PDP) will be evaluated based on criteria specified in the CBA for sabbaticals and PDPs and expectations for annual evaluations of performance will be adjusted proportionately in consultation with the Chair for any faculty members who are on leave during part of the academic year. Any ambiguities should be worked out in advance where possible.

#### **Note on Other Duties**

Some faculty may have an assignment including "Other Duties" as specified in their assignment of duties. Evaluation standards of "Other Duties" are determined by the Chair in consultation with the faculty member at the time of the issuing of such an assignment, when possible.

#### **Note on Joint Appointments**

Faculty members in joint secondary or tertiary appointments will be evaluated annually based on the evaluation standards herein if the majority of their assignment resides in this department, or by the standards of their majority appointment otherwise.

#### **The Annual Evaluation and its Relation to Other Kinds of Evaluation**

Article 10 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement provides for three separate evaluations: Annual Evaluation (for which this AESP defines the terms of reference), Cumulative Progress Evaluations (CPE), and Post-Tenure Review (PTR). While Annual Evaluations are included in promotion and tenure applications, their primary intent is to evaluate all faculty on an annual basis, regardless of rank, assignment, or promotion/tenure intentions. CPEs, on the other hand, are explicitly intended to be a multi-year assessment of one's progress toward promotion/tenure. As such, it is conceivable that someone could earn a satisfactory or higher on Annual Evaluations for multiple years and yet receive a CPE that indicates that he/she/they is/are not on track for promotion/tenure. It is crucial that candidates for promotion/tenure regard the CPE as the central evaluative document and most useful guide in that process. The Annual Evaluation, on the other hand, is the central evaluative document in relation to a faculty member's annual assignment.

The criteria below assume, as an example, a faculty member with 60% of their assignment devoted to teaching, and the Chair will take into consideration any variations in the percentage of assignment in assessment of the quality and impact of the faculty member's teaching activities. For faculty with a 50% or lower assignment devoted to teaching, one less "above satisfactory" standard will be required for above satisfactory or outstanding ratings. Regardless of the percentage of assignment devoted to teaching, "above satisfactory" performance in teaching indicates standards as noted in the definitions. All categories of evaluation are determined based on the quality and impact of work performed, not on a simple counting of numbers of types of achievements or basic/satisfactory requirements performed. While there are expectations of basic numbers or types of duties/work to be performed in any evaluation category, it is possible for a faculty member's work in a basic category to be of significant importance or exhibit exceptional or extraordinary achievement in itself to warrant an evaluation higher (or lower, in instances of substandard performance) than achieving a basic level of performance in that category would warrant.

## **I. TEACHING AND INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES**

The Department of Philosophy is committed to excellence in teaching and maintaining the highest standards of the profession. See the introductory section of this AESP for general standards of evaluation for all categories of assignment. While a set of fairly objective standards has been established by the discipline at large, it is also recognized that a wide range of conditions must be taken into account by the Chair in the evaluation process. The general standards for evaluations are based on the following: quality and impact of performance in the assignment, contribution of assignment, effectiveness, and recognition of significance. Note that faculty members will provide justification in documentation for the impact, quality, and significance of work performed.

### **EVALUATION STANDARDS**

#### **Unsatisfactory**

Repeated failure to meet the general expectations for satisfactory performance for a second consecutive evaluation period without improvement over the prior "Conditional" evaluation, or extreme substandard performance in the current evaluation period. In this case, a performance improvement plan (PIP) may be appropriate and developed by the Chair in consultation with the faculty member.

#### **Conditional**

Failure to meet the general expectations for satisfactory performance. A second consecutive year of "conditional" evaluation warrants an "Unsatisfactory" evaluation, as noted above.

#### **Satisfactory**

The performance expectations for a faculty member to achieve a satisfactory teaching evaluation are the following:

##### **1. Course Syllabi, Class Meetings and Office Hours**

- Makes syllabi available online through a university provided space for publication of syllabi such as "Simple Syllabus" (and, if desired and available, in the CAH Website) by the first day of classes or by the end of the first week of classes as appropriate to course type
- Provides and follows clear, detailed course syllabi that meet university requirements
- Meets classes on a regular basis as scheduled by course type and meets with classes consistent with course modality
- Provides continuous instruction for the full length of the semester, including the final examination period
- Regularly holds scheduled office hours, consistent with or appropriate to course modality

## **2. Student Inquiries and Grades**

- Replies in a timely fashion to student inquiries, i.e., within 72 working day hours
- Provides regular and appropriate evaluative feedback on student assignments

## **3. Administrative Teaching-Related Obligations**

- Provides appropriate accommodations and resources to students with accessibility needs as specified or required by SAS and to students who are identified by **ONAC** as requiring accommodations for other reasons
- Submits grades on time as required by the Office of the Registrar
- Submits assessment data as relevant
- Submits book orders on time as required by state legislation

Evaluation of the faculty member's performance as "satisfactory" in this category is determined by meeting the minimum requirements as specified above.

### **Above Satisfactory**

The quality and impact of teaching may be measured in a variety of ways. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make a strong and sound case for achievements in the above satisfactory category regarding complexity, impact, and high quality. The following items are a non-exhaustive list of achievements, accomplishments and endeavors that shall be used to identify the quality and impact of faculty members' work. Any measure may be recognized multiple times, where applicable.

The faculty member may receive an "Above Satisfactory" rating for satisfying four (4) of the following measures of quality and impact across at least any two (2) categories. These are examples of ways in which one may rise to the above satisfactory level.

### **1. Student Perception of Instruction.**

Has student evaluations in a majority of undergraduate courses and/or graduate courses above the department and college means, or has a majority of ratings in very good or excellent (measured by comparison of the "Overall Assessment of Instructor" category for excellent and very good) in the following course characteristics, which may be highlighted by the faculty member for consideration:

1. 150+ students, or
2. Honors, or
3. Undergraduate level, or

4. Graduate level, or
5. Online

## **2. Chair/Peer Evaluations**

1. Receives a rated teaching observation (which may include consideration of the total course content and materials) as requested from the chair and provided by the chair or chair's designee (observation must be provided to department if not done by chair). For tenure-earning faculty, it is recommended that at least two teaching observations be obtained each year, one by the Chair and one by the faculty member's mentor. The reviewer will provide an evaluation of "Excellent," "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory" in their observation. Ratings of "Satisfactory" and "Unsatisfactory" will be accompanied by constructive criticism by the observer.
  - a) For observations that are "Satisfactory," a faculty member must provide a statement as to how they may implement changes to the course to address such criticisms for the evaluation to count toward their annual evaluation.
  - b) For observations that are "Unsatisfactory," faculty members must make adjustments where applicable to their course and have the observer return to review it again to achieve a "Satisfactory" or "Excellent" rating before the observation may count toward their annual evaluation. For those faculty members who receive a "Satisfactory" on an observation after receiving an "Unsatisfactory," must complete the requirement listed in (a) above for the observation to count toward their annual evaluation.
2. Faculty may choose to add/include information in their annual report regarding observations of teaching or evaluations of courses from UCF entities such as CDL or FCTL.

## **3. Thesis/Dissertation/Student Awards and Achievements**

1. Chairs an in-progress or completed graduate or honors undergraduate thesis,
2. Mentors a student whose work done under faculty member's supervision is recognized with an award (e.g., Outstanding dissertation, outstanding MA thesis, Honors Undergraduate thesis scholarship)
3. Serves as a committee member for one or more completed Honors in the Major, MA, MFA, or PhD theses or dissertations
4. Documenting student achievements directly related to the impact and quality of a faculty member's mentorship and teaching, such as admission to graduate programs, other research-intensive faculty/student activities such as showcase activity of student research, student publications and presentations at



conferences, and external or internal awards (e.g., UCF's 30 under 30 award or others)

#### **4. Course Types by Workload**

1. Teaches four or more Gordon Rule courses or sections with student evaluations at least with the majority at very good or higher in overall assessment of the instructor.
2. Teaches three or more different courses or eight separate class sections.
3. Teaches in at least two different course delivery modalities.
4. Teaches a new course (i.e., new to the faculty member or new to the curriculum).
5. Gives independent study or directed reading/directed research courses (or equivalent courses) or supervises an internship that totals at least two hours of semester credit per student.
6. Teaches a High Impact Practices course(s).

#### **5. Teaching Enhancement**

1. Completes a **faculty development** conference or course innovation project sponsored by UCF FCTL, CDL, or an equivalent workshop conducted by a professionally recognized organization or participates in 6 hours of verified workshops during the evaluation period.
2. Creates substantial **innovative teaching materials** (e.g., supporting the GEP theme, teaching an FCTL workshop, Teaching Matters Workshop, maintaining a widely used teaching-related website) and shares with other faculty through these venues.
3. Serves as an **invited classroom observer**.
4. **Mentors** new or junior faculty as assigned or approved by the chair, college, or university.

#### **6. Curriculum Development and Service**

Items 1-3 below are typically weighted more heavily due to time and workload intensity. (It is possible that some elements of this work may be counted in service as documented by the faculty member.)

1. Directs a Department degree program. Directs a minor or undergraduate or graduate certificate program.
2. Spearheads or participates and contributes substantially to the creation or design of significant program curriculum revision or supports revisions of a program's curriculum by developing new courses.
3. Substantially revises a course to update it with substantially new or innovative materials.

#### **7. Completes an item in the Research & Creative Activities section if the**

**faculty member does not have a research assignment** (note: primarily for lecturers/instructors).

- a. An expectation of all faculty is that they remain **up-to-date in their respective fields**. While many non-tenure earning faculty will not have a research assignment, conducting activities such as publishing or presenting at conferences are important methods by which they may stay up-to-date in their field. For this reason, a non-tenure earning faculty member may count any **one or more** of the measures of quality and impact in the Research section toward their assessment in teaching. *See the Research & Creative Activities section for examples.*
8. Recognition of Accomplishments in Teaching
- a. Awards and recognitions for teaching are a measure of the quality of work being done by a faculty member. Such awards bring attention to the high quality work being done in the department that may have an impact on recruitment and enrollment.
    - i. Wins a UCF TIP or SoTL Award
    - ii. Wins a CAH or UCF Excellence in Teaching Award
    - iii. 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.)

### **Outstanding**

The faculty member may receive a rating of "Outstanding" if the faculty member meets the standards for an "Above Satisfactory" and an additional two (2) items across any categories in the "Above Satisfactory" section.

## II. RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

The Department of Philosophy is an interdisciplinary unit that values collaboration among its multiple programs and in other academic disciplines. Each specialty within the Department has a different set of standards for judging the prestige of research and creative activity. The list below offers a general guideline for evaluation, but the differences among specialties should be taken into account by the Chair during the annual evaluation process. 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. Faculty must document the quality and impact of their research productivity such as, but not limited to, a section of self-evaluation in which the faculty member documents the acceptance/rejection rates of a journal in which a publication appears; documents the quality and impact of a research presentation venue (i.e., a conference or workshop), and whether it is local, regional, national, or international in prominence, scope, attendance, and recognition.

An indicator of the quality and impact of one's research production (books, book chapters, articles, conference proceedings articles, and conference presentations) is demonstrated at least in part by the prominence, scope, attendance, and recognition of the venue. For this purpose, the terms "local," "regional," "national," and "international" are defined in the following:

- "Local" is a venue such as FCTL's Faculty Focus that is both published locally (i.e., at UCF and in the Central Florida region) and is intended primarily even if not exclusively for a UCF and/or Florida region's access. While this venue, to use one example, has the potential for world-wide distribution of its contents, the venue itself is local and has primarily local impact and significance. (It is possible, however, for a faculty member's essay or article appearing in Faculty Focus to be recognized nationally. In a case such as that, the faculty member can explain how the "local" publication has wider-ranging impact and significance. It is also possible for a presentation or publication at a local venue to grow into a larger work or receive positive attention in the field with more wide-ranging impact and significance.)
- "Regional" is a venue of publication or presentation specific to a region of this or another country having impact and significance for that geographical region and is primarily if not solely attended by scholars from that region. For a conference, such as the Florida Philosophical Association's annual meeting held, for example, in Orlando, the venue is "regional" even though it takes place locally for UCF. The venue is regional in location (Florida), intent and impact even if attendees and presenters are from other states, regions of the US, or other countries.
- "National" is a venue of publication or presentation intended for and including the attendance and participation primarily if not solely of persons from more than simply the local area or smaller region of that nation (whether the US or another country). For example, a conference called "The Canadian Conference on Z" is a national venue even if you, from another country, attend this conference. Note that being invited, for example, for a reading of your work at a workshop for graduate students at a university in Switzerland is either a "local" or "regional" venue due to the attendance and scope of the venue, and is not "national" for Switzerland nor "international" for a person going to this

- conference from the US or any other country.
- "International" is a venue of publication or presentation that is not determined simply by the fact that you traveled to an international destination. It is instead a venue of publication or presentation intended for and including the attendance and participation of a significant number of presenters and attendees from different countries and regions of the world. For that reason, for example, the conferences of the American Academy of Religion, the Modern Languages Association, and the American Philosophical Association are "international" due to their scope, significance, and attendance, as well as their purpose.
- Regardless of the indicators used by a faculty member in their annual report or self-evaluation, justification of the claim that a conference or publication venue is "local," "regional," "national," or "international" must be substantiated. The determination of the designator as local, regional, etc., is not made solely on the basis of geographic location or modality (in-person/online/audio) but on impact, quality, significance and distribution.

It should be noted that, regardless of specialty, publications 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 uneven from one year to the next. As a result, the Chair may exercise some judgment in deciding when to give credit for publications in press but see below in "Special Cases" for time limitations on credit for research activity.

*On research and diverse assignments in the department:*

The criteria below assume a tenured faculty member with approximately 30% of their assignment devoted to research. Thirty percent (30%) is considered a normal research load in the Philosophy Department for a tenured faculty member. *In consultation with the chair, evaluation expectations will be adjusted when assigning a higher or lower percentage research assignment.* There are variations in research assignment percentages based on rank and tenure status.

For faculty with a higher percentage of assignment dedicated to research than the department norm for research active faculty, the person will be expected to produce at least one additional "satisfactory" criterion or its equivalent for each additional 10% (up to 50%) of research assignment to earn a satisfactory rating. Because that is the case, and to ensure that a reasonable number of research products is achievable, for a research assignment above 50%, the faculty member will consult with the chair to reach agreement on a reasonable level and type(s) of research productivity for satisfactory, above satisfactory, and outstanding ratings.

The inverse applies for those with a lower percentage of assignment dedicated to research than the department norm for research active faculty; one less "satisfactory" indicator or its equivalent will be required for satisfactory, above satisfactory or outstanding ratings for a faculty member with a research percentage at approximately 20% or lower. This can also be satisfied by demonstrating

appropriate progress on one of the criteria for a "Satisfactory" rating, keeping in mind that a "satisfactory" rating is an indicator of performance that is at expectation for the assignment and is recognition of standard good quality, quantity, and impact of work performed. All faculty assigned a research percentage in their annual assignment are expected to achieve the standard in research to demonstrate appropriate good quality achievements.

If a research assignment falls between the 10% increments noted above, consideration of impact, quality, or work in progress toward completion will be evaluated with respect to the percent difference. For example, a person with a 25% research assignment might complete in an appropriate manner for the evaluation designator of 20%, and the additional 5% could be accounted for with markers of exceptional quality, or by a work in progress such as an article draft, a draft book proposal, etc.

### **Special Cases**

A substantial authored book (i.e., an authored book with a reputable academic publisher) should be allowed to count for major significance in the annual research review over a three-year period. For example, 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.

A book going through substantial editing for a second or subsequent edition may and can be considered in the annual evaluation year in which the work is being done and in the publication year, for a total of 2 years' credit for such editing and editions. Additional substantial activity might include conducting fieldwork or ethnographic work after a book proposal has been submitted or a contract has been signed, in which case up to four years may be granted to gain credit for the work in consultation with the Chair. In addition, a faculty member might choose not to count work on an upcoming publication when there are extenuating circumstances such as illness, pandemic, publishing delays, and so on, which would allow for counting a work in non-consecutive years.

For published articles, faculty can use a total of 2 years (e.g., submission and publication years) in annual reports. In general, a publication will not be credited in more than two annual evaluations unless it is of book length, or some additional substantial activity is involved in the publication. More specifically, a faculty member might "count" an article being submitted one year and its acceptance the second year, but would not count that same article, even if substantially revised, in a third year for its publication where the second year is a revise and resubmit and the first year is the submission year. A faculty member cannot "count" submission of a rejected item as a "first" submission to another journal but may count the publication of the re-submitted article in its publication year with another/different journal. Changing the name of a submitted work does not "count" as a different research product, nor does minor changes to content.

In the evaluation process of research and scholarship, the Chair must consider qualitative and impact measures, including but not limited to factors such as the

following: the reputation of publication venues (presses and journals), the acceptance rates for journals, the status of publication sites in the area of specialty, and the competitiveness and academic standing of conferences and professional meetings, and the reach and impact of one's work in the public sphere. Faculty must provide appropriate documentation of the quality and impact of the work and the venue in which the research product appears. In the case where a faculty member considers a publication normally qualifying for Satisfactory as having extraordinary merit or unusual influence on the field or in the public sphere, that person may present a case for that item counting as sufficient for Above Satisfactory. No distinction will be made in evaluations between online and print journals per se. Rather, claims for the significance or special recognition of a publication will be based on the venue's prestige determined by its quality, impact, and scope and not its format, place, or mode of delivery.

In some cases, the faculty member and chair may agree on a project that is not explicitly covered in the criteria below. The project could be considered in the evaluation process if the standards for satisfactory performance are agreed upon in advance.

### **Unsatisfactory**

Failure to meet the minimum conditions (i.e., substandard performance of the faculty member) for satisfactory performance for a second consecutive evaluation period without improvement over the prior "Conditional" evaluation, or extreme substandard performance in the current evaluation period. Unsatisfactory evaluation in any evaluation year warrants a performance improvement plan (PIP).

### **Conditional**

Failure to meet the minimum conditions for satisfactory performance. "Conditional" indicates substandard performance (i.e., failure to meet criteria for satisfactory performance).

### **Satisfactory**

The faculty member will receive a rating of "Satisfactory" for meeting two (2) of the following standards based on the standard load for tenured faculty at 30% research (with individual variations in percent of assignment taken into account), with both demonstrating good quality and significant impact of research productivity. Some indicators of "satisfactory" research are weighted more heavily than others due to time, complexity, or significance of the research activity performed. Generally, anonymously peer-reviewed work is weighted more heavily than open peer-reviewed; editor-reviewed is weighted more heavily in a more prestigious venue and less in a venue lacking such recognition; and national and international research productivity are weighted more heavily than regional and local productivity.

#### **1. Books and Book Chapters**

- a. Demonstration of appropriate progress on a book-length manuscript (i.e.,

progress satisfactory to meeting contract or publisher's deadlines). This work must be documented with inclusion in the faculty member's self-evaluation of actual work performed.

- b. Publishes a book chapter in a peer-reviewed or invited volume. Indication of publication must be provided in self-evaluation.

## **2. Other Publication and Preparation Activity**

- a. Demonstration of appropriate progress on editorship of an edition of a journal satisfactory to meet deadlines (documentation must be provided) and/or demonstrated progress on an article or conference presentation not yet submitted for publication.

## **3. Published Articles, Book Reviews, and Submitted Work**

- a. Peer-Reviewed
  - i. Publishes a scholarly article or essay or publishes a paper in a peer-reviewed conference proceeding for areas such as cognitive sciences where such work is equivalent to a peer-reviewed journal article.
  - ii. Receives at least a revise-resubmit response from the submission of a new article or humanities related project to a peer-reviewed journal
  - iii. Publishes a translation or an interview with a prominent author in a peer-reviewed journal or public venue
  - iv. Publishes a book review in a professionally reviewed journal or other appropriate public venue
  - v. Publishes a creative article or essay, or a humanities-related creative project in a peer-reviewed journal. In the case of creative or non-traditional humanities 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.)

## **4. Non-Peer Reviewed or Work Submitted (Peer or Non-Peer Reviewed)**

- a. Publishes a substantial article in a non-peer-reviewed venue
- b. Submits a new article for peer-reviewed publication
- c. Has an article accepted for publication forthcoming

## **5. Conference Presentations and Submissions**

- a. Presents a peer-reviewed paper at a conference (international and national presentations are more heavily weighted than regional and local). To receive consideration for more than one peer-reviewed paper presented at a conference, the papers must be substantially different from each other.
- b. Presents an invited or keynote address at a local or regional conference (national and international invited or keynote presentations are in the "Above Satisfactory" category)
- c. Submits a new article for peer-reviewed publication to a reputable journal with at least regional status
- d. Gives a reading of creative work at a university or other major venue (e.g., national or international book fair)
- e. In applicable academic areas, commentary published or presented at a conference or publication of abstracts or poster presentations are also

considered

**6. Other Creative or Scholarly Projects**

- a. Does significant work on a public-facing scholarly or creative project the quality and distribution of which are demonstrated. Examples include, but are not limited to,
  - i. leading or participating on a digital humanities team,
  - ii. designing a digital humanities project for publication/presentation,
  - iii. building a digital humanities database,
  - iv. preparing archival material for digital curation,
  - v. designing a digital humanities game,
  - vi. designing an app for scholarly purposes,
  - vii. creating or hosting a serial podcast, etc.
  - viii. Evidence of quality and/or extent of involvement will be useful and is required in self-evaluation in determining what "significant" means.

**7. Grants**

- a. Prepares an application *and* applies for an external grant
- b. Is awarded an internal grant for research (external awards are in the "Above Satisfactory" category)

**Above Satisfactory**

The faculty member may receive a rating of "Above Satisfactory" for meeting one (1) of the following standards (1-4 below) where criteria 1 and 2 put emphasis on number and quality of research products while 3 and 4 emphasize one major research activity, where all demonstrate excellent quality and significant impact of research productivity. Some indicators of "above satisfactory" research are weighted more heavily than others due to time, complexity, or significance of the research activity performed. Generally speaking, anonymously peer-reviewed work is weighted more heavily than open peer-reviewed; editor-reviewed is weighted more heavily in a more prestigious venue and less in a venue lacking such recognition; and national and international research productivity are weighted more heavily than regional and local productivity.

**1. Publication and Additional "Satisfactory" Criteria:**

- a. Meet at least three of the "Satisfactory" criteria (or one criterion more than once), with all those research products demonstrated to be in high quality, high impact venues at least at the regional level,
  - i. With at least one being an actual peer-reviewed publication or
  - ii. A significant deliverable resulting from a significant grant (e.g., a final report for an NEH or NEA grant), OR
  - iii. Meet two of the "Satisfactory" criteria, plus one of the following, with all research products demonstrated to be in high quality, high impact venues at least at the national level.
  - iv. The Department recognizes that it may be, due to funding limitations, impossible for a faculty member to attend a second conference for presentation of a paper or delivery of another appropriate research product. In a case like this, documentation of acceptance and the work performed/product should be provided in annual report documentation



to be considered in one's annual evaluation.

**b. Invited or Keynote Address**

- i.** Presents an invited or keynote address at a national/international conference

**c. Publication**

- i.** Publishes a translation of notable length in a recognized journal or as a stand-alone book

**2. Book(s):**

- a.** Significant sustained work on a book for which a contract has been secured, of which the quantity and quality of the writing can be documented by samples, a contract, option, letter of interest, or other demonstration that the project is likely to be published by a scholarly or creative press with national distribution and reputation
- b.** Receives significant recognition of the scholarly impact of one's research (e.g., through book reviews, citations, invited book talks, etc.)

**3. Grant(s):**

- a.** Is awarded an external grant for research, or continued administration and execution of the research aspects of a multi-year grant

**Outstanding**

The faculty member may receive a rating of "Outstanding" if the faculty member exceeds the "Above Satisfactory" standard in at least ONE of the following THREE ways:

**1. Meeting Additional Satisfactory or Above Satisfactory Criteria, Plus Publications:**

- a.** Meet singly or in combination at least four of the "Satisfactory" and/or "Above Satisfactory" criteria, with at least two being actual publications (i.e., peer reviewed publications in academic journals or conference proceedings, or chapters in academic books)

**2. Publication(s)**

- a.** Publication of a single-authored book in the faculty's field published by a scholarly or creative press with a national distribution and prestigious reputation. "Book" may be interpreted as any major project that undergoes professional review and achieves independent trade or academic publication, in particular scholarly works, but also textbooks, and
  - i.** Independently evaluated scholarly websites, or other significant nonfiction studies; novels; collections of short fiction, literary nonfiction, poems or articles; a play, film script; or other recognized achievement.
- b.** Publication of a jointly authored book by a scholarly or creative press with a national distribution and reputation in which the faculty member can demonstrate at least a 50% contribution (note: lesser levels of contribution do not guarantee an outstanding evaluation)
- c.** Publication of an edited or co-edited book by a scholarly or creative press with a national distribution and reputation in which the faculty member can

demonstrate at least a 50% contribution (note: lesser levels do not guarantee an outstanding evaluation)

- d. Book-length translation of a book with a reputable publisher.
- e. The considerations above also apply to editing or co-editing a special issue of a journal or similar research product of significance.

### **3. Awards and Recognition**

- a. Research award from a professional organization
- b. Book-length translation of your book with a reputable publisher
- c. Meet the criteria for "Above Satisfactory" plus one of the following:
  - i. Wins a UCF RIA Award
  - ii. Wins a CAH or UCF award for research excellence
  - iii. Is awarded multiple external grants or one very large or prestigious grant (e.g., major NEH grant, major foundation grant) as defined by standards in one's specialty. These standards will vary between areas that typically have access to major funding streams and those that do not, so a \$30K NEA grant may be equivalent for humanities scholars to a \$300K grant for cognitive sciences scholar.

### **III. SERVICE**

The Department of Philosophy is committed to excellence in service to the department, institution, and profession. While a set of fairly objective standards has been established by the discipline at large, it is also recognized that a wide range of conditions must be taken into account by the Chair in the evaluation process based on the faculty member's assigned duties and annual report. The general standards for evaluations are based on the following: contribution of assignment, effectiveness, quality and impact of performance in the assignment, special efforts, and recognition of excellence in service.

All members of the Department are expected to share in the work of the Department. All members are expected to:

- Serve on Department committees,
- Attend UCF graduation ceremonies (based on the Department's rotation schedule) and
- Serve in other roles during any term spent in residence at the University when not excused entirely for a period of time for sabbatical, medical, or other leave or alternate assignment.
- In addition, faculty may engage in service work for the University, for their discipline, or for their profession. Faculty members cannot expect to receive a satisfactory evaluation for service if they do not meet these minimum expectations.

All tenured faculty members are expected to:

- Participate in the tenure review process when a colleague applies for tenure and promotion to associate professor, and
- All full professors are expected to participate when a colleague applies for promotion to professor, and
- More senior members are expected to assume leadership and mentorship roles appropriate to their academic rank, experience, and expertise.

Tenure-earning members of the Department should take care to avoid (and more senior members should help them to avoid) assuming too many service duties such that they interfere with their more important responsibilities to develop as teachers and scholars. However, the decision to take on additional service assignments is the prerogative of the faculty member. For a tenure-earning faculty member, the decision to take on additional or heavy service assignments should be discussed with the Chair or senior faculty mentor for advice.

Below are the standards for all 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 department, college, university, community, and profession levels.

When the percentage of assignment for service differs from the departmental norm of 10% by at least 5%, the standards for assessing a faculty member's service contributions will be adjusted as follows:

- For each additional 5% allotted to service, an additional activity from the list for a satisfactory evaluation (which also takes into account time commitment of the service activity, and the quality and impact of service) will be required or demonstration of a significantly heavy time commitment and workload to a single or more than one service activity to receive a satisfactory, above satisfactory, or outstanding rating.
- The inverse applies for each 5% of assignment less than the department norm: one less service activity or reduced time commitment will be required to receive a satisfactory, above satisfactory, or outstanding rating.

## **Special Cases**

Journal editing, for which a faculty member does not receive alternate workload or have a pre-existing agreement for its assignment of percentage of effort, may in some circumstances have that work count as "Other Duties." The Department Chair, in consultation with the faculty member, will stipulate the percentage of effort, up to a maximum of 5%, and whether that percentage is to be deducted from the Research or the Service segment of the annual assignment.

## **Unsatisfactory**

Failure to meet the minimum conditions for satisfactory performance for a second year in a row, or extreme substandard performance in the evaluation period. A performance improvement plan (PIP) is appropriate for an unsatisfactory evaluation.

## **Conditional**

Failure to meet the minimum conditions for satisfactory performance (i.e., "conditional" indicates substandard performance for the assignment).

## **Satisfactory**

The faculty member may receive a "Satisfactory" rating if the faculty member meets minimum standards consistent with academic rank (e.g., serving on P&T, CPE committees, etc.) as noted above and usually satisfies at least 3 service assignments as listed below (which includes those requirements listed above by academic rank) all demonstrating good quality and significant impact of service activity. It is possible that less than 3 service activities can reach this standard based on time, complexity, and workload of service activity or activities. Some indicators of "satisfactory" service are weighted more heavily than others due to time, complexity, or significance of the service activity performed such as serving on a search committee is more time-consuming and more difficult in most cases than serving on a department curriculum committee; and providing service as an editorial board member of and who also reviews submissions to-a professional journal is more time-intensive and prestigious than being a reader of submissions to a regional journal or conference, and so on.

At least one of the items for service must include service on a department committee or some other activity that fulfills service to the department unless other arrangements are made with the Chair. Also, all faculty members are responsible for providing documentation for all non-UCF service, such as letters of appointment, invitations to review manuscripts, or requests to serve as external evaluators. In

addition, to receive credit for any of the items that follow, the service must be at least satisfactory in the judgment of the chair or other relevant supervisor. For example, those who do not attend regularly scheduled department or committee meetings or complete necessary service work in a timely and professional manner will not get credit for such committee work or other service and their annual evaluation will reflect that/those facts. Note that service for UFF activities is not considered university service and shall not be evaluated. Items indicated with a single "\*" are considered high impact service; those indicated with a double "\*\*" indicate very high impact service.

**1. Department, College, or University Committee Service**

- a. Chairing a Committee\*
- i. Chairing a Search Committee\*\*
- b. Receives externally funded grants to benefit the University, College, and Department concerning a service-related issue\*\*

**2. Committee Service for Department or College/University**

- a. Serves on a departmental standing committee
- b. Serves on a departmental search committee\* or other ad hoc committee
- c. Serves on a CAH committee (for example, Promotion and Tenure, TIP Selection, RIA Selection, Sabbatical, Curriculum, Dean's Advisory)\*
- d. Serves on a university committee (e.g., Promotion and Tenure, Curriculum, College of Graduate Studies)\*
- e. Serves on Faculty Senate\*
- f. Organizes a public lecture by a distinguished lecturer from outside UCF at UCF
- g. Mentors students outside the Department through a UCF Office, such as TRIO, RAMP, or McNair

**3. Directorship/Coordinator of Department Degree Program\*\***

- a. Includes administering program assessments (if the program coordinator does not administer program assessment, directorship *may* count less heavily and thus as one "\*", depending on the number of majors in the program)
- b. Directorship of a Department Minor or Graduate or Undergraduate Certificate Program\*
- c. Note: See also the teaching section on inclusion of directorship of degree, minor, and certificate programs. This activity may be counted in either or both of the teaching and service sections of one's annual report/annual evaluation.
  - i. It is possible, for example, to designate in one's annual report an activity as director counting as teaching and another counting as service, depending on the nature of that activity.

**4. Student-Related Organization Advisory Status**

- a. Advises or provides other substantial service to a registered student organization at UCF

**5. Officer, Board Membership**

- a. Serves as officer, board member, or in some other major role for an organization related to UCF

**6. Professional Service**

- a. Serves as an officer for a local, regional, state, national or international professional organization, or serves on a State University System or federal level committee
- b. Evaluates a manuscript for a professional journal or assesses a book for publication for a press

- c. Serves as a manuscript review coordinator for a professional journal
- d. Serves as an editor of a journal or magazine in the faculty member's discipline (unless this activity is placed under Other Duties in the assignment of effort)\*
- e. Serves as a chairperson for, or a moderator on, a panel at a state, regional, national or international professional meeting
- f. Organizes a professional conference, seminar, or leads a workshop or organizes the department's colloquium series\*
- g. Serves 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.
- h. Contributes significantly in some other 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)

#### **7. Community Service**

- a. Gives a public lecture to a local or regional group or organization related to one's areas of expertise
- b. Gives a talk to, participates in contest judging for, consults with, or organizes a program for a public, private, or charter school related to one's areas of expertise

#### **8. Other Service**

- a. Provides a published or broadcast interview on a subject pertaining to philosophy, religious studies, humanities, or cognitive science to a local or national media outlet
- b. Serves in a role not listed above that the Chair designates as fulfilling service to the Department, College, University, or profession
- c. Organizes, plans, and manages recruitment and retention activities, events, or presentations for the department
- d. Engages in recruitment and retention activities, events, or presentations for the department

### **Above Satisfactory**

The faculty member may receive an "Above Satisfactory" rating if the faculty member meets minimum standards consistent with academic rank (e.g., serving on P&T, CPE committees, etc.) and usually satisfy at least 4 service assignments as listed in the "Satisfactory" category (which includes those requirements by academic rank) , with the majority demonstrating **excellent quality** and significant impact of service activity. It is possible that less than 4 service activities can reach this standard based on time, complexity, and workload. For example, some indicators of "satisfactory" service are weighted more heavily than others due to time, complexity, or significance of the service activity performed. For example, serving on a search committee or directing a degree program is or may be more time-consuming and more difficult in most cases than serving on a department curriculum committee and providing service as an editorial board member of- and who also reviews submissions to - a professional journal is more time-intensive and prestigious than being a reader of submissions to a regional journal or conference, and so on.

## **Outstanding**

The faculty member may receive an "Outstanding" rating if the faculty member must meet minimum standards consistent with academic rank (e.g., serving on P&T, CPE committees, etc.) and usually satisfy at least 5 service assignments as listed in the "Above Satisfactory" category (which includes those requirements by academic rank) with the majority demonstrating exemplary **quality** and significant impact of service activity. It is possible that less than 5 service activities can reach this standard based on time, complexity, and workload. As indicated above, some indicators of "satisfactory" service are weighted more heavily than others due to time, complexity, or significance of the service activity performed. For example, serving on a search committee is more time-consuming and more difficult in most cases than serving on a department curriculum committee and providing service as an editorial board member of- and who also reviews submissions to - a professional journal is more time-intensive and prestigious than being a reader of submissions to a regional journal or conference, and so on:

At least one service assignment must include service on a department committee or some other activity that fulfills service to the department, unless other arrangements are made with the Chair. Examples include but are not limited to a major task force for the college or university that takes a faculty member away from department service.

## **Special Cases**

When the work of a particular service item requires an above average or extraordinary amount of time and effort in a given year (e.g., heading up a large curriculum revision, spearheading a new program proposal), a faculty member may request that the Chair consider that service work equivalent to fulfilling two or more of the standards.