

## Department of Physics

### **ANNUAL EVALUATION STANDARDS & PROCEDURES FOR LECTURERS, INSTRUCTORS, AND VISITING FACULTY**

#### **Basic Assumptions**

Faculty at the Lecturer or Instructor rank and Visiting Faculty are non-tenure earning and may not have a research assignment. A research assignment may be given upon agreement between the Chair and the faculty member. Annual evaluations will be based only on those areas in which there is a formal assignment.

Review of performance will emphasize quality rather than quantity. For each area, the possible reviews are Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Conditional, and Unsatisfactory.

#### **Guiding Principles**

The purpose of annual evaluations is to assess faculty contributions and accomplishments in instructional, research, and service activities. Institutional excellence is dependent upon the individual performance of each faculty member as well as the collective performance of the faculty.

The contributions and accomplishments of a faculty member are often not easily quantified, and the AESP document is intended to protect academic freedom and equity in the evaluation process. While an element of subjectivity is unavoidable in annual evaluations, evaluators are expected to operate objectively to the greatest extent possible, and with trust and respect towards the faculty.

Scholarly activity and accomplishments will be assessed based on contributions to the advancement of knowledge in the faculty member's respective discipline. Evidence will be evaluated for both *quality* and *overall impact*.

The annual performance evaluation will be evidence-based using information obtained through the Faculty Annual Report, student evaluation forms, annual assignment forms, and other information available to the supervisor and/or provided by the faculty member. The evaluation will be done in a manner consistent with their annual assignment. 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. Faculty who return from administrative leave or something similar would work with the chair to develop an evaluation plan appropriate for the subsequent years.

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

#### **INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES**

All assigned courses, including 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 the classroom and independent teaching/research. The faculty member should provide a variety of evidence demonstrating their effectiveness in promoting student learning.

### **Section 1: Basic Expectations**

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

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. For asynchronous online courses, instructors are expected to contribute a minimum of weekly announcements or other communications.
2. Holds all scheduled office hours and provides opportunities for student appointments outside of office hours pursuant to college and university policy.
3. Maintains effective and professional communication with students during a course. This includes replies to course-related student inquiries generally within 3 business days whenever possible (except when students have been notified through class announcements).
4. Submits book orders on time as required by university and unit policy.
5. Complies with state, university, and unit policies and deadlines pertaining to teaching, including syllabus policies and final grade submission deadlines.
6. Holds final examinations in compliance with university regulations and policies.
7. Provides an appropriate level of supervision and evaluation for any TAs and other assistants (graduate or undergraduate) assigned to help with instruction.
8. Successfully remedied areas of concern specifically pointed out in the previous year's evaluation. This item is only relevant if there were substantial issues with instruction in a previous evaluation year.

### **Section 2: Evaluation Criteria**

Each of the evaluation criteria in the next section will be scored as follows:

- 1 – Unsatisfactory
- 2 – Needs Improvement
- 3 – Satisfactory
- 4 – Above satisfactory

5 – Outstanding

N/A - if a question is not applicable (questions rated N/A will not be considered when computing overall evaluation of teaching).

Items 1-8 will each be assigned a weight of 1.

Items 9-11 may involve varying time commitments which are reflected by assigning weights to the scores. For example, developing a new course (item 11) is a time-consuming task that would receive a weight 3. Supervision of 1 graduate student in research (item 10) would receive a weight 1, whereas supervision of 3 graduate students in research would receive a weight 3.

The overall teaching evaluation depends on scores and weights for the below areas as detailed later. The overall numerical score is based on a weighted average. Item 12 is only relevant for faculty members with assigned duties in that category. In cases where item 12 is not relevant, it will not be included in the calculation of the weighted average.

## **2.1 Classroom teaching**

All courses taught during the evaluation period will be assessed, including summer and overload courses. Assessment will be done based on uploaded course packs and any additional information provided. Course packs should provide evidence of comprehensive and rigorous learning objectives. Grade distributions should accurately measure achievement of learning objectives.

1. All courses had clear and measurable learning objectives.
2. The course content was aligned with the stated learning objectives.
3. Assessments (tests, quizzes, assignments) effectively measured student learning outcomes as evidenced by score distributions and grading rubrics.
4. Course materials and assignments reflect the current state of the subjects covered.
5. Course materials are well organized.
6. The instructor provided timely (usually within one week of submission) and constructive feedback that supported student learning.
7. Based on collected data (e.g., grades, grade distributions, pre- and post-tests, standardized assessments), students demonstrated significant progress towards reaching the learning objectives of the class.
8. Student evaluations indicated a reasonable level of satisfaction with the instructor's teaching and the learning experience. The Chair will take into consideration any extenuating circumstances, for example, first time teaching a course and other factors. Faculty members should reflect on student comments, and this will also be taken into consideration in the Chair's evaluation. Evaluations from FCTL, unit administrator, and/or peers that indicate an effective learning environment can also be taken into consideration in the Chair's evaluation.

## **2.2 Other contributions to teaching and student mentoring.**

9. Supervision of graduate and/or undergraduate students in directed research, independent study, or dissertation/thesis hours. Evidence may include published journal articles, presentations, awards, student self-reflection of learning outcomes, software, hardware, honors undergraduate theses, and research reports.
10. 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. Weights will range from 1-2 depending on the level of activity.

The final two items are only evaluated by the Chair if appropriate to the assigned duties:

11. The instructor supervision of student research, and actively and successfully participates in the graduate program by chairing and serving on Master's and PhD committees. Weights will range from 1-3 depending on the level of activity.
12. Other Contributions (This category may include designing new classes, updating or improving content of an existing course, developing a new program that contributes to student success, etc.). Weights will range from 1-3 depending on the level of activity.

Overall Evaluation of Teaching:

To receive a rating of **satisfactory** a faculty member needs to meet all basic expectations in Section 1 and from Section 2 achieve an average score of satisfactory or above (3+) on items 1-8 above. Items 9-12 from Section 2.2 can also be considered in the evaluation.

To receive a rating of **above satisfactory** a faculty member needs to meet the criteria for a satisfactory rating and achieve a weighted average of at least 4 on the relevant criteria in Section 2.

As an example, if faculty member has a cumulative score of 28 on items 1-8, a score of 4 on item 9 with a weight 1, and a score of 4 on item 11 with weight 3, the overall score will be  $(28+4*1+4*3)/10=4.40$ , which would be more than the requirement for an Above Satisfactory.

To receive a rating of **outstanding** a faculty member needs to meet the criteria for a satisfactory rating and achieve a weighted average of at least 4.5 on the criteria in Sections 2.

## **RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE WORK ACTIVITIES**

Research is not expected to represent a large FTE for lecturers, instructors, and visiting faculty. The thresholds below are based on a nominal assignment of 0.1 FTE in research. The department chair will consider differences in assigned service when making the evaluation.

Faculty will be assigned a category at the beginning of the academic year to reflect their expected research activity. Categories are T1, T2, and T3, from research active faculty (T1) to no research activity (T3). Evaluations will be based on the research category and the corresponding FTE's. These categories are defined in the Physics Work Equity document. Research, scholarship, and creative work activities will not be evaluated for the T3 category.

### **Section 1: Basic Expectations**

#### **T1 and T2:**

1. Publication of at least one peer-reviewed paper and/or peer-reviewed conference proceedings within the past 3 years.

### **Section 2: Evaluation Criteria**

For each of the sections below, evidence should be presented for quantity, quality, and impact on the field. Based on the evidence provided in the Annual Report, each section below will be scored on a scale from 1-5 which is to be associated with ratings as indicated here:

- 1 – Unsatisfactory
- 2 – Needs Improvement
- 3 – Satisfactory
- 4 – Above satisfactory
- 5 – Outstanding
- N/A - if one of the Sections 2.1-2.4 is not applicable

Within each section 2.1-2.4, relevant items are listed that will be considered when the Chair assigns a score/ranking. Ratings 1-5 will be given in each section where relevant effort is reported, and a rating N/A where no efforts are reported. It is not necessary to demonstrate effort and contributions in each section 2.1-2.4 in order to obtain a Satisfactory or better overall evaluation.

It is not necessary for a faculty member to show evidence of contributions in each of the enumerated items below. Rather, the Chair will consider the overall quantity, quality, and impact of contributions that fall within the scope of Section 2.1-2.4.

The enumerated lists below are not assumed to be exhaustive. The Chair can use discretion in recognizing contributions not explicitly listed below.

It is assumed that the Chair can also exercise discretion in assigning scores/ratings, especially in instances where high impacts have been demonstrated. For example, publications in prestigious journals (Science, Nature, Phys. Rev. Lett., etc.) are expected to be recognized by the Chair. Similarly, awards and other recognition, or positive media coverage and high visibility of research efforts, would also reasonably be expected to enhance the score/rating assigned by the Chair.

## **2.1 Scholarly Productivity and Quality.**

Each of the following measures of productivity and quality will be assessed over a 3-year period.

- a. Papers accepted or published in peer-reviewed journals or peer-reviewed conference proceedings listed in the ISI Web of Science or in other indexing organizations pertinent to the research focus of the faculty member. To achieve a rating of Above Satisfactory or higher, it is assumed that either the quantity or quality of publications will exceed the basic expectations for a Satisfactory rating. The Chair is expected to recognize publications in high impact journals.
- b. Publication or documented progress on publication of refereed scholarly books as either author or editor.
- c. Authored or co-authored chapters to a scholarly book.
- d. Impact of scholarly work, measured by number of citations received in the evaluation period reported in the ISI Web of Science.
- e. Invited presentations in research conferences and workshops.
- f. Invited seminars at other research institutions.
- g. Filing of patents.
- h. Disclosure of inventions.
- i. Contributed presentations in research conferences and workshops.

## **2.2 Research Grants and Contracts.**

- a. Active grants or contracts as P.I. or co-P.I./co-I will be recognized. This includes grants to support graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, undergraduate students, or other research support. The rating will depend on various factors considered by the Chair, including area of research, size, and impact of the grant.
- b. Submission of viable proposals as a P.I. or co-P.I./co-I.
- c. Participation in external grants and contracts as non-P.I. or non-co-P.I./co-I. This would also include awards of fellowships, grants, and consulting contracts outside of the university that enable research.
- d. Award of facility time in observatories, national laboratories, supercomputers, etc., or flight opportunities.
- e. Securing an external award or donation of equipment or other resources for the faculty member's research group.

## **2.3 Directing undergraduate students in research.**

- a. Papers published over the past 3-year period.

- b. Presentations by students at local or international conferences.
- c. Awards won by students, including fellowships or internships (e.g. at a national lab).
- d. Honors Undergraduate Thesis supervision.
- e. Honors Undergraduate Thesis successfully defended.

### **Overall Evaluation of Research:**

The overall evaluation of research activity depends on meeting the basic expectations for the assigned level T1-T2, and also on the scores/ratings assigned by the Chair for Sections 2.1-2.4. The evaluations are then determined as follows:

To receive a rating of **Satisfactory** a faculty member needs to meet all basic expectations in Section 1

To receive a rating of **Above Satisfactory** a faculty member needs to meet all basic expectations in Section 1, and from Sections 2.1-2.4 a score of Above Satisfactory (4) in one category.

To receive a rating of **Outstanding** a faculty member needs to meet all basic expectations in Section 1, and from Section 2.1-2.4 score at the level of Outstanding (5) in one category or a score of Above Satisfactory (4) in two categories.

## **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 scored in four categories based on the *quality* of service as follows:

- 1 - Unsatisfactory
- 2 - Needs Improvement
- 3 - Satisfactory
- 4 – Above satisfactory
- 5 – Outstanding

### **Section 1: Service to the departmental unit.**

The following are considered in evaluation of service to the physics department.

- a. Chairing a departmental committee.
- b. Serves and demonstrates activity on a departmental committee.
- c. Documented exceptional activity in departmental committees.
- d. Oversight of major departmental facilities.
- e. Securing donations of major facilities or equipment that is made broadly available.
- f. Coordinate multi-section/instructor course.
- g. Any other non-assigned duties such as recruitment or advising.
- h. Membership in (not chairing or co-chairing) thesis or dissertation committees.
- i. Attendance at commencement ceremonies.

- j. Attendance at faculty meetings.
- k. Other activities contributing to the department that are not research, instruction, or assigned administration.

### **Section 2: Service to the College or University**

This includes serving on college or university committees, leading or participating in special projects that benefit the college or the university and are external to the department, etc.

- a. Service on College and University Committees or the Faculty Senate.
- b. Chairing a College or University Committee or holding an office of the Faculty Senate.
- c. Involvement in interdisciplinary and interdepartmental activities. Examples include service on promotion committees, research cluster committees, search committees, thesis/dissertation committees, mentoring activities, etc.
- d. Representing the college or university at a public function.
- e. Other activities contributing mainly to the university or college as a whole, or to another department or entity in the university, that are not related to research, instruction, or assigned administration.

### **Section 3: Service to the profession**

This includes service to the broader professional community, and may include refereeing scholarship by others, organizing conferences or exhibits, serving on committees in professional organizations, etc.

- a. Editor or editorial board member of scholarly journals.
- b. Serving on review panels for funding agencies and user facilities.
- c. Reviewing proposals for funding agencies (not on a panel)
- d. Serving as an officer or committee member for professional organizations. possible.
- e. Organizing a conference, workshop, or summer school.
- f. Organizing a session at an international or local meeting.
- g. Chairing conference sessions.
- h. Refereeing scholarly journal articles, conference proceedings, or scholarly books. 2 points per article.
- i. Communicating or advocating for the profession or a professional organization, to the extent permitted by law and university policy.
- j. Other activities in support of the profession.

### **Section 4: Professional service to the community**

This includes outreach to K-12 and other groups in the community, apart from work on the Outreach Committee. Examples include

- a. Participating in departmental outreach events (e.g. STEM Day, Career Day, Knights Under the Stars).
- b. Giving media interviews, even if related to research or instruction.
- c. Giving public talks, podcasts, presentations at museums or elsewhere outside of the professional realm.
- d. Presenting or participating in profession-related activities at K-12 schools or state



- colleges, unless related to course coordination.
- e. Other activities related to the profession for the world at large outside the university and profession.

### **Overall Evaluation of Service:**

Scores will be given for each category defined above. The overall ranking will be determined as described below:

To receive a rating of **satisfactory** a faculty member needs to obtain a score of Satisfactory (3) in at least two of the categories above, or a score of Above Satisfactory (4) in one of the categories above.

To receive a rating of **above satisfactory** a faculty member needs to obtain a score of Above Satisfactory (4) in at least two of the categories above, or a score of Outstanding (5) in one of the categories above.

To receive a rating of **outstanding** a faculty member needs to score at the level of Outstanding (5) in at least two of the categories above, or a score of Outstanding (5) in one of the categories above and a score of Above Satisfactory (4) in one of the categories above.

## **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.

## OVERALL EVALUATION

The overall evaluation of each faculty member will be based on the weighted average of the four categories. Weighting will be determined by the FTE assigned for each category for the regular academic year.

### EXAMPLES

#### Teaching

Unsatisfactory: Does not meet multiple basic expectations for a Satisfactory evaluation. As an example, the faculty member has not taught appropriate material, failed to hold regularly-scheduled office hours, and did not provide an end-of-term course pack.

Conditional: Meets most but not all basic expectations for a Satisfactory evaluation. As an example, the faculty member repeatedly missed regularly-scheduled office hours and did not provided timely responses to student inquiries.

Satisfactory: Satisfies all of the basic expectations for a Satisfactory evaluation.

Above Satisfactory: Highly effective classroom teaching as demonstrated by student learning gains, use of research-based instructional techniques, and student success. The lecturer provided evidence of effectiveness and/or student learning.

Above Satisfactory: Effective teaching as demonstrated by student learning gains, use of research-based instructional techniques, and student success. Supervised one student in research and published one paper with students in the past three years.

Outstanding: Outstanding teaching as demonstrated by student learning gains, use of research-based instructional techniques, and student success. Supervised one student in research and published one paper with students in the past three years.

Outstanding: Outstanding teaching as demonstrated by student learning gains, use of research-based instructional techniques, and student success. Supervised several students in research.

Outstanding: Highly effective teaching as demonstrated by student learning gains, use of research-based instructional techniques, and student success. Supervised one student in research who presented at a conference and published one paper with students in the past three years.

Outstanding: Highly effective teaching as demonstrated by student learning gains, use of research-based instructional techniques, and student success. Led a major program or course revision, or developed and taught a new course.

#### Research

Unsatisfactory: The faculty member has T1 or T2 expectations but demonstrates no measurable

research activity.

Conditional: The faculty member failed to satisfy the T1 or T2 basic expectations.

Satisfactory: Met the basic expectations for T1 or T2, depending on assignment.

Above Satisfactory: Published two papers in the past 3 years.

Above Satisfactory: Published one paper in the past 3 years, obtained an average level of citations based on departmental and discipline standards, and presented one contributed talk.

Outstanding: Published one paper in the past 3 years, obtained an average level of citations based on departmental and discipline standards, submitted at least one proposal during the reporting period, and presented one contributed talk.

### **Service (Examples based on 0.1FTE)**

Unsatisfactory: The faculty member is inactive in most committee assignments. Does not attend most committee meetings.

Conditional: The faculty member is active on some committees but does not demonstrate activity across all committee assignments.

Satisfactory: Served on 2 departmental committees, was active as a referee for journals, participated in departmental outreach activities.

Satisfactory: Served on 2 departmental committees, attended commencement ceremony one time. Served on a thesis or dissertation committee.

Above Satisfactory: Served on 4 departmental committees with active participation. Volunteered at Physics Career Day.

Above Satisfactory: Chairs a departmental committee and served on two other departmental committees with active participation. Coordinated a multi-section course.

Above Satisfactory: Chairs a departmental committee, serves on 2 additional departmental committees, and participates in departmental outreach activities.

Above Satisfactory: Serves on 3 or more departmental committees, participates in a review panel for a funding agency, participates in departmental outreach activities.

Above Satisfactory: Chairs a departmental committee, serves on 2 additional departmental committees, participates in a review panel for a funding agency.

Outstanding: Active participation in departmental committees (2 or more) with exceptional activities,

served on one College committee, organized a conference.

Outstanding: Served as chair of a departmental committee, active participation in other departmental committees, served on a College committee, active as a journal referee.

Outstanding: Served as chair of a departmental committee, active participation in other departmental committees, served on a College committee, service to department in organizing/directing GTA assignments/activity.

Outstanding: Served as chair of a departmental committee, served on 2 additional departmental committees, participated in departmental outreach activities, and is active as a journal referee.

Outstanding: Served on 3 or more departmental committees, participated in departmental outreach activities, participates in a review panel for a funding agency, and is active as a journal referee.