

Department of Physics

ANNUAL EVALUATION STANDARDS & PROCEDURES

For Research Faculty

Basic Assumptions

Research faculty are expected to have most, if not all, of their annual assignment in research and will be evaluated accordingly. Potentially, some research faculty will also have a small service assignment. Performance should be consistent with annual assignments given by the chair of the Department. Review of performance will emphasize quality rather than quantity.

This document has three parts: The first part presents guiding principles for the annual evaluation of research faculty in the Department. The following two parts delineate the basis for determining the overall evaluation in Research and Service. Each evaluation area describes the basic requirements to obtain a Satisfactory evaluation. For each area, possible reviews are Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Conditional, and Unsatisfactory.

Research faculty are assumed to spend most of their assignment in research activities, including obtaining external funding and disseminating research results. Research faculty will engage in collaborative research that might include mentoring of students or postdoctoral associates.

Research faculty may also engage in service activities. This will include service to profession and also service to the department, college, university, or broader community.

The Department follows the rules set by the BOT/UFF collective bargaining agreements, and the guidelines set by the College of Sciences.

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.

RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE WORK ACTIVITIES

Measures of scholarly activity will account both for quantity and quality. The measures for research professors with different FTE devoted to research will have expectations that scale with the assigned FTE. Example calculations will follow the next section.

Section 1: Basic Expectations

1. Publication of at least two peer-reviewed papers and/or peer-reviewed conference proceedings within the past 3 years.
2. Funding commensurate with research needs.

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. Scores 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 research 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, 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 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 for salary support for the research faculty, and possibly support for 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 graduate students and postdocs in research.

- a. Papers published over the past 3-year period, with a student and/or a postdoc coauthor, with additional emphasis for a student/postdoc listed as the first author.
- b. Presentations by students and/or postdocs at local or international conferences.
- c. Awards won by students and/or postdocs.
- d. Student(s) passed dissertation proposal(s) during evaluation period.
- e. Student(s) successfully defended dissertation or thesis (faculty member Chair or co-Chair) during evaluation period.
- f. Students and/or postdocs awarded fellowships or external internships (e.g. at a national lab).

2.4 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 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 research faculty member needs to meet all basic expectations in Section 1.

To receive a rating of **Above Satisfactory** a research 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 at least two of the categories, or a score at the level of Outstanding (5) in one category and a score/ranking at the level of Satisfactory (3) in at least one category.

To receive a rating of **Outstanding** a research 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 at least one of the categories and at the level of at least Above Satisfactory (4) in one other category.

SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Research faculty who are fully supported through external funding are not assigned any FTE for institutional service. In this case, institutional service will not be evaluated.

In the instance that external research funding has a component of the grant that includes an outreach or service, it is expected that research faculty will have a service assignment to carry out those duties. Typically, those might include service to the profession (e.g., participation in review panels, review of manuscripts and proposals, and organizing or chairing a meeting or workshop), or service and outreach to the local community.

In the case when the research faculty member is partially supported by internal funding and has received institutional service assignment, service activities 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 of 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, 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

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

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

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

Research

Unsatisfactory: The faculty member does not satisfy a majority of the Section 1 expectations.

Conditional: The faculty member satisfies a majority, but not all of the Section 1 expectations.

Satisfactory: The faculty member meets the basic expectations as described in Section 1.

Above Satisfactory: Published 6 papers in the past 3 years. Directed two graduate students and/or postdocs in research. Actively applied for external funding.

Above Satisfactory: Published 4 papers in the past 3 years. Directed and/or supported 1 graduate students and/or postdocs in research.

Above Satisfactory: Published 2 papers in the past 3 years. Directed and/or supported 2 graduate students and/or postdocs in research. Two invited or contributed talks as author or coauthor to national/international conferences.

Outstanding: Published 6 papers in past 3 years with high impact, supported 1 student or postdocs from external research grants, submitted several proposals during the reporting period, awarded facility time.

Outstanding: Published 6 papers in past 3 years with high impact, supported 2 students or postdocs from external research grants, awarded facility time.

Service

Unsatisfactory: The faculty member does not have any reported professional service and is inactive in committee assignment(s).

Conditional: The faculty member demonstrates little evidence of professional service activities and is somewhat active in committee assignment(s).

Satisfactory: Without any departmental/college/university assignment, the faculty member demonstrates activity as a referee for journals or a reviewer for grant agencies.

Satisfactory: Serves actively on one departmental committee.

Satisfactory: Participates in departmental outreach activities.

Above Satisfactory: Serves actively on one departmental committee. Shows activity as a referee for journals or reviewer for grant agencies.

Above Satisfactory: Serves actively on two or more departmental/college/university committees.

Above Satisfactory: Chairs a departmental/college/university committee.

Above Satisfactory: Active reviewer for multiple journals and/or funding agencies.

Outstanding: Serves actively on one departmental/college/university committee. Shows activity as a referee for journals or reviewer for grant agencies. Participates in departmental outreach activities.

Outstanding: Chairs one departmental/college/university committee. Shows activity as a referee for journals or reviewer for grant agencies. Organized a session at an international or local meeting.

Outstanding: The faculty member showed activity as a referee for journals and organized a session at an international or local meeting. Participated in departmental outreach activities.

Outstanding: Active reviewer for journals and/or funding agencies, Organizer or Chair for a conference.

Outstanding: Serves on multiple proposal review panels, participant or lead in national-level professional society or committee.