

Department of Physics

ANNUAL EVALUATION STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURED AND TENURE-EARNING FACULTY

Basic Assumptions

As a Ph.D. granting department, faculty holding Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor ranks are expected to have a significant assignment in research and will be evaluated accordingly. Performance should be consistent with annual assignments given by the chair of the Department. A faculty member with a higher teaching (research) assignment will be expected to produce more in teaching (research) compared to a faculty member having a lesser teaching (research) assignment. Review of performance will emphasize quality rather than quantity.

This document has four parts: The first part presents guiding principles for the annual evaluation of tenured and tenure-earning faculty in the Department. For each area, the possible reviews are Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Conditional, and Unsatisfactory. The following three parts delineate the basis for determining the overall evaluation in Instructional Activities (Teaching), Research, and Service. Each evaluation area also describes the basic requirements to obtain a Satisfactory evaluation.

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.

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

All assigned courses, including summer and overload courses, are subject to evaluation. One primary goal in teaching should be to foster student learning in the classroom and/or independent study. For tenure-earning faculty, instructional activities also include supervision of directed research, dissertation, thesis, and independent study. Faculty members should provide a variety of evidence demonstrating their effectiveness in promoting student learning.

For faculty members without a classroom teaching assignment, only items 9-12 in Section 2.2 and possibly other items that will be discussed and agreed upon with the Chair while assigning instructional duties will be considered. Evaluation of these cases are described below.

Section 1: Basic Expectations

The following are **basic expectations** 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 could receive a weight 3. Supervision of 1 graduate student in research (item 10) could receive a weight 1, whereas supervision of 3 graduate students in research could receive a weight 3.

The overall teaching evaluation depends on scores and weights for the areas below, 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.

1. All courses had clear, comprehensive, rigorous, and measurable learning objectives.
2. The course content was aligned with the stated learning objectives and the curricula of the course.
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 were well organized.
6. The instructor provided timely (usually within 1-2 weeks of an assignment submission) and constructive feedback that supported student learning.
7. The data provided in the course pack (e.g., grades, grade distributions, pre- and post-tests, standardized assessments) shows student progress towards achieving 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 the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning (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 of advising efforts may include student authorship of research articles or presentations, awards, student self-reflection of learning outcomes, software, hardware, honors undergraduate theses, and research reports. Journal articles will only be counted in "research". Weights will range from 1-6 depending on the level of activity.
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.
11. The instructor actively and successfully participates in the graduate program by chairing and serving on Master's and PhD committees. Chairing or serving on Honors in the Major committees will also receive credit. Weights will range from 1-3 depending on the level of activity.

The final item is only evaluated by the Chair if appropriate to the assigned duties:

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, coordination of multi-section/instructor courses, etc.). Weights will range from 1-3 depending on the level of activity.

Overall Evaluation of Teaching (with assigned classroom duties):

To receive a rating of **satisfactory** a faculty member needs to meet all basic expectations in Section 1 and from Section 2.1 achieve an average score of satisfactory or above (3+) on items 1-8. 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 criteria in Section 2. If a faculty member has a score of 3 on items 1-8, a score of 4 on item 9 with a weight 2, and a score of 4 on item 10 with a weight of 2, and a score of 4 on item 11 with a weight 1, the overall

score will be $(3*8+4*2+4*3+4)/11=4.36$, 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 Section 2.

Overall Evaluation of Teaching (without assigned classroom duties):

To receive a rating of **satisfactory** a faculty member needs to achieve a weighted average of at least 3 on Items 9-12 from Section 2.2, as applicable, as well as expectations agreed to by the faculty and department chair in the case of significant other teaching-related assignments.

To receive a rating of **above satisfactory** a faculty member needs achieve a weighted average of at least 4 on Items 9-12 from Section 2.2, as applicable, as well as expectations agreed to by the faculty and department chair in the case of faculty members who have significant other teaching-related assignments.

To receive a rating of **outstanding** a faculty member needs to achieve a weighted average of at least 4.5 on Items 9-12 from Section 2.2, as applicable, as well as expectations agreed to by the faculty and department chair in the case of faculty members who have significant other teaching-related assignments.

RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE WORK ACTIVITIES

Measures of scholarly activity will account for both quantity and quality. Research productivity will be evaluated over the previous 3-year time period, excluding periods of approved leave (e.g., parental leave, FMLA leave). The specific metrics below are established for a research FTE of 0.6, which is a standard assignment for research-active faculty members. The measures for faculty members with different FTE devoted to research will have expectations that scale with the assigned FTE. Example calculations will follow the next section.

Faculty will be assigned a category at the beginning of the academic year to reflect their expected research activity. Categories are R1, R2, R3, and R4, from most research active (R1) to least active (R4). Evaluations will be based on the research category and the corresponding FTE's. The general guidelines for Research FTE assignments of all the categories are defined in the Work Equity Guidelines.

Section 1: Basic Expectations (Assistant Professors)

1. After three years of employment, publication of at least two peer-reviewed papers and/or peer-reviewed conference proceedings.
2. After the first year of employment, supervision of at least one graduate student or postdoc in research during the evaluation period.
3. Has external funding or is actively working to obtain external funding during the current evaluation period commensurate with research needs, including funding for

graduate students, undergraduates, and/or postdocs.

Section 1: Basic Expectations (Associate and Full Professors)

R1:

1. Publication of at least two peer-reviewed papers and/or peer-reviewed conference proceedings.
2. Supervision of at least one graduate student or postdoc in research.
3. Funding commensurate with research needs, including funding for graduate students, undergraduates, and/or postdocs.

R2:

1. Publication of at least two peer-reviewed papers and/or peer-reviewed conference proceedings
2. Supervision and funding of at least one graduate student or postdoc in research.
3. Funding commensurate with research needs, including funding for graduate students, undergraduates, and/or postdocs, or submission of a proposal within the current evaluation period.

R3:

1. Publication of at least two peer-reviewed papers and/or peer-reviewed conference proceedings .
2. Supervision of at least one graduate/undergraduate/postdoc in research .
3. Funding commensurate with research needs, including funding for graduate students, undergraduates, and/or postdocs, or submission of a proposal within the current evaluation period.

R4:

1. Publication of at least one peer-reviewed paper and/or peer-reviewed conference proceeding.

Section 2: Evaluation Criteria

For each of the sections below, evidence should be presented for quality, quantity, 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:

- 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 faculty member to show evidence of contributions in each of the enumerated items below. Rather, the Chair will consider the overall quality, quantity, 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 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 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 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, flight opportunities, etc.
- 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 for the assigned level R1-R4, 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 for their designated category R1-R4.

To receive a rating of **Above Satisfactory** a faculty member needs to meet all basic expectations in Section 1 according to their assigned category R1-R4, 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 two categories.

To receive a rating of **Outstanding** a faculty member needs to meet all basic expectations in Section 1 according to their assigned category R1-R4, 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

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. Faculty mentoring
- l. 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 or vice-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, faculty 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 members 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.
- 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.
- 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 Section 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 Sections 1-4 above, or a score of Above Satisfactory (4) or higher in one of the Sections 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 Sections 1-4 above, or a score of Outstanding (5) in one of the Sections 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 Sections 1-4 above, or a score of Outstanding (5) in one of the Sections above and a score of Above Satisfactory (4) in one of the Sections 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 (assignment includes classroom duties)

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: Above average classroom teaching as demonstrated by evidence in the course pack and SPI reports (relevant for items 1-8 in Section 2.1), documented efforts to improve instruction, supervised at least 2 students in research who have made significant and documented progress, and participated in dissertation/thesis committees either as Chair or participating member.

Above Satisfactory: Average classroom teaching as demonstrated by evidence in the course pack and SPI reports (relevant for items 1-8 in Section 2.1), documented efforts to improve instruction, supervises at least 2 students in research who have made significant and documented progress, and participated in dissertation/thesis committees either as Chair or participating member. Published at least 3 papers in the past 3 years with student coauthors.

Outstanding: Above average classroom teaching as demonstrated by evidence in the course pack and SPI reports (relevant for items 1-8 in Section 2.1), documented efforts to improve instruction, supervised at least 2 students in research who have made significant and documented progress, and participated in dissertation/thesis committees either as Chair or participating member. Developed and/or implemented a new course, or new curriculum (e.g. course redesign, new lab activities) within an existing course

Outstanding: Above average classroom teaching as demonstrated by evidence in the course pack and SPI reports (relevant for items 1-8 in Section 2.1), documented efforts to improve instruction, supervises at least 3 students in research who have made significant and documented progress, and participated in dissertation/thesis committees either as Chair or participating member.

Outstanding: Average classroom teaching as demonstrated by evidence in the course pack and SPI reports (relevant for items 1-8 in Section 2.1), documented efforts to improve instruction, supervised at least 3 students in research who have made significant and documented progress, and participated in dissertation/thesis committees either as Chair or participating member.

Published at least 3 papers in the past 3 years with student coauthors. Students presented papers in national/international meetings with faculty supervision.

Teaching (no classroom duties)

In this assignment type, items 1-8 are not considered. Evaluations are based on items in Section 2.2 where relevant.

Unsatisfactory: The faculty member does not supervise a student in research activities.

Conditional: The faculty member supervised 1 undergraduate student in research.

Satisfactory: Supervised two graduate students in research and has published two papers with students as coauthors in the past three years.

Satisfactory: Supervised one graduate student. Supervised two undergraduate students in directed research courses. One publication within the past three years with a student co-author. One student presentation at a conference in the current year.

Above Satisfactory: Supervised three graduate students in research and published five papers with student co-authors in the past three years. One supervised graduate student graduated within the last five years.

Above Satisfactory: Supervised two graduate students, one of whom passed the dissertation proposal. One supervised graduate student graduated within the last five years. Supervision of two undergraduate students in directed research courses. Three publications with student co-authors in the past three years.

Outstanding: Supervised three graduate and four undergraduate students, graduate students published 5 papers in the past three years out of which 3 as first authors, graduate students presented their work in multiple conferences

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. This depends on whether the faculty member is at the assistant professor level, and also the assigned level R1-R4.

The following requirements for Above Satisfactory and Outstanding are described for each level separately, R1-R4.

R1:

Above Satisfactory: Published 6 papers in the past 3 years and supported one graduate student or postdoc from an external research grant.

Above Satisfactory: Published 4 papers in the past 3 years and supported one postdoc and one graduate student from external research grants.

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

R2:

Above Satisfactory: Published 3 papers in the past 3 years, got an average level of citations based on departmental and discipline standards, and presented 1 contributed talk in the past year.

Outstanding: Published 4 papers in the past 3 years, obtained an above average level of citations based on departmental and discipline standards, submitted several proposals during the reporting period, awarded facility time.

R3:

Above Satisfactory: Published 2 papers in the past 3 years, got an average level of citations based on departmental and discipline standards.

Outstanding: Published 3 papers in the past 3 years, got an above average level of citations based on departmental and discipline standards, submitted several proposals during the reporting period, awarded facility time.

R4:

Above Satisfactory: Published 2 papers in the past 3 years, and got an average level of citations based on departmental and discipline standards.

Above Satisfactory: Publish 2 papers in the past 3 years, got an average level of citations based on departmental and discipline standards, and present 2 contributed talks.

Outstanding: Published 2 papers in the past 3 years, got an above average level of citations based on departmental and discipline standards, submitted proposals during the reporting period, and presented 2 contributed talks.

Service

Unsatisfactory: The faculty member is inactive in most committee assignments.

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

Satisfactory: Served on 3 departmental committees. Participated in departmental outreach activities. Was active as a referee for journals.

Satisfactory: Served on 3 departmental committees with active participation. Attended commencement ceremony one time. Served on a dissertation committee not as chair. Reviewed proposals for a funding agency (not on a panel).

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

Satisfactory: Served on 3 departmental committees. Was active as a referee for journals. Chaired a conference session.

Above Satisfactory: Chaired a departmental committee and served on two other departmental committees with active participation. Coordinated a multi-section course. Attended all faculty meetings.

Above Satisfactory: Served on 2 departmental committees with active participation. Active as a journal referee. Served on a review panel for a funding agency.

Above Satisfactory: Chaired a departmental committee and served on 2 additional departmental committees with active participation. Served on a University committee and a research cluster committee.

Outstanding: Active participation in departmental committees (2 or more) with exceptional activities. Organized a conference.

Outstanding: Chaired a departmental committee and served on 2 additional committees with active participation. Served as editor of a scholarly journal. Served on a review panel for a funding agency.