

# Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP)

Department of Population Health Sciences  
UCF College of Medicine

---

## Introduction

The annual review process is designed to be fair, consistent, and useful in providing guidance to faculty, as well as an equitable opportunity to achieve successful academic promotion, earn merit increases, and develop exceptional faculty who will play essential roles in the advancement of the University of Central Florida and College of Medicine missions. The Department recognizes the importance of teaching, research, and service, while honoring diverse patterns of activity and productivity. To allow for diversity of achievement, discretion is allowed during the annual review process for the Chair and the individual faculty member to discuss adjustment of effort percentages for teaching, research, service, and possibly other duties as assigned. (No departmental faculty currently have clinical roles. We will revise this document if future faculty include clinical responsibilities).

## Steps of the Annual Review Process

1. The *Assignment of Duties*, in which percent effort is allocated to teaching, research, and service for each faculty member, is decided by the Chair, after discussion with the faculty member, with consideration to the needs of the unit and career trajectory of the faculty member.
2. At the end of the reporting period, the faculty member submits three documents – a) Annual Report, b) Annual Evaluation, and c) Goals for Next Year. The *Annual Report* describes performance and accomplishments during the reporting period. The report should contain specific details on teaching, research, and service activities completed during the reporting period. The *Annual Evaluation* includes a self-evaluation of overall accomplishments and progress toward goals in the prior year. A narrative summary should be included that describes the impact of accomplishments in teaching, research, and service and explains any challenges that affected the faculty member's performance. The Goals document briefly describes concrete goals for the next academic year related to teaching, research and service, as well as strategies for meeting missed goals from the prior year.
3. The Chair reviews and signs the *Annual Evaluation* for each faculty member, providing performance evaluations and written feedback as appropriate.
4. The *Evaluation* is returned to the faculty member, who is given the opportunity to discuss the report with the Chair and plan a strategy to improve performance as needed or address challenges. Plans for the *Assignment of Duties* in the coming year are also reviewed.
5. The *Evaluation* is signed by the Dean of COM and filed with the appropriate administrative departments in COM. A signed copy is returned to the faculty member.

## **Chair Review and Final Ratings**

Expectations for accomplishments and corresponding Chair ratings for all faculty will be evaluated based on 1) rank and 2) assignment of duties. Expectations for faculty at the level of professor and (tenured) associate professor will be higher than those of their more junior colleagues at the (tenure-track) assistant professor level due to differences in experience, opportunity, and time in the field. Expectations within the teaching domain will be higher for those faculty with a higher teaching annual assignment (e.g., 50%) than for faculty with a lower teaching assignment (e.g., 5%). Similarly, expectations for faculty with high service or high research assignments will differ from those with lower service or research assignments.

## **Rating Scale for Evaluation**

Faculty will be evaluated separately as Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Conditional, or Unsatisfactory for each area (research, teaching, service). These will be weighed based on the annual percentage effort assigned to each role (research, teaching, and service) and summed to achieve an overall score for all missions.

## **Research and Other Scholarly Activities**

The department expects all tenured and tenure-earning faculty to demonstrate a sustained record of scholarly achievement. The evaluation of research excellence involves the examination of several standards. Documentation of scholarly productivity will be provided on the Faculty Annual Report in the form of a list of publications, presentations, grant proposals submitted, and grants/contracts awarded during the reporting period. Faculty are also encouraged to provide other documents that will allow assessment of quality and quantity of research activities. These might include non-grant research awards, fellowship in societies, or published reviews of books.

Expectations for research accomplishments will differ based on rank and annual research assignment. Scholarly activities will include publication in various formats, dissemination of research at conferences, and securing grant funding. Faculty in Population Health Sciences engage in research in a variety of disciplines, using diverse methods, and on varied topics. Some of these topics and disciplines are more likely to obtain large external grants, thus, obtaining grant funding and/or the amount of grant funding must be evaluated within the context of funds available in the field. Likewise, the production of a single publication can be the effort of a few months or the culmination of years of data collection and analysis. For example, team science and community-engaged research requires additional time in the development, planning, execution, and dissemination of research. Thus, evaluation of research will take a wholistic view of number, quality, impact, and methodological effort.

Evaluation of publication excellence will be based on multiple indicators including:

- Number of peer-reviewed publications;
- Impact factor / ranking of journals within field; publications in journals without an impact factor will be evaluated based on the reason for no impact factor (e.g., journal is too new vs. low quality);
- First and Last authored articles will be evaluated more highly than co-authored articles;
- Publication of original research (both empirical and theoretical) will be evaluated more highly than book chapters, scoping reviews, and commentaries;
- Authored books will be evaluated more highly than edited volumes;
- Refereed books and book chapters in academic presses will be evaluated more highly than publications in trade presses, which will be evaluated more highly than self-published work.

Evaluation of conference excellence will be based on multiple indicators including:

- Number of invited presentations, oral conference presentations, and poster conference presentations;
- Invited (keynote) talks at international or national conferences will be evaluated more highly than invited talks at universities (brown bag talks) or local or regional conferences;
- Oral presentations at international or national conferences will be evaluated more highly than those at local or regional conferences;
- Oral presentations will be evaluated more highly than poster presentations;
- Inclusion of students in research dissemination will be considered as evidence of Teaching/Mentoring quality, not as part of research.

Grant activity excellence will be based on multiple indicators including:

- Number of grants submitted;
- Amount of grant funding (new and ongoing);
- Amount of salary support covered by grants;
- Grants submitted as PI or MPI will be evaluated as equal, and more highly than grants as co-I;
- Funded grant applications will be evaluated more highly than applications under review or unfunded;
- External grants with full indirect cost rate will be evaluated more highly than external grants with limited indirect costs; which will be evaluated more highly than competitive internal grants.

## **Teaching and Mentoring**

Given the research-intensive nature of the department and unique curricular design of MD education, teaching activities will not be restricted to traditional semester-long didactic pedagogy. Rather, depending on teaching efforts assigned, teaching may instead be focused on mentoring learners involved in research, evaluating student research, serving on dissertation/thesis committees, and providing lectures or facilitating discussion within courses/modules led by other faculty. Teaching and curricular development activities will also be included. Teaching can include learners at all levels, including junior faculty, post-doctoral fellows, PhD students, MD students, MPH and other master's students, bachelor's students, and high school students.

Evidence of teaching excellence will be based on multiple indicators, depending on the nature of teaching activities:

- Formal and informal student evaluations
- Formal and informal peer evaluations
- Development of new courses, digital learning platforms, classroom strategies, and active learning methodologies that enhance student engagement and learning outcomes
- Teaching awards
- Additional evidence provided

Evidence of research mentoring success will be based on multiple indicators:

- Number of students mentored at various levels; priority to UCF-affiliated learners;
- Student authorship and student co-authorship on papers;
- Student authorship and student co-authorship on conference presentations;
- Indicators of student research quality (e.g., honors designation, selection for oral presentation, student abstract or presentation awards, etc.);
- Evidence of student success: student receipt of competitive grants, student success in subsequent career (e.g., obtaining tenure-track faculty position; post-doc position;

doctoral/MD admission; etc.);

- Development and implementation of structured mentoring initiatives, workshops, and peer-mentoring networks that promote professional growth.

### **Service:**

All faculty are expected to provide service to the Department, the College, the University (as assigned or invited by Chair, Dean, or University leadership), their discipline or field of specialization, and the larger community (e.g., local, statewide, nationally, or internationally). Service will be evaluated based on many factors, including evaluating service at the University level more highly than College-level service, which will be evaluated more highly than Departmental service. Community service will be evaluated based on both time devoted and impact on the community served. Leadership within a service role (rather than serving as a member) will be evaluated more highly. Service to the field will be evaluated similarly (e.g., federal/national service, leadership, etc.). Service will also be evaluated based on time commitment, quality of service, and impact for the department/college/university/field. As noted earlier, expectations will differ based on faculty rank and annual service assignment.

Evidence of excellence in departmental service may include chairing or serving on a faculty search committee or other time intensive committee. Other departmental services (e.g., CPE and/or P&T committee, etc.) that are critical, but less time intensive, will be considered less highly.

Evidence of excellence in college service may include serving on faculty council, search committee for college leadership, or other time intensive committee (e.g., ABC committee). Other college services that are critical, but less time intensive (e.g., College P&T), will be considered less highly.

Evidence of excellence in university service may include serving on faculty senate, on the IRB, and other university-wide, time-intensive committees or initiatives that have university-wide benefits. Other university-level committees that are less time intensive (e.g., University travel awards, grant pitch circles from OR, etc.), will be considered less highly.

Evidence of excellence in service to the field may include:

- Chairing or serving on grant review study section, where Chairing or serving as standing member of a federal study section will be evaluated more highly than “ad hoc” membership; federal will be evaluated more highly than foundation grant review; and internal grant review will be evaluated less.
- Serving as Editor, Editorial Board member for journal, with higher impact journals being evaluated more highly.
- Service to a professional scholarly organization (e.g., elected office, organizing or coordinating conference, etc.).
- Number of peer reviews conducted of manuscripts, with higher impact journals being evaluated more highly;
- Development or service to programs that support the development of future scholars within the field.

Evidence of service to the community may include:

- Providing media interviews, presentations, or other public-facing activities to share scholarly-informed expertise with the non-academic community

- Engagement in services to advise the community such as participation in boards of directors, policy committees, or community-advisory boards
- Participation in community-based projects or community-lead research to assist furtherance of community-based health goals