

Department of Statistics and Data Science

ANNUAL EVALUATION STANDARDS & PROCEDURES

Guiding Principles

The purpose of annual evaluations is to facilitate and assess faculty success in instructional activities; research, scholarship, and creative activities; service activities; other assigned activities; and overall performance. Institutional excellence is dependent upon the individual performance of each faculty member as well as the collective performance of the faculty. The success and reputation of the University of Central Florida are highly dependent upon the talents that exist among the faculty and how effectively those talents are harnessed and blended to achieve the university's mission.

The work of faculty is not easily described or measured, and the AESPs exist to protect academic freedom and improve accuracy, fairness, and equity in the evaluation of faculty. There will always be an element of subjectivity in the determination of annual evaluation ratings. Evaluators are expected to operate with trust and respect. When assigned by administrative supervisors (usually department chairs or school directors), annual evaluation ratings shall be evidence-based and informed by faculty activity reporting and other forms of documented evidence. Evidence shall be evaluated for *quality* and *impact* toward the achievement of the university's mission.

The basis of the annual performance evaluation will be information obtained through the Faculty Annual Report, student evaluation forms, annual assignment forms, student success data, and other information available to the supervisor and/or provided by the faculty member. 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.

The sections that follow present a suggested approach for crafting an AESP that addresses evidence, criteria, and evaluation rating standards for instructional activities; research, scholarship, and creative activities; service activities; and other assigned activities. The performance ratings in each area of assigned activities are combined to arrive at an overall evaluation rating.

The possible performance ratings in each area of assigned activities and overall are:

- Outstanding – indicates that the faculty member significantly exceeded the success level expected by their supervisor.
- Above Satisfactory – indicates that the faculty member exceeded the success level expected by their supervisor.
- Satisfactory – indicates that the faculty member achieved a success level consistent with the supervisor's expectations.
- Conditional – indicates that the faculty member was deficient in achieving a success level consistent with the supervisor's expectations.
- Unsatisfactory – indicates that the faculty member was deficient in achieving success for the second year in a row or the faculty member was exceptionally deficient in their performance.

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. To help with this evaluation, the faculty member can provide a variety of evidence demonstrating their effectiveness in promoting student learning. Below is a list of some specific types of evidence that could be useful. Faculty are not required to submit all of these materials, and they may submit other materials that would be useful in the supervisor's evaluation. The materials should be carefully curated to focus only on aspects that the faculty member believes are relevant. The supervisor may also require a faculty member to submit specific materials. (Units may choose to set a limit on the amount of material that can be submitted.)

1. **Syllabi.**
2. **Course Materials:** Examples of textbooks, readings, and other resources used.
3. **Evidence of varied and appropriate teaching methods:** lecture notes, multimedia presentations, technology integration, active learning activities.
4. **Grade Distributions:** Data on grade distributions, highlighting improvements or trends over time.
5. **Pre- and Post-Test Results:** Evidence of learning gains through comparative analysis of pre-course and post-course assessments.
6. **Student Evaluations:** Summary of student evaluation scores and comments, with emphasis on teaching effectiveness and learning experience.
7. **Engagement Metrics:** Data on student participation in class activities, such as attendance records, discussion board activity, or engagement in group work.
8. **Professional Development Activities:** List of workshops, seminars, or courses attended focused on teaching and learning with certificates of completion or evidence of participation. Documentation of changes made to teaching practices based on student feedback, self-reflection or professional development, such as revised syllabi, new teaching methods, or updated course materials.
9. **Self-reflection statement that explains the impact of the teaching activities.**

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Section 1: 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. (For example, a faculty member is unable to log into Webcourses due to a technical issue that is expected to take three days to fix. They should inform the supervisor of the situation right away.)

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.
2. Maintains a regular online presence, being present online at least once every day (email and within the learning management system) when teaching online courses.

3. Holds all scheduled office hours in the appropriate modality and location and provides opportunities for student appointments outside of office hours pursuant to unit, college, and university policy.
4. Replies to student inquiries within 2 business days (except when students have been notified through class announcements).
5. Submits book orders and syllabi on time as required by university and unit policy.
6. Complies with state, university, and unit policies and deadlines pertaining to teaching, including syllabus policies and final grade submission deadlines.
7. Maintains accurate and up-to-date grades on Webcourses which reflect the grade the student is receiving in the class and makes those grades visible and available to students.
8. Holds final examinations in compliance with university regulations and policies.
9. Appropriately supervises and evaluates any TAs and other assistants (graduate or undergraduate) assigned to help with instruction.
10. Upholds a high level of professionalism when communicating with students in and out of the classroom.

Section 2: At the Chair's discretion, each of the evaluation criteria in the next section will be rated as follows: 1 – Unsatisfactory, 2 – Satisfactory, 3 – Above satisfactory, 4 – Outstanding, N/A -if a question is not applicable (questions rated N/A will not be considered when computing overall evaluation of teaching).

Classroom teaching (all courses taught during the evaluation period will be assessed including summer and overload courses)

1. All courses had clear and measurable learning objectives, as reflected on the syllabus.
2. The course content was aligned with the stated learning objectives, as reflected on the syllabus.
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, pre- and post-tests, standardized assessments), students demonstrated progress towards reaching the learning objectives of the class.
8. Student evaluations indicated satisfaction with the instructor's teaching and the learning experience.

Other contributions to teaching and student mentoring.

9. The faculty 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. Successfully remedied areas of concern specifically pointed out in the previous year's evaluation.

10. The faculty actively participates in the graduate program by chairing and serving on Master and PhD committees.
11. The faculty actively and successfully contributes to undergraduate student supervision and mentoring.
12. Other Contributions (This category may include designing new classes, developing a new program that contributes to student success, etc.)

Overall Evaluation of Teaching:

T/TE:

To receive a rating of **satisfactory** a faculty member needs to meet all basic expectations in Section 1 and achieve a score of satisfactory or above on each of items 1-8 in Section 2, and items 9-12 if applicable.

To receive a rating of **above satisfactory** a faculty member needs to meet the criteria for satisfactory and achieve an average of at least 2.5 on the criteria in Sections 2. Items 1-8 have equal weight. At chair's discretion, bonus points from 0 to 0.4 (total) in items 9-11 and bonus points from 0 to 1 in item 12 can be added to the average of questions 1-8.

To receive a rating of **outstanding**, a faculty member needs to meet the criteria for above satisfactory and achieve average of at least 3.0 on the criteria in Sections 2.

Items 1-8 have equal weight. At chair's discretion, bonus points from 0 to 0.4 (total) in items 9-11 and bonus points from 0 to 1 in item 12 can be added to the average of questions 1-8.

Instructor/Lecturer:

To receive a rating of **satisfactory** a faculty member needs to meet all basic expectations in Section 1 and achieve a score of satisfactory or above on each of items 1-8 in Section 2, and items 9-12 if applicable.

To receive a rating of **above satisfactory** a faculty member needs to meet the criteria for satisfactory and achieve an average of at least 2.5 on the criteria in Section 2. Items 1-8 have equal weight. At chair's discretion, bonus points from 0 to 0.5 (total) in items 9-11 and bonus points from 0 to 1 in item 12 can be added to the average of questions 1-8.

To receive a rating of **outstanding**, a faculty member needs to meet the criteria for satisfactory and achieve an average of at least 3.0 on the criteria in Section 2. Items 1-8 have equal weight. At chair's discretion, bonus points from 0 to 0.5 (total) in items 9-11 and bonus points from 0 to 1 in item 12 can be added to the average of questions 1-8.

RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE WORK ACTIVITIES

Section 1: The following **basic expectations** are required for all faculty and need to be met to receive a rating above conditional.

- T/TE Faculty members demonstrate progress in their research, scholarship, or creative work by contributing to at least one new paper, substantial revision of a previous paper, or a similar research outcome, which should be in preparation for refereed publications.
- T/TE Faculty members deliver at least one presentation, either individually or jointly, at the departmental colloquium series annually.

Section 2: At the Chair's discretion, evaluation criteria in the next section will be rated as follows: 1 – Unsatisfactory, 2 – Satisfactory, 3 – Above satisfactory, 4 – Outstanding, based on total points earned in Publications, Fundings, Awards, and Presentations.

Major importance:

- Mid/top tier article (relevant to statistics and data science, broadly defined) accepted/published by a refereed journal or refereed conference proceeding or refereed book chapter. Articles published in predatory journals receive no credit (see, e.g. <https://beallslit.net/>). Faculty members are required to provide information about the quality of the research journals and conference proceedings, and their contributions.
- Published monographs or textbooks
- Newly funded external grant proposal or contract
- Recurring grant expenditure exceeding \$2000
- External research awards and recognition by professional societies/organizations (e.g., fellows of societies, best paper awards, plenary speaker)
- UCF research awards (RIA, excellence in research, etc.)

Medium importance

- Article (relevant to statistics and data science, broadly defined) accepted/published by a refereed journal or refereed conference proceeding or refereed book chapter. Articles published in predatory journals receive no credit (see, e.g. <https://beallslit.net/>).
- Production or revision of monographs or textbooks
- Newly funded internal grant proposal or contract
- Recurring grant expenditure not exceeding \$2000
- Invited presentation of scholarly works in national and international conferences organized by reputable professional societies (e.g. ASA, Biometric society, ISI, etc.)
- Patents.

Minor importance:

- Substantial revision of a previous paper
- Substantial revision of a refereed publication
- Paper (relevant to statistics and data science, broadly defined) submitted to a refereed journal or refereed conference proceeding points. Faculty members are required to provide information about the quality of the research journals and conference proceedings, and their contributions.
- External grant proposal submission
- Contributed presentation of scholarly works in national and international conferences

organized by reputable professional societies (e.g. ASA, Biometric society, ISI, etc.)

- Presentation of scholarly works in conferences organized by regional/country specific societies (e.g. Statistical Association of country A, State A, etc.)
- Presentation of scholarly works in colloquium/local conference/symposium organized by Departments/Centers/Institutes)
- Other presentation (e.g., promoting departmental programs in major conferences, co-author of presentation made by others, etc.)
- arXiv/OSF papers with at least average citations

Other importance:

- Substantial progress contributing to a new paper
- Paper (relevant to statistics and data science, broadly defined) submitted to a journal or conference proceeding.
- Presentation of scholarly works in colloquium/local conference/symposium organized by Departments/Centers/Institutes)
- Other presentation (e.g., promoting departmental programs in major conferences, co-author of presentation made by others, etc.)
- ArXiv/OSF papers with below average citations

At the chair's discretion, a joint author paper can be considered as a major importance or medium importance item.

The Research Assignment is evaluated based on Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) levels of 0.22, 0.33, and 0.44, with performance categorized into three ratings: Satisfactory, Above satisfactory, and Outstanding.

For a 0.22 FTE position, a Satisfactory rating is achieved by completing at least one minor importance item, while an Above Satisfactory rating requires completing at least one other importance items and one minor importance item. An Outstanding rating is attained by completing at least one other importance item and one medium importance item.

For a 0.33 FTE position, a Satisfactory rating is met by completing at least one other importance item and one Minor importance item, Above Satisfactory by completing at least two Minor importance items, Outstanding by completing at least one Minor importance items and one Medium/Major importance item.

For a 0.44 FTE position, achieving a Satisfactory rating involves completing at least two minor importance items, and having at least one accepted or published peer-reviewed publication in the last three years. An Above Satisfactory rating requires completing at least one other importance item, one minor importance item and one Medium/Major importance item. An Outstanding rating is accomplished by completing at least two Minor importance items and at least one Medium importance item, or at least two Medium importance items, or at least one Major importance items.

SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Service will be evaluated based on the quantity and the quality of the service. At the Chair's discretion, service will be rated in four categories based on the *quality* of service as follows: 1 – Unsatisfactory, 2 – Satisfactory, 3 – Above satisfactory, 4 – Outstanding.

Category 1: Service to the unit (this includes serving on departmental committees, participating in job candidate interviews for future members of the department, attending Commencement, attending departmental functions including colloquiums and faculty meetings).

Category 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)

Category 3: Service to the profession (this includes referring scholarship by others, organizing conferences, serving on committees in professional organizations, public relation activities related to the mission of UCF).

Category 4: Professional service to the community (media interviews, public lectures community outreach)

Other assigned duties:

Faculty with other assigned duties on the annual assignment form may be evaluated in this category. Other Assigned Duties, may include, but are not limited to, course scheduler, associate chair, program coordinators, lab directors.

Overall evaluation of service (and other assigned duties if applicable):

T/TE and I/IL

To receive a rating of **satisfactory** a faculty member needs to achieve a score of satisfactory on Category 1 (and other assigned duties if applicable).

To receive a rating of **above satisfactory** a faculty member needs to achieve a score of above satisfactory on Category 1 (and other assigned duties if applicable), or satisfactory on both Category 1 (and other assigned duties if applicable) and another category.

To receive a rating of **outstanding** a faculty member needs to achieve a score of outstanding on Category 1 (and other assigned duties if applicable), or above satisfactory on Category 1 (and other assigned duties if applicable) and satisfactory on another category, or satisfactory on Category 1 (and other assigned duties if applicable) and on another two categories.

OVERALL EVALUATION

The overall evaluation of each faculty member will be based on the weighted average of evaluation scores multiplied by the FTE assigned for each category for the regular academic year (summer or overload teaching will not affect the FTE used for teaching).

Overall Evaluation (based on weighted average):

Outstanding	≥ 3
Above satisfactory	≥ 2.5
Satisfactory	≥ 2
Unsatisfactory	< 2