Annual Evaluation Standards & Procedures (AESP)

The Chair of ECE division, Department of EECS will use the primary performance measures outlined in this document for annual faculty evaluations.

The objective of this section is to provide the ECE faculty with the annual evaluation procedure, productivity measures and expected faculty performance, which will move the Department forward and help it to be recognized nationally.

1. Annual Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Workloads:

The following procedures apply to all full-time faculty members in the ECE Division, Department of EECS.

Procedures

Each ECE faculty member (tenured, tenure-track, visiting or lecturer) will prepare the required Faculty Annual Report (FAR), describing his or her accomplishments in teaching, research, service and activities during the evaluation period. An up-to-date curriculum vitae (CV) is required with the FAR.

The FAR and CV will be due on the date set by the College $(14$ days after evaluation period). The date selected would be consistent with the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement. The Chair will use these summary reports, CV and other relevant information from peers and students to assign a set of ratings that describes the performance of each faculty member. In doing so, the Department Chair will pay careful attention to the criteria outlined in this document.

For the annual evaluation, the Chair of the Department will have face-to-face meetings with all Assistant Professors and upon request with Associate and Full Professors. The face-to-face meetings will be to discuss:

- Productivity during the evaluation period
- Rating of teaching, research and service
- Overall rating
- Next year's plan and goals
- Open time to discuss any other issues, needs or concerns

The Chair will complete a written review on the Evaluation Form for each faculty member of the Department within 60 days after the due date of the FAR and CV. This review should provide feedback on research, teaching and service, and provide explanation on scoring for each section. Upon receipt of the completed evaluation form, a face-to-face meeting can be requested by faculty member. Each faculty member will be asked to sign the Evaluation Form and may choose to respond in writing to the annual review. This response also becomes a part of that faculty member's file.

Annual evaluations may be used to determine faculty merit salary increases for the following year if such raises are provided.

Faculty Workload Models

CECS work load (i.e., FTEs) is (for most faculty members who are teaching 2+2 courses) 50% in instructional activities, 25% in research, and 25% in service. Consistent with CECS workload guidance, the ECE faculty agrees to the

subsequent FTE percentages of instructional activities, research and creative activities, and service activities in order to recognize individual faculty's choices of workload models and foci. The following table outlines the FTE allocation for variant duty assignments.

Workload Table

Type of faculty members	Teaching FTE (F_T)	Research FTE (F_R)	Service FTE (F_S)
teaching 2+2 courses	0.5	0.25	0.25
teaching 3+3 courses	0.75	0-0.10	0.25-F_R
teaching 1+2 or 2+1 courses (with buy-out)	0.375	0.375	0.25
Teaching 1+1 courses (with buy-out)	0.25	0.5	0.25

Specifically, a faculty member may have more instructional activities (e.g., 3 courses per semester), or standard instructional activities (e.g., 2 courses per semester), or other assigned/administrative duties. For faculty members with a 3+3 course teaching load, the standard workload percentages are 75% for instructional activities, 25% for combination of research and creative activities and service activities. For those with administrative and other assigned duties, the chair will adjust their weights at the beginning of that assignment and inform the faculty member.

2. Expected Performance Measures: All faculty members

Faculty evaluations will be based on expected productivity measures in teaching, research and service outlines in this section.

a. Teaching Activities:

Table 1. Teaching Effectiveness Criteria

UNSATISFACTORY	CONDITIONAL	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE SATISFACTORY	OUTSTANDING
No Activity & No Steps to Correct	No Activity	Presence of Activity	Presence of Outcomes	Significant Presence of Outcomes
A faculty member who fails to meet the requirements for "Satisfactory" and fails to perform, or chronically demonstrates poor performance will receive an evaluation of **UNSATISFACTORY.** Poor performance includes consistently: • receiving **poor teaching evaluation from** the courses taught during the evaluation period in the category of "Overall Assessment of Instruction" on the Student Perception of Instruction Reports., • failing to hold class in a responsible manner, or • failing to return papers, other assignments or tests on a timely basis, or • failing to communicate with students, or failing to serve as a responsible discipline area advisor to students.	An evaluation of **CONDITIONAL** in Teaching will be assigned if a faculty member fails to meet the requirements for "Satisfactory" Poor performance includes consistently: • receiving **significant deficit in course evaluation** from the courses taught during the evaluation period in the category of "Overall Assessment of Instruction" on the Student Perception of Instruction Reports., • failing to hold class in a responsible manner, or • failing to return papers, other assignments or tests on a timely basis, or • failing to communicate with students, or failing to serve as a responsible discipline area advisor to students.	In order to achieve a **SATISFACTORY** evaluation in Teaching, faculty must demonstrate competence in teaching by receiving **teaching evaluation above 3.0** from the courses taught during the evaluation period in the category of "Overall Assessment of Instruction" on the Student Perception of Instruction Reports. In addition, faculty must complete at least **three** of the tasks listed in ETA or ETO	To achieve an evaluation of **ABOVE SATISFACTORY** in Teaching, faculty must demonstrate competence in teaching by achieving **teaching evaluation above 3.5** in teaching evaluation from the courses taught during the evaluation period in the category of "Overall Assessment of Instruction" on the Student Perception of Instruction Reports. In addition, faculty must complete either (a) at least **three** of the tasks listed in ETA and **one** of the tasks listed in ETO.	To achieve an evaluation of **OUTSTANDING** in Teaching, faculty must demonstrate competence in teaching by achieving **teaching evaluation above 3.8** from the courses taught during the evaluation period in the category of "Overall Assessment of Instruction" on the Student Perception of Instruction Reports. In addition, faculty must complete at least **four** of the tasks listed in ETA and **two** of the tasks listed in ETO. ETO can also be counted in ETA, but ETA can not be counted in ETO

Table 2. Teaching Activities and Outcomes.

Evidence of Teaching Activity (ETA)	Evidence of Teaching Outcomes (ETO)
1. Complete classroom Teaching assignment. 2. Involvement of Ph.D. Dissertation, M.S. Thesis or B.S. Honors Thesis supervision 3. Involvement of Educational Journal and Conference publications which improve the quality of teaching 4. Involvement of Educational grants/partnerships/ projects such as NSF CCLI, STEP, IGERT, CRCD, REU, RET, etc, which improve the quality of teaching 5. Involvement of Curriculum development that includes course revisions and development, new preparations, lab development and seminar development 6. Involvement of multi-media/FEEDS courses and creative instructional methods. 7. Involvement with student team competitions, independent studies, as well as projects and student teams/organizations directed 8. Industry/educational partnership involvement, which improve the quality of teaching 9. Ph.D. and M.S. committee participation	10. Dissertation supervision to completion, M.S. Thesis to completion 11. Educational grants/partnerships/projects such as NSF CCLI, STEP, IGERT, CRCD, REU, RET, etc 12. Competitive regional, national and international teaching award 13. Educational Journal and Conference publications which improve the quality of teaching 14. Textbook and textbook chapter publications 15. Leadership in Curriculum development that includes course revisions and development, new preparations, lab development and seminar development 16. Other significant teaching outcome such as fellowships, student awards, etc.

b. Research Activities:

Table 3 provides the overall criteria for research effectiveness. Table 4 provides further definition of research activities and outcomes.

Table 3. Research Effectiveness Criteria

UNSATISFACTORY	CONDITIONAL	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE SATISFACTORY	OUTSTANDING
No Activity & No Steps to Correct	**No Activity**	**Presence of Activity**	**Presence of Outcomes**	**Significant Presence of Outcomes**
A faculty member who does not complete the activities necessary for a **CONDITIONAL** evaluation will receive an **UNSATISFACTORY** rating in the area of Research and Creative Activities.	A faculty member will receive a **CONDITIONAL** evaluation in Research and Creative Activities if s/he demonstrates *less than two items in the list of Evidence of Research Activity (ERA).*	In order to achieve a **SATISFACTORY** evaluation in Research, a faculty member must demonstrate *at least two items in the list of Evidence of Research Activity (ERA).*	In order to achieve an **ABOVE SATISFACTORY** evaluation in Research, a faculty member must demonstrate *at least two (2) of the items in the list of Evidence of Research Outcome (ERO).*	In order to achieve an **OUTSTANDING** evaluation in Research, a faculty member must demonstrate *significant contribution in at least two ERO items*. Singular examples would be significantly above average monetary funding award and/or current performance as PI on such an award from federal agencies or industry.

Table 4. Research Activities and Outcomes.

Evidence of Research Activity (ERA)	Evidence of Research Outcomes (ERO)
17. Submission of articles on Research topics in peer-reviewed journals 18. Submission as PI/CPI of Research Funding to external agencies. 19. Submission of book proposals and other professional publications. 20. Involvement with research and industry partnerships. 21. Involvement with interdisciplinary research. 22. Participation in Technical Conferences 23. Supporting Students for Conferences 24. Involvement in invention, patent disclosure, software, copyright, and other related works.	25. Publication of articles on Research topics in peer-reviewed journals (faculty are encouraged to publish in major journals published by professional engineering societies such as IEEE Transaction and other IET peer-review journals, etc) 26. Award and/or current performance on an award as PI / CPI of Research Funding from external funding agencies. 27. Research expenditure 28. Leadership in Research Partnerships ad multidisciplinary research team 29. Publication of authored or co-authored books and book chapters. 30. Refereed, IEEE/IEE and other high-impact high-impact conference publications. 31. Conferences/workshops/tutorials as keynote or invited speaker. 32. Competitive regional, national and international research awards. 33. Patent innovation, innovative hardware and/or software inventions. 34. Being elected as a Distinguished Member or Fellow a professional organization (e.g., IEEE, National Academy of Science or Engineering (NAE/NAS) membership)

c. Service Activities:

Table 5 provides the overall criteria for service effectiveness. Table 6 provides further definition of service activities and outcomes.

Table 5. Service Effectiveness Criteria

UNSATISFACTORY	CONDITIONAL	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE SATISFACTORY	OUTSTANDING
No Activity & No Steps to Correct	**No Activity**	**Active Participation**	**Leadership Position & Presence of Outcomes**	**Leadership Presence & Significant Presence of Outcomes**
A faculty member who does not complete the activities necessary for a **CONDITIONAL** evaluation will receive an **UNSATISFACTORY** rating in the area of Service.	A faculty member will receive a **CONDITIONAL** evaluation in Service if s/he demonstrates *less than two items in the list of Evidence of Service Activity. (ESA)*	In order to achieve a **SATISFACTORY** evaluation in Research, a faculty member must demonstrate *at least three items in the list of Evidence of Service Activity (ESA)*	In order to achieve an **ABOVE SATISFACTORY** evaluation in Service, in addition to *at least three items* in **ESA**, a faculty member must demonstrate *at least one (1) of the items in the list of Evidence of Service Outcome (ESO)*	In order to achieve an **OUTSTANDING** evaluation in Service, a faculty member must demonstrate service outcomes well above Above Satisfactory level

Table 6. Service Activities and Outcomes.

Evidence of Service Activity (ESA)	Evidence of Service Outcomes (ESO)
35. Active member of a professional organization 36. Active member of a department committee 37. Active reviewer for Professional Conference 38. Active reviewer for Professional Journal. 39. Active member of a College committee 40. Active member of a University committee. 41. Mentor to a New Faculty member 42. Advisor to Student organization	43. Officer of a professional organization 44. External reviewer and panel at state and national levels such as NSF panel or publicities (TV interview, etc.) 45. Chair or members of key department, college, university committee 46. Chair of other department committee 47. Organizer for Professional Conference 48. Member for a Professional Conference Committee 49. Editor, associate Editor, Guest Editor for Professional Journal. 50. Member of Editorial Board for Professional Journal 51. Editing of Scholarly books and collection of articles

3. Overall Performance

The individual's teaching, research and service ratings will be based on the performance measures when compared to Department average productivity in each category. The Department Chair determines the ratings to the individual's teaching, research and service categories in 5 classes (Outstanding (O), Above satisfactory (AS), satisfactory (S), conditional (C), and unsatisfactory (U)). Each class is assigned to a numerical number as follow: 4 for O, 3 for AS, 2 for S, 1 for C, and 0 for U. These ratings are denoted as T (for teaching), R (for research), and S (for service).

Because CECS expects/encourages excellence in both teaching and research (with somewhat more emphasis on research), weights are added to these categories in the calculations (but not change FTEs). A set of weights are created to reflect these. Set $W_T=3$, $W_R=5$, $W_S=1$. The overall score (OS) of a faculty member's performance is to be computed by weighting average of each individual's three categories as follow

$$Os = \frac{W_T F_T T + W_R F_R R + W_S F_S S}{W_T F_T + W_R F_R + W_S F_S}$$

For example, for a teaching focused faculty, earning O in teaching, AS in research, and O in service will result in a total score of 4; another example, for a research focused faculty, earning AS in teaching, O in research, and O in service will result in a total score of 3.5. The overall performance is determined based on the overall score as follow:

$$OS \geq 3.5 \quad \text{for overall Outstanding performance (O),}$$
$$3.5 > OS \geq 2.5 \quad \text{for overall Above Satisfactory performance (AS),}$$
$$2.5 > OS \geq 2 \quad \text{for overall Satisfactory performance (S),}$$
$$2 > OS \geq 1 \quad \text{for overall Conditional performance (C),}$$

and OS<1   for overall Unsatisfactory performance (U).

4. Typical Examples

In this section, we list various typical cases for several categories with $W_T=3$, $W_R=5$, $W_S=1$.

Workload	F_T	F_R	F_S	T	R	S	Overall score	Overall rating
teaching 2+2 courses	0.5	0.25	0.25	4	3	4	3.58	O
teaching 2+2 courses	0.5	0.25	0.25	4	3	3	3.5	O
teaching 2+2 courses	0.5	0.25	0.25	3	4	4	3.5	O
teaching 2+2 courses	0.5	0.25	0.25	3	4	3	3.41	AS
teaching 2+2 courses	0.5	0.25	0.25	3	2	2	2.5	AS
teaching 2+2 courses	0.5	0.25	0.25	2	3	3	2.5	AS
teaching 2+2 courses	0.5	0.25	0.25	2	3	2	2.41	S
teaching 2+2 courses	0.5	0.25	0.25	2	1	2	1.58	C
teaching 3+3 courses	0.75	0.1	0.15	4	2	2	3.55	O
teaching 3+3 courses	0.75	0.1	0.15	3	4	4	3.22	AS
teaching 3+3 courses	0.75	0.1	0.15	3	1	1	2.55	AS
teaching 3+3 courses	0.75	0.1	0.15	2	1	2	1. 82	C
teaching 3+3 courses	0.75	0	0.25	2	1	2	2	S

5. Final Remarks:

Faculty can provide input to Chair about importance of conference publication. Whenever a question of quality arises, the Department's Chair must take the effort to seek out faculty and other professionals who can provide insight into the quality of the publications.

The faculty member under evaluation can provide supplemental information such as frequency and impact of citations of published papers, textbooks and other materials produced.

The Chair may seek the help of other faculty in ECE, college or outside UCF to assess the quality of the productivity measures presented by the faculty.

The Chair will also distinguish the faculty rank in terms of expected performance. Full Professors are expected to perform at or above the expectations for an Associate Professor; likewise, Associate Professors are expected to perform above those at the Assistant Professor level. Visiting and instructors will follow the evaluations and standards and procedure outlines here with the proper FTE assignment.

In cases where faculty evaluation is contested, UCF grievance procedure in place at that time will be followed.