

Department of Physics

ANNUAL EVALUATION OF TENURED AND TENURE-EARNING FACULTY

Standards & Guidelines for Evaluation of Faculty

Intended for first use in the 2013-2014 year
Approved by vote of Physics Faculty on December 5, 2012

Introduction

The Standards & Guidelines documents will form the basis of all faculty evaluations in the Physics Department. Annual evaluations, cumulative progress evaluations, tenure recommendations, promotion recommendations, merit-based salary raise recommendations, and other review processes will be based on this document.

Basic Assumptions

1. As a Ph.D. granting department, faculty holding Assistant, Associate, and Professor ranks are expected to have a significant assignment in research and will be judged accordingly.
2. 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.
3. Review of performance will emphasize “quality” rather than “quantity”.

The document has three parts: Part I provides the guidelines for the annual evaluation of tenured and tenure-earning faculty in the Physics Department. Part II lists the evaluation criteria topics, classified as major or minor, for meritorious performance in the annual assignment. Part III sets forth the level of performance required to achieve Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory and Conditional annual evaluations in the individual categories of Teaching, Research, Service, and Other and how these are employed to determine the annual Overall evaluation. Part IV contains a set of possible examples of the various evaluation categories.

The Department of Physics follows the rules set by the BOT/UFF collective bargaining agreements, and the guidelines set by the College of Sciences. As a further supplement the Department of Physics establishes the following guidelines to help faculty with the rank of Lecturer in understanding what is expected for meritorious performance.

Part I. EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Meritorious annual evaluation depends upon strong performance in teaching, research, and service. Annual evaluation will be based upon these guidelines and the evaluation criteria specified in Part II of this document.

I. Teaching

High quality teaching is expected of each faculty member. Thus, the granting of tenure presupposes that the faculty member has demonstrated his/her dedication and effectiveness as a teacher. A measure of teaching effectiveness may be demonstrated, but is not exclusively determined, by mechanisms such as evaluations provided by students and peers, accessibility outside of the classroom structure and success of graduate and undergraduate students. Although quality of classroom performance is the primary criterion for the determination of the effectiveness of teaching, using the norms listed above will also be considered. Faculty members are expected to maintain high standards in the courses.

II. Research

A record of significant scholarly achievement is essential for the earning of tenure. As a Ph.D.-granting department, the department's mission is to excel in research and scholarly activities that compare with those in other Ph.D.-granting universities. All members of the Physics faculty are expected to develop independent research programs of high quality. By the time the tenure decision is made for a faculty member hired as tenure track assistant professor, the faculty member should have:

- (i) Several publications as a tenure-earning faculty member at UCF in journals listed in the ISI Web of Science. The publications should demonstrate that the faculty has played a major role in the research and the research is developed beyond the post-doctoral stage.
- (ii) Success in establishing a viable research program as demonstrated primarily by success in obtaining external research funding.
- (iii) Started guiding doctoral students.

III. Service

All members of the faculty will routinely be assigned committee work in the department. Sometimes faculty members will also be asked to serve on College and University committees. It is expected that faculty seeking tenure will discharge these duties diligently. Professional service, such as refereeing of journal articles, reviewing proposals for funding agencies, and other professional service will be recognized, as will exceptional service to the department.

IV. Other

All members of the faculty may from time to time be given other assignments not specifically included in the categories above. In those cases where other duties are a significant part of the faculty member's annual assignment, the performance evaluation will include that category.

Part II. ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

I. Teaching

A. Classroom Instruction --- MAJOR

- a) Syllabi and course material (examinations, assignments and other material contained in the end-of-term course packs)
- b) Student Evaluations along with grade distributions
- c) Peer evaluations if requested by the faculty member, following the guidelines in the Collective Bargaining Agreement Article 10

B. Directing Graduate Students

- a) Advisor of Graduate students --- MAJOR
- c) Graduate student research/independent study supervision --- MINOR
- d) Publications, awards, conference presentations of students under faculty supervision --
- MAJOR

C. Directing Undergraduate Students

- a) Honors thesis supervision --- MAJOR
- b) Undergraduate student research/independent study supervision --- MINOR
- c) Publications, awards, conference presentations of students under faculty supervision ---
MAJOR

D. Curriculum & Course Development --- MAJOR

- a) Major course revisions including laboratory
- b) Introduction of innovative new courses
- c) Publication of pedagogic articles, textbooks, and laboratory
manuals
- d) Developing web-based courses and material

E. Grants & Contracts Supporting Teaching

- a) Successful proposals --- MAJOR
- b) Proposal submissions --- MINOR

F. Supplemental Instruction --- MINOR (countable two times)

- a) Student advising
- b) Conducting help sessions for students
- c) Teaching outside a structured course
- d) Memberships of thesis/dissertation committees
- e) Coordinators of multi-section classes and laboratories

G. Other --- MINOR

Reviewer of articles and books, presentations in conferences, organization of conferences/ workshops, participation in conferences/workshops

II. Research

Scholarly Work

- a) Acceptance of publications in journals listed in ISI Web of Science
--- MAJOR
- b) Publishing scholarly books or chapters --- MAJOR
- c) Other publications --- MINOR
- d) Recognition of research by Citation Indices ---MAJOR
- e) Submission of research articles to refereed journals --- MINOR
- f) Presentations in national/international conferences/workshops --- MINOR
- g) Invited conference presentations --- MAJOR
- h) Invited seminars at other research institutions --- MAJOR
- i) Award of patents --- MAJOR
- j) Submission of patent filing --- MINOR

B. Research Grants & Contracts

- a) Award of grants or contracts as P.I. or co-P.I. --- MAJOR
- b) Submission of proposals --- MINOR
- c) Award of internal funds as P.I. or co-P.I. ---- MINOR
- d) Participate in external grants & contracts as non-P.I. and non-co-P.I. --- MINOR

III. Service

A. Service to the department --- MAJOR

- a) Leadership and contributions in departmental committees
- b) Oversight of major departmental facilities
- c) Other non-assigned activities such as recruitment, advising, and departmental governance

B. Service on College and University committees, involvement in interdisciplinary and interdepartmental activities --- MAJOR

C. Service to the Profession---MAJOR

Examples --- Editor or reviewer for scholarly publications or conference proceedings; serving as officer or committee member for professional organizations; serving on review panels; chairing conference sessions; organizing conferences, workshops, and technical sessions.

D. Service to elementary and secondary schools --- MAJOR

E. Service to the Central Florida community ---MINOR

F. Service to industries --- MINOR

G. Extensive Outreach Activities --- MAJOR

IV. Other

In those cases where other duties are a significant part of the faculty member's annual assignment, the evaluation standards will include those assignments. The relative weights (MAJOR or MINOR) will be determined at the time each such assignment is made.

Part III. DETERMINATION OF ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

Annual performance in each of the MAJOR criteria areas (see Part II) will be evaluated on a scale of 0 to 5. Annual performance in each of the MINOR criteria areas will be evaluated on a scale of 0 to 3. The number of MAJOR and MINOR criteria in each of the evaluation categories is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

	MAJOR	MINOR	Maximum
Teaching	7	6	53
Research	7	7	56
Service	5	2	31
Other	0 or TBA	0 or TBA	

The numerical scores that result will be used to determine the annual evaluation in each of the categories. Table 2 records an example of the scores needed in each of the evaluation categories in order to achieve the indicated evaluation for that category.

Table 2

	Teaching	Research	Service	Other
Outstanding (O)	≥ 20	≥ 20	≥ 11	*
Above Satisfactory (AS)	15-19	15-19	7-10	*
Satisfactory (S)	10-14	10-14	3-6	*
Conditional (C)	5-9	5-9	2-3	*
Unsatisfactory (U)	≤ 4	≤ 4	≤ 1	*

Overall evaluation: The Chair will determine the overall performance of each faculty member. This will be based on the ratings for teaching, research, service and other assigned duties after adjustments for the work assignments. This adjustment will allow the evaluation of individuals (e.g., faculty and instructors) with different assignments. In no case will an individual receive an overall outstanding evaluation if they don't receive at least one outstanding in teaching or research, or if they receive less than satisfactory in one of the four categories. The exact procedure will be as follows: The rating in each activity area will be converted to points, where Outstanding = 4, Above Satisfactory = 3, Satisfactory = 2, Conditional = 1, and Unsatisfactory = 0. These will be multiplied by the percent work assignment for that activity. Thus, an assistant professor with an assigned **research** workload of 50% and a rating of *Above Satisfactory* would receive 150 pts. An instructor with an assigned **teaching** workload of 90% and a rating of *Outstanding* would receive 360 pts. An associate professor with an assigned **service** workload of 10% and a rating of *Satisfactory* would receive 20 pts. A full professor with an assignment of 30% to **other assigned duties** and a rating of *Above Satisfactory* would receive 90 pts. The sum of these numbers (max. = 400) will be converted to an overall evaluation by:

Outstanding = 351 - 400
 Above satisfactory = 276 - 350
 Satisfactory = 176 - 275
 Conditional = 100 - 175
 Unsatisfactory <100

Department of Physics

EVALUATION OF LECTURERS, INSTRUCTORS, AND VISITING FACULTY

Standards & Guidelines for Evaluations of Faculty

Introduction

The Standards & Guidelines documents will form the basis of all faculty evaluations in the Physics Department. Annual evaluations, merit-based salary raise recommendations, and other review processes will be based on this document.

Basic Assumptions

1. Faculty at the Lecturer/Instructor rank and Visiting Faculty are not tenure-earning and will normally not have a research assignment. Annual evaluations will be based only on those areas in which there is a formal assignment.
2. Review of performance will emphasize quality rather than quantity.

This document has three parts: Part I provides the guidelines for the evaluation of faculty with the rank of Lecturer/Instructor and Visiting Faculty in the Physics Department. Part II lists the evaluation standards topics, classified as major or minor, for meritorious performance. Part III sets forth the level of performance required to achieve Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, and Conditional annual evaluations in the individual categories of Teaching, Research, Service, and Other and how these are employed to determine the annual Overall evaluation.

The Department of Physics follows the rules set by the BOT/UFF collective bargaining agreements, and the guidelines set by the College of Sciences. As a further supplement the Department of Physics establishes the following guidelines to help faculty with the rank of Lecturer/Instructor and Visiting Faculty in understanding what is expected for meritorious performance.

Part I. EVALUATION GUIDELINES

I. Teaching

High quality teaching is expected of each faculty member. A measure of teaching effectiveness may be demonstrated, but is not exclusively determined, by mechanisms such as evaluations provided by students and peers, accessibility outside of the classroom structure, and success of undergraduate students. Although the quality of classroom

performance is the primary basis for the determination of the effectiveness of teaching, using the norms listed above will also be considered. Faculty members are expected to maintain high academic standards in their courses.

II. Service

All members of the faculty will routinely be assigned committee work in the department. Sometimes faculty members will also be asked to serve on College and University committees. It is expected that faculty will discharge these duties diligently. Professional service, such as refereeing of journal articles and other professional service will be recognized, as will exceptional service to the Department.

III. Other

All members of the faculty may from time to time be given other assignments not specifically included in the categories above. In those cases where other duties are a significant part of the faculty member's annual assignment, the performance evaluation will include that category.

Part II. EVALUATION STANDARDS

I. Teaching

A. Classroom Instruction --- MAJOR

- a) Syllabi and course material (examinations, assignments and other material contained in the end-of-term course packs)
- b) Student Evaluations along with grade distributions
- c) Peer evaluations if requested by the faculty member, following the guidelines in the Collective Bargaining Agreement Article 10

B. Directing Undergraduate Students

- a) Honors thesis supervision --- MAJOR
- b) Undergraduate student research/independent study supervision --- MINOR
- c) Publications, awards, conference presentations of students under faculty supervision --- MAJOR

C. Curriculum & Course Development --- MAJOR

- a) Major course revisions including laboratory
- b) Introduction of innovative new courses
- c) Publication of pedagogic articles, textbooks, and laboratory manuals

d) Developing web-based courses and material

D. Grants & Contracts Supporting Teaching

- a) Successful proposals --- MAJOR
- b) Proposal submissions --- MINOR

E. Supplemental Instruction --- MINOR (countable two times)

- a) Student advising
- b) Conducting help sessions for students
- c) Teaching outside a structured course
- d) Memberships of thesis/dissertation committees
- e) Coordinators of multi-section classes and laboratories

F. Other --- MINOR

Awards, reviewer of articles and books, presentations in conferences, organization of conferences/ workshops, participation in conferences/workshops

II. Service

A. Service to the department --- MAJOR

- a) Contributions in departmental committees
- b) Oversight of major departmental facilities
- c) Other non-assigned activities such as recruitment, advising, and departmental governance

B. Service on College and University committees, involvement in interdisciplinary and interdepartmental activities --- MAJOR

C. Service to the Profession---MAJOR

Examples --- Editor or reviewer for scholarly publications or conference proceedings; serving as officer or committee member for professional organizations; publication or presentation of research papers; serving on review panels; chairing conference sessions; organizing conferences, workshops, and technical sessions.

D. Service to elementary and secondary schools --- MAJOR

E. Service to the Central Florida community ---MINOR

F. Service to industries --- MINOR

G. Extensive Outreach Activities --- MAJOR

III. Other

In those cases where other duties are a significant part of the faculty member's annual assignment, the evaluation standards will include those assignments. The relative weights (MAJOR or MINOR) will be determined at the time each such assignment is made.

Part III. DETERMINATION OF ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

Annual performance in each of the MAJOR standards areas (see Part II) will be evaluated on a scale of 0 to 5. Annual performance in each of the MINOR standards areas will be evaluated on a scale of 0 to 3. The number of MAJOR and MINOR criteria in each of the evaluation categories is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

	MAJOR	MINOR	Maximum
Teaching	5	5	40
Research	-	-	
Service	5	2	31
Other	0 or TBA	0 or TBA	

The numerical scores that result will be used to determine the annual evaluation in each of the categories. Table 2 records an example of the scores needed in each of the evaluation categories in order to achieve the indicated evaluation for that category.

Table 2

	Teaching	Research	Service	Other
Outstanding (O)	≥ 14	-	≥ 11	*
Above Satisfactory (AS)	10 – 13	-	7-10	*
Satisfactory (S)	5 – 9	-	4 – 6	*
Conditional (C)	2 – 4	-	2 – 3	*
Unsatisfactory (U)	≤ 2	-	≤ 1	*

For overall evaluation see page 6.

Part IV. EXAMPLES OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

A. Examples for evaluation of **INSTRUCTION & ADVISEMENT** for Physics faculty members

FOR OUTSTANDING:

Example #1 of Outstanding:

- Syllabi and course material (examinations, assignments and other material contained in the end-of-term course packs) are well documented and readily available
- Student Evaluations are on average “very good” or above
- advises several graduate and/or undergraduate students
- students are co-authors on scientific publications
- students are engaged in presenting their results at meetings

Example #2 of Outstanding:

- Syllabi and course material (examinations, assignments and other material contained in the end-of-term course packs) are well documented and readily available
- students are co-authors on publications
- has engaged in major course reform
- has introduced innovative new courses
- conducts supplemental instructions (help sessions, extra office hours, etc.)

Example #3 of Outstanding:

- Syllabi and course material (examinations, assignments and other material contained in the end-of-term course packs) are well documented and readily available
- has introduced innovative new courses
- has presented papers at conferences dedicated to teaching reform (such as those organized by AAPT, APS, PhysTEC etc)
- has been awarded an education related grant (e.g. PhysTEC, NSF-TUES, etc.)

Example #4 of Outstanding:

- Syllabi and course material (examinations, assignments and other material contained in the end-of-term course packs) are well documented and readily available
- students are engaged in presenting their results at meetings
- has supervised an honors thesis
- has developed new pedagogical skills
- has published in education related journals (AJP, Physics Teacher, etc.)

FOR ABOVE SATISFACTORY:

Example #1 of Above Satisfactory:

- Syllabi and course material (examinations, assignments and other material contained in the end-of-term course packs) are well documented and readily available
- Student Evaluations are on average “very good” or above
- advises several graduate and/or undergraduate students
- has submitted education related proposal for funding

Example #2 of Above Satisfactory:

- Syllabi and course material (examinations, assignments and other material contained in the end-of-term course packs) are well documented and readily available
- Student Evaluations are respectable (“good” or above)
- students are co-authors on publications
- has engaged in major course reform

Example #3 of Above Satisfactory:

- Syllabi and course material (examinations, assignments and other material contained in the end-of-term course packs) are well documented and readily available
- Student Evaluations are respectable (“very good” or above)
- has presented papers at conferences dedicated to teaching reform (such as those organized by AAPT, APS, PhysTEC etc)
- has advised graduate and/or undergraduate students

Example #4 of Above Satisfactory:

- Syllabi and course material (examinations, assignments and other material contained in the end-of-term course packs) are well documented and readily available
- Student Evaluations are respectable (“good” or above)
- has developed new pedagogical skills
- has submitted education related proposal for funding

FOR SATISFACTORY:

Example #1 of Satisfactory:

- Syllabi and course material (examinations, assignments and other material contained in the end-of-term course packs) are well documented and readily available
- Student Evaluations are reasonable (“good” or above)
- conducts supplemental instructions (help sessions, extra office hours, etc.)

Example #2 of Satisfactory:

- Syllabi and course material (examinations, assignments and other material contained in the end-of-term course packs) are well documented and readily available
- Student Evaluations are respectable (“good” or above)
- advises graduate and/or undergraduate students

Example #3 of Satisfactory:

- Syllabi and course material (examinations, assignments and other material contained in the end-of-term course packs) are well documented and readily available
- Student Evaluations are respectable (“good” or above)
- has developed new pedagogical skills

Example #4 of Satisfactory:

- Syllabi and course material (examinations, assignments and other material contained in the end-of-term course packs) are well documented and readily available
- Student Evaluations are respectable (“good” or above)
- has presented papers at conferences dedicated to teaching reform (such as those organized by AAPT, APS, PhysTEC etc)

FOR CONDITIONAL:

Example #1 of Conditional:

- Syllabi and course material (examinations, assignments and other material contained in the end-of-term course packs) are NOT well documented and NOT readily available
- Student Evaluations are on average “fair” or below
- conducts supplemental instructions (help sessions, extra office hours, etc.)
- has not engaged in curriculum development or other new teaching initiatives in the department.

FOR UNSATISFACTORY:

Example #1 of Unsatisfactory:

- Syllabi and course material (examinations, assignments and other material contained in the end-of-term course packs) are NOT well documented and NOT readily available
- Student Evaluations are on average “poor”
- has not engaged in curriculum development or other new teaching initiatives in the department.

Example #2 of Unsatisfactory:

- Syllabi and course material (examinations, assignments and other material contained in the end-of-term course packs) are NOT well documented and NOT readily available
- Has not fulfilled basic course requirements as laid out in syllabus (classes canceled, tests not administered, assignments and grading not following syllabus policy)

B. Examples for the evaluation of **RESEARCH** for Physics R1 faculty members

(The classifications R1, R2 etc. are described in the Appendix at the end)

FOR OUTSTANDING:

Example #1 of Outstanding:

- supervised and supported two or more full-time GRAs;
- supervised and supported full-time postdoctoral researcher/s;
- published several (> 3) papers in peer-reviewed, high-impact journals;
- gave several invited talks at international conferences and/or at academic institutions
- received more than 100 citations in the year of evaluation for past work
- engaged in external funding process (grants, renewals, seeking new sources of funding, etc.)

Example #2 of Outstanding:

- supervised and supported at least one graduate student;
- supervised and supported one or more full-time postdoctoral researcher/s;
- received more than 100 citations in the year of evaluation for past work
- gave several invited talks at conferences and research institutions.
- published several papers in peer-reviewed, high-impact journals;
- obtained patents for original research

Example #3 of Outstanding:

- supported and supervised a large group of students and post-docs;
- published a paper in a journal of the highest impact (Nature, Science, PNAS, etc);
- secured funding for the purchase of major equipment or for extensive use of major instrumentation (telescope time, satellite time, accelerator time, etc);
- received a distinction (award, prize, fellowship, etc) in his/her field.
- published several (> 3) papers in peer-reviewed, high-impact journals;
- obtained patents for original research

Example #4 of Outstanding:

- supervised and supported two or more GRAs;
- supervised and supported one or more full-time postdoctoral researcher/s;
- authored a major book in his/her research field;
- received a high distinction (award, prize, nomination, etc) in his/her field, or broad media coverage for his/her work.
- received more than 50 citations in the year of evaluation for past work
- presented talks at conferences and/or research/academic institutions

FOR ABOVE SATISFACTORY:

Example #1 of Above Satisfactory:

- supervised and supported two or more full-time GRAs;
- published several papers (> 2) in peer-reviewed journals;

- gave a few invited talks in conference or at research institutions.

Example #2 of Above Satisfactory:

- supervised and supported at least one graduate student;
- secured new external funding sufficient to fund another full-time GRA;
- received a substantial number of citations for recently published work;
- published several papers (> 2) in peer-reviewed journals;

Example #3 of Above Satisfactory:

- supported and supervised a large group of students and post-docs;
- published a paper in a journal of the highest impact (Nature, Science, PNAS, etc) or a seminal paper in the field;
- secured funding for the purchase of equipment or use of major instrumentation (telescope time, satellite time, accelerator time, etc);
- presented papers at conferences

Example #4 of Above Satisfactory:

- supervised and supported one full-time GRA;
- authored a major book in his/her research field;
- published several papers (> 2) in peer-reviewed journals;
- received more than 50 citations in the year of evaluation for past work

FOR SATISFACTORY:

Example #1 of Satisfactory:

- supervised and supported one full-time GRA;
- published several (>1) papers in peer-reviewed journals;
- gave a talk in a conference or at a research institution.

Example #2 of Satisfactory:

- secured new external funding sufficient to fund a full-time GRA;
- published several (>1) papers in peer-reviewed journals;
- received a substantial number of citations for recently published work;

Example #3 of Satisfactory:

- supervised several undergraduate students;
- supervised and supported one full-time GRA;
- secured funding for the purchase of equipment or use of major instrumentation (telescope time, satellite time, accelerator time, etc);

Example #4 of Satisfactory:

- supervised and supported one full-time GRA;
- authored a major book in his/her research field;
- gave at least one invited talk in a conference.

FOR CONDITIONAL:

Example of Conditional:

- supervised and supported one full-time GRA;
- submitted manuscripts/book for publication in journals in the field
- submitted proposal to acquire additional funding

FOR UNSATISFACTORY

Example of Unsatisfactory:

- supervised and supported one full-time GRA;
- no manuscripts/book submitted for publication
- no serious effort made to acquire additional funding

C. Examples for the evaluation of **RESEARCH** for Physics R2 faculty members

FOR OUTSTANDING:

Example #1 of Outstanding:

- supervised and supported one full-time GRA;
- published several (> 3) papers in peer-reviewed journals;
- gave at least one invited talk in an international conference.
- submitted proposals to funding agencies
- received 50 or more citations in the evaluation period for past work

Example #2 of Outstanding:

- supervised and supported three full-time GRAs;
- published several (> 1) papers in peer-reviewed journals;
- gave at least one talk in an international conference.
- submitted proposals to funding agencies
- received patent for original research finding

Example #3 of Outstanding:

- supported and supervised one full-time GRA;
- secured funding for the purchase of equipment or for extensive use of major instrumentation (telescope time, satellite time, accelerator time, etc);
- published several (> 3) papers in peer-reviewed, high-impact journals;
- presented several invited papers at conferences
- received notable number of citations for past work

Example #4 of Outstanding:

- supervised and supported one full-time GRA;
- authored a major book in his/her research field;

- received a high distinction (award, prize, nomination, etc) in his/her field, or broad media coverage for his/her work.
- submitted several proposals to major funding agencies

FOR ABOVE SATISFACTORY:

Example #1 of Above Satisfactory:

- supervised and supported one full-time GRA;
- published several papers (> 2) in peer-reviewed journals;
- submitted several proposals to major funding agencies
- presented papers at conferences

Example #2 of Above Satisfactory:

- supervised and supported one full-time GRA;
- submitted several proposals to major funding agencies
- received a substantial number of citations for recently published work;
- published several papers (> 2) in peer-reviewed journals;

Example #3 of Above Satisfactory:

- supervised and supported one full-time GRA;
- published several papers in refereed journals;
- submitted several proposals to major funding agencies
- presented papers at conferences

Example #4 of Above Satisfactory:

- supervised and supported one full-time GRA;
- worked on a major book in his/her research field;
- published papers in peer reviewed journals
- submitted proposals to major funding agencies

FOR SATISFACTORY:

Example #1 of Satisfactory:

- supervised and supported one full-time GRA;
- published a paper in peer-reviewed journal;
- gave a talk in conference or at a research institution.

Example #2 of Satisfactory:

- secured new external funding sufficient to fund a full-time GRA;
- published several (>1) papers in peer-reviewed journals;
- received a substantial number of citations for recently published work;

Example #3 of Satisfactory:

- supervised several undergraduate students;
- supervised and supported one full-time GRA;

- secured funding for the purchase of equipment or use of major instrumentation (telescope time, satellite time, accelerator time, etc);

Example #4 of Satisfactory:

- supervised and supported one full-time GRA;
- worked on a book manuscript in his/her research field;
- gave at least one talk in a conference.

FOR CONDITIONAL:

Example of Conditional:

- supervised and supported one full-time GRA;
- submitted manuscripts/book for publication in journals in the field
- submitted proposal to acquire additional funding

FOR UNSATISFACTORY

Example of Unsatisfactory:

- supervised and supported one full-time GRA;
- no manuscripts/book available for submission to journals in the field
- no serious effort made to acquire additional funding

D. Examples for evaluation of **RESEARCH PERFORMANCE** for R3 faculty members

FOR OUTSTANDING:

Example #1 of Outstanding:

- supervised the research of more than 2 undergraduate students;
- published more than 1 paper in peer-reviewed, high-impact journals;
- gave at least one high-visibility invited talk in an international conference.
- submitted proposals to funding agencies

Example #2 of Outstanding:

- supervised the research of more than 2 undergraduate students;
- received 25 or more citations for past work, during the evaluation period;
- submitted proposals to funding agencies
- published more than 1 paper in peer-reviewed journals;

Example #3 of Outstanding:

- supervised the research of one full-time graduate student;
- secured funding for the purchase of equipment or for extensive use of major instrumentation (telescope time, satellite time, accelerator time, etc);
- published several papers in peer-reviewed, high-impact journals;

Example #4 of Outstanding:

- supervised one or more students;
- authored a major book in his/her research field;
- received a high distinction (award, prize, nomination, etc) in his/her field, or broad media coverage for his/her work.
- submitted proposals to major funding agencies

FOR ABOVE SATISFACTORY:

Example #1 of Above Satisfactory:

- supervised one full-time graduate student;
- published several papers (> 2) in peer-reviewed journals;
- submitted several proposals to major funding agencies

Example #2 of Above Satisfactory:

- supervised at least one undergraduate student;
- submitted several proposals to major funding agencies
- published several papers in peer-reviewed journals;

Example #3 of Above Satisfactory:

- supervised at least one graduate student;
- received a patent for original research
- submitted several proposals to major funding agencies

Example #4 of Above Satisfactory:

- supervised at least one full-time graduate student;
- worked on a major book in his/her research field;
- submitted several proposals to major funding agencies

FOR SATISFACTORY:

Example #1 of Satisfactory:

- supervised one full-time graduate student;
- published a paper in peer-reviewed journal;
- gave a talk in conference or at a research institution.

Example #2 of Satisfactory:

- secured new internal funding sufficient to fund an undergraduate student;
- published a paper in peer-reviewed journals;
- received 20 or more citations for past work, during evaluation period;

Example #3 of Satisfactory:

- supervised one undergraduate student;
- secured funding for the purchase of equipment or use of major instrumentation (telescope time, satellite time, accelerator time, high performance computational time, etc);

Example #4 of Satisfactory:

- supervised one undergraduate or graduate student;
- worked on a major book in his/her research field;

FOR CONDITIONAL:

Example of Conditional:

- did not supervise an undergraduate or a graduate student;
- submitted a manuscript for publication

FOR UNSATISFACTORY:

Example of Unsatisfactory:

- did not supervise an undergraduate or a graduate student;
- no evidence of research (e.g. manuscript of paper or book, scientific publication).

E. Examples for evaluation of **RESEARCH PERFORMANCE** for R4 faculty members

FOR OUTSTANDING:

Example #1 of Outstanding:

- published 2 or more papers in peer-reviewed, high-impact journals;
- gave at least one invited talk at a conference or an institution.
- submitted proposals to funding agencies

Example #2 of Outstanding:

- received 20 or more citations for published work;
- supervised at least one graduate student
- published 2 or more papers in peer-reviewed journals;

Example #3 of Outstanding:

- secured funding for the purchase of equipment or for extensive use of major instrumentation (telescope time, satellite time, accelerator time, computer time etc);
- supervised at least one graduate student
- secured patent for original research

Example #4 of Outstanding:

- authored a book in his/her research field;
- supervised 1 or more undergraduate students

FOR ABOVE SATISFACTORY:

Example #1 of Above Satisfactory:

- published 1 or more papers in peer-reviewed journals;

- submitted more than 1 proposal to major funding agencies

Example #2 of Above Satisfactory:

- supervised a graduate student
- published 1 or more papers in peer-reviewed journals;

Example #3 of Above Satisfactory:

- supervised 1 or more undergraduate students
- submitted several proposals to major funding agencies

Example #4 of Above Satisfactory:

- worked on a major book in his/her research field;
- received a patent for original research

FOR SATISFACTORY:

Example #1 of Satisfactory:

- published a paper in a peer-reviewed journal;
- gave a talk in conference or at a research institution.

Example #2 of Satisfactory:

- published a paper in peer-reviewed journal;
- supervised a graduate student

Example #3 of Satisfactory:

- secured funding for the purchase of equipment or use of major instrumentation (telescope time, satellite time, accelerator time, etc);
- supervised an undergraduate student

Example #4 of Satisfactory:

- worked on a book in his/her research field;
- gave at least one talk in a conference.

FOR CONDITIONAL:

Example of Conditional:

- supervised an undergraduate student
- submitted a manuscript for publication

FOR UNSATISFACTORY:

Example of Unsatisfactory:

- did not supervise a student
- did not submit a manuscript for publication
- did not file a patent
- did not present any other evidence of research productivity

F. Examples for evaluation of **RESEARCH PERFORMANCE** for T1 faculty members

FOR OUTSTANDING:

Example #1 of Outstanding:

- published several (> 1) papers in peer-reviewed, high-impact journals;
- gave at least one high-visibility invited talk in an international conference.

Example #2 of Outstanding:

- received a reasonable number of citations for recently published work;
- supervised research of students

Example #3 of Outstanding:

- authored or co-authored a book in physics;
- submitted proposal to funding agencies

FOR ABOVE SATISFACTORY:

Example #1 of Above Satisfactory:

- presented a paper at a conference
- submitted proposal to major funding agencies

Example #2 of Above Satisfactory:

- submitted proposal to funding agencies
- published a paper in peer-reviewed journals;

Example #3 of Above Satisfactory:

- has a manuscript ready for submission in refereed journals
- supervised research of a student

FOR SATISFACTORY:

Example #1 of Satisfactory:

- gave a talk in conference or at a research institution.

Example #2 of Satisfactory:

- received a substantial number of citations for published work;

Example #3 of Satisfactory:

- secured funding for use of computational time or any other research activity

Example #4 of Satisfactory:

- supervised research of a student

FOR CONDITIONAL:

Example1 of Conditional:

- plans are in place to supervise the research of a student

Example2 of Conditional:

- a manuscript draft is ready for submission

FOR UNSATISFACTORY

Example of Unsatisfactory:

No visible sign of research activity such as supervision of student, writing of manuscripts, submission of proposal, presentation of seminar, etc.

G. Examples for evaluation of SERVICE for Physics faculty members

Note that a faculty member is to be evaluated only on items that are assigned to him/her or those that she/he reports in her/his annual report.

FOR OUTSTANDING:

Example #1 of Outstanding:

- is an effective chair of a departmental or university committee
- engages effectively in community outreach activities
- advises a large number of undergraduate students
- serves on a large number of graduate thesis committees
- serves as referee for large number of journals in his/her field
- serves as an effective liaison to industry

Example #2 of Outstanding:

- serves in professional committees in his/her field
- serves as a referee to large number of journals in his/her field
- serves in high profile research proposal review panels
- displays leadership in outreach activities
- serves on a large number of graduate thesis committees
- leads efforts in community/K-12 outreach activities

Example #3 of Outstanding:

- member of editorial board of a leading journal in his/her field
- engages actively in recruitment of students
- initiates activities that enhance the image of the department/university world-wide

- engages effectively in interdisciplinary and interdepartmental activities
- serves as referee for large number of journals in his/her field
- serves as advisor to large number of students

Example #4 of Outstanding:

- serves actively in international review panels
- engages actively in international outreach activities
- serves as referee for large number of journals in his/her field
- serves on board/s of community organizations
- engages in leading outreach activities with K-12
- advises student organization/s or registered student groups

FOR ABOVE SATISFACTORY:

Example #1 of Above Satisfactory:

- is an effective member of a departmental or university committee
- engages in community outreach activities
- advises undergraduate students
- serves on graduate thesis committees
- serves as referee for journals in his/her field
- serves as liaison to industry

Example #2 of Above Satisfactory:

- serves in professional committees in his/her field
- serves as a referee for journals in his/her field
- serves in research proposal review panels
- engages in outreach activities
- serves on graduate thesis committees

Example #3 of Above Satisfactory:

- engages in recruitment of students
- involved in activities that enhance the image of the department/university world-wide
- engages in interdisciplinary and interdepartmental activities
- serves as referee for journals in his/her field
- serves as advisor to students

Example #4 of Above Satisfactory:

- engages in international outreach activities
- serves in community organizations
- engages in outreach activities with K-12
- advises student organization/s or registered student groups

FOR SATISFACTORY:

Example #1 of Satisfactory:

- is a member of a departmental or university committee
- engages in community outreach activities
- advises undergraduate student
- serves on graduate thesis committee

Example #2 of Satisfactory:

- serves as a referee for journals in his/her field
- engages in outreach activities
- serves on graduate thesis committees

Example #3 of Satisfactory:

- engages in recruitment of students
- engages in interdisciplinary and interdepartmental activities
- serves as referee for journals in his/her field

Example #4 of Satisfactory:

- serves in community organizations
- engages in outreach activities with K-12
- serves as judge in student competitions

FOR CONDITIONAL:

Example #1 of Conditional:

- assigned to committees but not actively engaged
- serves on thesis committees of physics students

Example #2 of Conditional:

- not actively engaged in any outreach activity
- serves as academic advisor to physics students

FOR UNSATISFACTORY:

Example #1 of Unsatisfactory:

- refuses to serve on any committee
- not interested in any service activities as listed in Physics AESP

Example #2 of Unsatisfactory:

- assigned as academic advisor to students but does not make attempts to meet these students
- not interested in any service activities as listed in Physics AESP

APPENDIX

According to the Physics Department Work Equity Policy (approved October 10, 2012), faculty member may be classified in the following categories, depending on their teaching load.

R1 faculty: 30 - 40% teaching; 60-65% research, 5-10% service (1-1 load)

R2 faculty: 50% teaching; 45-40% research, 5-10% service (1-2 load)

R3 faculty: 60% teaching; 35-30% research, 5-10% service (2-2 load)

R4 faculty: 70% teaching; 25-20% research, 5-10% service (3-2 load)

T1 faculty: 80% teaching; 15-10% research, 5-10% service (3-3 load)

T2 faculty: 95% teaching; 0% research, 5% service (4-4 load)