

ANNUAL EVALUATION STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

**COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA**

Approved by Faculty Relations on 5/7/2012 for first use in the 2012-2013 academic year

ANNUAL EVALUATION STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

I. Introduction

a. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidelines, standards, and procedures to evaluate the annual performance of public administration faculty, including tenured professors, tenure-earning professors, and instructors. The tenure and promotion evaluation will be based on guidelines, standards, and procedures specified in the most current UCF Regulations and UCF BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement.

b. General Guidelines

The Director should meet with each faculty member prior to the Fall Semester each year to establish goals and expectations for the upcoming academic year. At this time the teaching load and a tentative teaching assignment will be established for the next academic year. In addition, school/college/university service or committee assignments will be confirmed. The percentage (weighted) allocation for each category of teaching, research, and service should be established at this time. The School Director should include specific comments about performance and accomplishments during the meeting in the Fall Semester, and when the annual evaluation is conducted comments about performance and accomplishments are to be placed in the general comments space of the evaluation form.

The Director maintains flexibility in assigning weights to each of the items identified by the faculty member in teaching, research, service, and other assignments. Documentation of activities (in the form of copies of letters of acceptance for journal articles, papers presented at professional meetings, committee assignments and the faculty member's attendance record, or special contributions to committee assignments, etc.) will be attached to the annual report.

Tenure-earning faculty members are required to develop and annually maintain a portfolio with documentation for teaching, research, and service that will be used by the Director for the annual evaluation and by the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee for the annual review of progress toward tenure.

The School is multidisciplinary and the evaluation of faculty will be based on discipline-specific information that is appropriate to teaching, research, and service.

Service and leadership at the level of the school, the college, the university, and the profession are expected from tenured professors.

c. Evaluation of Overall Performance

Each faculty member will be given an overall performance assessment based on the ratings earned in teaching, research, and service activities. The overall rating will be determined using the percentages assigned to each activity. The overall rating cannot be outstanding if a faculty member receives below satisfactory in any activities evaluated. The overall evaluation rating and the rating for each of the three areas of professional activity will be based on the scale in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Evaluation Scale

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Evaluation Rating</i>	<i>Range for Overall Rating</i>
Outstanding	4.00	3.51 – 4.00
Above Satisfactory	3.50	3.01 – 3.50
Satisfactory	3.00	2.51 – 3.00
Conditional	2.50	2.01 – 2.50
Unsatisfactory	2.00	0.0 – 2.00

The overall rating is a weighted average of the points earned across teaching, research, and service activities (and other activities, if applicable). For example, the overall evaluation rating for a faculty member with above satisfactory in teaching, outstanding in research and outstanding in service, would be calculated as follows: $.40 (3.50) + .50 (4.00) + .10 (4.00) = 3.80$. According to Table 1, this average falls into the overall evaluation rating of “outstanding.”

Example 1: Tenure-earning research faculty

Category	Evaluation	Points	FTE	Overall Rating (Points * FTE)
Teaching	Above Satisfactory	3.5	.40	1.40
Research	Outstanding	4.0	.50	2.00
Service	Outstanding	4.0	.10	0.40
				3.80

Example 2: Tenured research faculty

Category	Evaluation	Points	FTE	Overall Rating (Points * FTE)
Teaching	Outstanding	4.0	.60	2.40
Research	Above Satisfactory	3.5	.30	1.05
Service	Outstanding	4.0	.10	0.40
				3.85

Example 3: Tenured teaching faculty /Instructor

Category	Evaluation	Points	FTE	Overall Rating (Points * FTE)
Teaching	Outstanding	4.0	.90	3.60
Research	NA			
Service	Above Satisfactory	3.5	.10	0.35
				3.95

d. Relationship between Annual Evaluations and Tenure/Promotion

The results of a faculty member’s annual evaluations in the School of Public Administration represent just one of numerous components that are examined in the college and university tenure and/or promotion processes. Therefore, it should not be construed that achieving a

satisfactory or above rating in any or all annual evaluations will automatically result in a positive tenure or promotion decision. The same is true for evaluation of promotion to the rank of professor.

e. Modifications to the Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP)

The AESP may require periodic changes as a result of changes in the collective bargaining agreement, faculty governance, changes in school and college missions and goals, and accreditation standards. Proposed changes to the document will be considered by an evaluation standards and procedures committee in the school. A revised AESP will be submitted to the Dean's Office, where it will be reviewed and either sent back to the school for further work, or approved and forwarded to Faculty Affairs. Faculty Affairs will review the revised AESP and communicate with the school and college as necessary, until the document is approved.

f. Implementation

The Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures are effective for the evaluation process beginning in the academic year of 2012-2013.

II. Evaluation of Teaching Performance

The School Director will evaluate the teaching component of each faculty member's assignment and rate this performance using the evaluation scale shown in Table 1. The teaching evaluation will be based only on teaching activities during the current evaluation year. The Director's evaluation of teaching performance will be based on many factors. In May of each year, faculty members will submit a teaching portfolio (as part of the faculty member's annual report) to the Director for review and evaluation. Faculty members are encouraged to document as thoroughly as possible their efforts to meet the evaluation standards outlined in this document.

Faculty teaching will be evaluated based on the standards listed below as well as the Student Perception of Instruction (SPI) feedback. The exception to this standard occurs when the faculty experience unexpected interruptions in their teaching. In this case, the process for evaluation will be determined in consultation with the Director.

All faculty members are required to keep regular office hours of a minimum of five (5) hours per week (office hours can be held online if a faculty member teaches online courses), as well as special advisement or appointment hours. In addition, all faculty members are to be well informed and to act in a professional manner when advising students. This includes handling the paperwork associated with advisement in a timely and accurate manner. If the posted office hours cannot be met on any given occasion, the faculty member should inform the staff. If the office hour standards are not met, the overall teaching rating for an individual faculty member shall be no higher than satisfactory or one rank below the rank otherwise awarded. The Director will make the determination of the teaching rating.

Faculty members are to hold classes as scheduled and to give the final during the scheduled final exam period or provide for final projects to be completed, unless prior arrangements have been made with the Director.

To be rated as "satisfactory" or above, a faculty member must meet the basic teaching standards listed in II(a) below, plus the specified number of additional teaching activities listed in II(b). The order of these standards does not imply ranking of importance. It is very important that faculty members thoroughly document achievement of teaching standards in their annual reports.

a. Basic Teaching Standards

1. Course syllabi

Faculty members are to *provide* and *follow* a syllabus for every course taught that complies with the current university, college, and school guidelines regarding syllabi. Faculty members are to provide an “*electronic*” copy of the syllabus for each course taught to the School office before the second week of classes.

- University/college/School guidelines for syllabi construction are followed.
- Course objectives are clearly stated.
- Evaluation procedures are clearly stated.
- Learning outcomes are clearly stated.

2. Course content

- Course content is based on current research and practice in the field. Course materials (text, handouts, cases, etc.) reflect this.

3. Course structure and design

- Teaching/learning methods, technological tools, and course materials appropriate to each course are used to facilitate communication and active learning.
- Practical applications are included in course materials and pedagogy.
- Course web site facilitates instructor/student communication if utilized.
- Final exam (or appropriate final project/exercise) is held according to the university calendar and policy unless an exemption is approved by the School Director.

4. Assessment of student performance

- Assessment/evaluation procedures are clearly stated in the syllabus.
- Course contains multiple, timely, and appropriate methods of measuring student performance.
- Course objectives and performance measurement are in alignment.
- Quality and timely feedback is provided to students about their performance.

5. Assessment of Learning Outcomes

- Instructor collects assessment data in a timely and appropriate manner according to schedule supplied by the School Director so that students have feedback regarding their performance before the withdrawal deadline each semester.
- Instructor participates and contributes to the school’s review and refinement of the assessment process and outcomes.

6. Student Evaluation of Instruction

- Faculty members will achieve student ratings in the category “Overall Assessment of Instruction” on the Student Perception of Instruction Reports of at least 50% in the “Good,” “Very Good,” and “Excellent” categories (accumulated across all courses taught).

7. Curriculum development

- Actively participates in school and/or program curriculum review and development process when asked/elected to do.
- Actively participates in deliberation on curriculum revision indicated by assessment process results.

8. Interactions with Students

- Advises students when called upon to do so.
- Classes are held according to the university schedule.

- Responds to student email messages in a timely fashion.
- Office hours are posted, are adequate in number, and are held when scheduled.

Teaching Evaluation Standards for Faculty (for evaluation period)

Standards for a Rating of Outstanding

In addition to meeting the basic teaching standards listed in section (a) above, a faculty member must complete *three* of the additional teaching standards in section (b) below to be rated “outstanding.”

Standards for a Rating of Above Satisfactory

In addition to meet the basic teaching standards listed in section (a) above, a faculty member must complete *two* of the additional teaching standards below to be rated “above satisfactory.”

Standards for a Rating of Satisfactory

A faculty member must meet the basic teaching standards listed in section (a) above to be rated “satisfactory.”

Standards for a Rating of Conditional

A faculty member who does not meet two of the basic teaching standards listed in section (a) above will rated “conditional.”

Standards for a Rating of Unsatisfactory

To achieve a rating of “unsatisfactory” in teaching, a faculty member who does not meet four of the standards necessary to achieve a rating of “satisfactory” will be rated “unsatisfactory.”

b. Additional Teaching Standards (for evaluation period)

1. Student ratings of instruction place the faculty member in the top half of the school.
2. Student ratings of instruction place the faculty member in the top quartile of the school.
3. Won teaching award from external organization or student organizations.
4. *Won university teaching excellence award.
5. *Won college teaching award.
6. *Won UCF TIP award.
7. Supervised one or more independent studies.
8. Supervised/oversight interns
9. Undertook a major course revision.
10. Undertook one or more new course preparations (first time taught).
11. Supervised an Honors-in-Major thesis.
12. Served on an Honors-in-the-Major thesis committee.
13. Taught two or more course preparations during a term.
14. Developed and delivered a web course.
15. Taught service learning courses.
16. Taught large classes.
17. Developed/taught study abroad course.
18. Involved with mentoring or advising student organizations, groups, competitions, etc.
19. Mentored colleagues in teaching effectiveness
20. Published or revised a textbook.

21. Published refereed journal article on scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL).
22. Published or provided online course supplements, templates, workbooks, or software for classroom use.
23. Exhibited extraordinary innovation in course design and delivery.
24. Developed and implemented a guest speaker series.
25. Developed significant relationship/involvement with community that benefits teaching.
26. Received internal or external grants related to teaching.
27. Served on Ph.D. student advisory committee and/or examination committee.
28. Participated in Ph.D. student training (seminars, committee work, mentor, etc.).
29. Conducted internal or external seminars or presentations on teaching.
30. Attended an FCTL or outside teaching workshop or training module.
31. Participated in the FCTL summer or winter multi-day workshop.
32. Attended one or more school teaching circles/seminars.
33. Completed the IDL 6543 course on web course design and development.
34. Performed other teaching related activities as assigned by the Director during the evaluation period.

Note: The above list is not exhaustive. Other activities may be counted toward the teaching performance evaluation if agreed upon by the faculty member and the School Director. Each item in the list may count multiple times per evaluation period. Winning any of the teaching awards marked with an asterisk (*) during the evaluation year results in a teaching evaluation of outstanding for the evaluation year.

c. Teaching Portfolio: The teaching portfolio, as part of the annual report, should contain the following information (as well as the items included in section II(b) of evaluation of teaching performance):

1. Statement of teaching and advising duties and responsibilities
2. Enrollment, information on types of courses, advising load
3. Statement of faculty member's approach or philosophy of teaching
4. Brief statement of materials, methods, and techniques used in achieving the desired outcomes (including any efforts made to improve quality and effectiveness of teaching, as well as the integration of leading edge research and knowledge into course content.)
5. Evaluation data indicating outcomes and achievements. These are determined by individual faculty members, but might include:
6. Summary of teaching evaluations
7. Voluntary peer evaluations
8. Brief qualitative assessments of student performance, materials developed
9. Grants awarded to improve teaching, methods or materials
10. Teaching awards
11. Participation in voluntary self-assessment and developmental efforts
12. Alumni assessments
13. Courses taken to improve the quality of teaching
14. Back-up materials can be made available, including samples of student work from current classes or samples of newly developed teaching materials.

In determining the overall evaluation, the Director may also consider mitigating factors such as the type of courses taught, size of class, time class offered, major/non-major ratio, required/non-required course, and extent to which course material was within the faculty member's area of

expertise.

III. Evaluation of Research Performance

The research component of each faculty member’s assignment will be evaluated based on research accomplishments during the evaluation period. Research accomplishments will be rated using the scale in Table 1. The Director shall consider research productivity and the contribution of this productivity to each faculty member’s research program and to the mission and goals of the school, college, and the university. This assessment includes the quantity and quality of publications in scholarly journals and other academic outlets, research contracts and grants, and other activities included in the list below. A ranking list of peer-reviewed journal for each discipline within the school will be used in assessing the quality of research outlets.

a. Research Evaluation Standards for Faculty (for evaluation period)

Table 2: Evaluation of research and creative activities

Performance Rating	Tenure-Earning & Research Faculty (2:2 teaching load)	Tenured Faculty with Research Assignment (3:3 teaching load)
Outstanding - <i>Meets two or more of the standards below</i>		
Publication(s) in peer-reviewed journals	2 ^x	1
Publication of a book	1	1
Publication of a book chapter (single authored)	1	1
Grant of \$25,000 or more	1	1
Presentation(s) at international/national conferences	2	1
Other - See additional research standards	1	1
Above Satisfactory - <i>Meets two or more of the standards below</i>		
Publication in peer-reviewed journals	1	1
A book contract signed	1	1
Publication of a book chapter	1	1
Grant of \$7,000 or more (includes UCF ORC grants)	1	1
Presentation(s) at International/National Conference	2	1
Other - See additional research standards	1	1
Satisfactory - <i>Meets two or more of the standards below</i>		
Submits a small grant proposal for research project	1	1
Publishes a scholarly manuscript in a professional newsletter or publication at the state level outlet	1	1
Publishes a non-peer-reviewed paper in a national publication	1	1
Submits a scholarly manuscript for peer-review in a journal	1	1
Publishes a book review for an appropriate journal	1	1
Serves as a peer reviewer for a professional journal or organization	1	1
Presentation presented at a local or regional professional meeting	1	1
A book chapter accepted for publication	1	1
Other – See additional research standards	1	1
Conditional – <i>Meets one or more of the standards below</i>		
Reviewer for a journal manuscript	1	1
An article manuscript in progress	1	1

Substantial work completed on a grant application	1	1
A presentation accepted at a national/international conference	1	1
Served as an evaluator for a local organization	1	1
Unsatisfactory – <i>Does not have any work in progress or a research agenda</i>		

^x Expected from tenure-earning faculty

b) Additional Research Standards (during the evaluation year):

1. Implements a funded grant or contract from a recognized source for work in progress.
2. Presents 1 peer-reviewed poster at a national meeting.
3. Recognized as an expert in the area of research, scholarship or creative activity at college, university or local level.
4. Maintains a publicly accessible resource of substantial benefit to the profession or public (at the School/Center webpage, for example).
5. Mentors student in research, scholarship or creative activity in some way not indicated above (e.g. helps students publish research, present poster at a conference).
6. Submits a major grant proposal (\$25,000 or more) for research or education project.
7. Presents a report of a funded grant at a local, regional or national meeting.
8. Renews contract for funding for an external grant.
9. Serves as keynote speaker at a national/international meeting.
10. Recognized as expert in area of scholarship, research, or creative activities at regional, national or international level.
11. Serves on an editorial board.
12. Edits professional journal.
13. Serves on a national review panel.
14. Editor of conference proceedings
15. Editor of special issue of a refereed journal
16. Section editor of refereed journal
17. Best paper awards from conferences
18. Invited research presentation at other colleges, universities, or institutes
19. Research presentations made to the public and nonprofit community
20. International, national, or regional research awards
21. Membership on PhD dissertation committees
22. Chair of PhD dissertation committee
23. Membership on advisory research councils
24. *Significant research award (s) from journals, external organizations, etc.
25. *RIA award
26. *University Excellence in Research Award
27. COHPA Excellence in Research Award
28. Research workshops conducted (internal and external)
29. Track or session chair, discussant or reviewer for professional conferences (research-related)
30. Strong portfolio of research in process
31. Demonstration of a programmatic approach to research (tight focus)
32. Successful completion of other research-related activities as assigned by the Director during the evaluation period

Notes: The above list is not considered exhaustive; faculty members may bring to the attention of the Director and document activities not included in the above list that may be counted towards the research performance evaluation.

Winning any of the research awards marked with an asterisk (*) during the evaluation year results in a research evaluation of outstanding for the evaluation year.

The faculty member and the Director may determine that certain research activities that require extraordinary time commitments may count as more than one research activity.

IV. Evaluation of Service Performance

The service component of each faculty member's assignment will be evaluated for the current evaluation year by the Director, and rated using the scale in Table 1. All service activities must be documented in the faculty member's annual report. An FTE Range for service is assigned or selected at the beginning of the fall semester, which should be 5-20%. The percentage can be changed in the spring semester and the average used in the final faculty evaluation by the Director. It is recognized that community and university service is expected of each faculty member and that this category contributes the least to promotion/tenure decisions.

a) Fundamental Service Activities (for evaluation period)

All faculty members are expected to complete each of the following "fundamental" service activities:

- 1) Actively participate in school meetings
- 2) Serve on a school committee or serve as a coordinator
- 3) Actively participate in school initiatives
- 4) Actively participate in college faculty meetings

Standards for a Rating of Outstanding

In addition to completing the fundamental service activities listed in section (a) above, a faculty member must complete *four* of the additional service activities below to be rated "outstanding."

Standards for a Rating of Above Satisfactory

In addition to completing the fundamental service activities listed in section (a) above, a faculty member must complete *three* of the additional service activities below to be rated "above satisfactory."

Standards for a Rating of Satisfactory

In addition to completing the fundamental service activities listed in section (a) above, a faculty member must complete *two* of the additional service activities below to be rated "satisfactory."

Standards for a Rating of Conditional

To receive a rating of "conditional" a faculty member must fail to complete *any* of the additional service activities below.

Standards for a Rating of Unsatisfactory

To achieve a rating of "unsatisfactory" in service, a faculty member must fail to meet the standards necessary to achieve a rating of "conditional" and fail to meet the expectation of foundational service activities listed in section (a) above.

b- Additional Service Activities (for evaluation period)

1. Serve on school or college faculty search committee and/or conference interviewing committee
2. Serve as a faculty advisor to student organizations, groups, competitions, etc.
3. Serve on school, college, or university committees/task forces beyond the basic expectation listed above. Multiple committee assignments count as multiple service activities
4. Chair school, college, or university committees/task forces beyond the basic expectation listed above
5. Provide professional service to scholarly and professional organizations, governmental boards, agencies, and commissions, at the state, regional, or national level
6. Serve in a leadership position related to accreditation activities
7. *Receive a college, university, or national Excellence in Service Award
8. Serve in a leadership position related to a UCF activity or initiative
9. Provide service to public schools or other higher education agencies
10. Deliver profession-related talks or speeches to university, local, regional, or national/international groups or organizations
11. Serve in a leadership role in professional and/or community organizations impacting the discipline/profession
12. Serve as a member of an accreditation site visit team or review board
13. Serve as an external reviewer for a promotion and tenure case at another university
14. Serve as a book reviewer for a peer reviewed journal
15. Serve as an officer in an organization relevant to the discipline, e.g., ASPA, ARNOVA, APPAM, APA, PMRA, etc.
16. Complete other service activities as agreed upon by the faculty member and the Director
17. Participate in media interviews on topics relative to our discipline
18. Serve the profession by reviewing a manuscript for a professional book/journal
19. Serve as a member of an editorial board on a journal/association board of directors.
20. Serve by substantially contributing to the effectiveness of any degree program through being generally available for and performing extra workload in terms of handling calls and requests for information, advising persons other than one's own advisees, and such other activities, that enhance the daily functioning of the school.

Notes: The above list is not considered exhaustive; faculty members may bring to the attention of the Director and document activities not included in the above list that may be counted towards the service performance evaluation.

In some circumstances, one or more of the additional service standards/activities will be allowed to substitute for the minimum requirements. For example, this might be the case if a faculty member's teaching schedule conflicted with faculty meetings.

The faculty member and the Director may determine that certain activities that require extraordinary time commitments may count as more than one service activity.

Winning a service award (internal/external) designated with an asterisk (*) during the evaluation year results in a service evaluation of outstanding for the evaluation year.

c- Reporting Service Activities: It is the faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate that a reported service activity represented a valuable contribution and a significant time commitment.

When listing service activities in the annual report, a faculty member must provide a brief description of the activity, including information such as the number of meetings, and an estimate of the amount of time spent on the activity during the year. If this information is not provided, the service activity will not be factored into the annual evaluation. Service assignments which result in little or no effort during the evaluation period will not be factored into the annual evaluation.

V. Evaluation of Performance on Other Activities

Other university duties are occasionally assigned for special activities, such as administrative duties or other special projects. Since the nature of these assignments is variable, no attempt is made to specify evaluation in proportion to the total amount of time, and the assignment is weighted in the annual assignment form.