

Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP)

Department of Psychology

*Approved – Faculty Excellence – April 2017
Available for first use academic year 2017-18*

Philosophy Underlying the Annual Review System

Our annual review process rests on the following philosophy: The system should be fair and consistent in application, useful in providing guidance to faculty, adaptable so that (regardless of assignment) there is equitable opportunity to earn merit increases, and helpful to cultivating exceptional faculty who will be integral to achieving UCF's Collective Impact Strategic Plan to "use the power of scale and the pursuit of excellence to solve tomorrow's greatest challenges and to make a better future for our students and society. Through learning, discovery, and partnerships, we transform lives and livelihoods."

The Department recognizes the importance of research, teaching, and service while honoring diverse patterns of activity and productivity. Weights are attached to teaching, research, and service that differ according to individual assignments. The overall rating shall include the weighting of these category ratings and shall be regarded as the final indicator of performance assessment.

To allow for diversity of achievement, discretion is allowed in the annual review system for the chair and the individual faculty member to negotiate the relative weights placed on teaching, research, and service by the first week of June. (On rare occasions a faculty member may have a major assignment for the year that does not constitute research, teaching, and service. In this event, a fourth category of "other" will be added to what is described below and the weight assigned to this category will be negotiated with the chair. Because this is likely to be infrequent, what follows includes only research, teaching, and service.)

Major Steps

1. Assignment of Responsibilities

Prior to making assignments (ideally during the first week of June), the Chair will notify faculty that assignments are being made and encourage them to discuss their activities for the upcoming period and the weights attached to teaching, research, and service assignments. The chair will provide the faculty assignment, in writing, to each faculty member, as detailed in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

2. Submission of Annual Report to the chair

Faculty submit their Annual Report at the end of the reporting period, as specified in the CBA. The report format is provided and summarizes accomplishments in research, teaching, and service during that period. Faculty should consider their specific accomplishments and performances and the relative importance of each to the research, teaching, or service mission of the department.

Attached to the Annual Report is a narrative summary of the accomplishments and performances that faculty consider most important to their annual evaluation, including a short justification of its importance to their overall evaluation. The list of scaled standards provides guidance on the relative importance of various accomplishments and performances. The narrative provides the opportunity for faculty to explain how they believe a specific accomplishment exceeds written criteria. For instance, a publication in a journal with a lower impact factor might have greater importance by virtue of a number of other considerations. Lower than usual course evaluations might be the result of special circumstances such as a new preparation or unforeseen and unavoidable problems. Faculty can use the narrative to describe these mitigating circumstances.

3. Chair Review and Final Ratings

The department chair makes the final performance ratings.

4. Review by faculty and submission to the Dean

Faculty will be given the chair's evaluation and will have an opportunity to discuss this evaluation with the chair and to attach a concise comment to the evaluation, as per the CBA. Faculty are encouraged to meet with the chair to discuss ideas and ways to improve performance ratings.

Typical/Example Assignments for Teaching, Research, and Service

The faculty assignments are used as weights in combining the ratings for research, teaching, and service. These weights indicate the relative importance of each area to the evaluation of a faculty member at that rank. The following are "typical" assignments, but will be adjusted to reflect the faculty member's individual assignment.

Tenure earning/Tenured professor (Normally a 2/2 teaching load):

50 research
45 teaching
05 service

Instructors and Lecturers (Normally a 4/4 teaching load):

0 research
95 teaching
05 service

Clinical Professor (Normally a 2/2 teaching load)

0 research
45 teaching
5 service
50 other duties (clinical service)

While the example assignments listed above are typical for faculty, they may be adjusted for the upcoming evaluation period due to considerations in any area of research, teaching, or service. Thus, if faculty anticipate decreases or increases in their research activity, they may negotiate with the chair to adjust their assignments accordingly. Additionally, if faculty anticipate decreases or increases in their service activities (e.g., through program directorship or department initiative), they may negotiate with the chair to adjust their assignments accordingly.

1. At the assistant professor tenure earning rank, research and teaching are the most important factors in the awarding of tenure. The department aspires to national prominence in research and consistent with this aspiration, tenure earning junior faculty members are recruited because of their potential to establish a productive and visible research program. Promotion and tenure requires an outstanding record and clear potential to develop a nationally visible research program. The least important factor in the evaluation of tenure earning assistant professors is service. Assistant professors are expected to provide service through participation on department committees.
2. At the associate professor rank, the expectation is that faculty will do more than show promise of research productivity. According to the current standards for promotion and tenure, "To seek the rank of Professor, consistent and increasingly significant achievements must be evidenced. There is no specific time period specified for the establishment of a pattern of performance consistent with achievement of the rank of Professor. The hallmark suggesting readiness for the submission of a promotion file is a record of sustained excellence and nationally recognized contributions to the field." One might also expect that those who achieve the rank of tenured associate professor have proven themselves to be effective teachers. Thus, despite the emphasis on research productivity, sustained evidence of teaching effectiveness is also necessary. Service is least important, but a tenured associated professor is expected to become involved in service within and beyond the department (i.e., the college, university, and/or the profession).
3. At the professor rank, the expectation is that the individual will continue to have a productive research program and contribute to departmental teaching. But in comparison to other professorial ranks, full professors are expected to provide service through leadership roles within and beyond the department (i.e., the college, university, and/or the profession). This could include active participation in committees, chairing of committees, and directing graduate programs.
4. At the instructor and lecturer ranks, the expectation is that the individual's primary responsibility is teaching. Service to the department through participation on department committees is also required as assigned. Research, on the other hand, may or may not be expected. If the faculty member requests part of his or her assignment to be in research, it will be weighted in determining the annual evaluation. If there is no assignment in research, no evaluation will be made for this

dimension and the overall evaluation will be based solely on teaching and service.

I. Teaching Activities:

We acknowledge the limitations of student evaluations as the sole means of evaluating teaching. Faculty may provide other material including course materials, informal and formal peer evaluations, and grade distributions. It is the responsibility of faculty to describe their importance. For instance, faculty may wish to have new preparations, challenging course material, a large class, and other factors taken into consideration.

Teaching at a major research university includes training and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students in addition to classroom instruction. These activities often occur outside the traditional classroom setting, but are nonetheless important to the overall mission of a research university – e.g., the development of a future generation of scholars. Teaching the necessary skills to be successful in this endeavor includes supervising undergraduate honors theses and encouraging undergraduates to participate in faculty research. At the graduate level supervising master's theses and dissertations, supporting students' efforts to publish their research, and providing guidance on obtaining pre-doctoral and post-doctoral extramural and intramural research support are all aspects of effective teaching. Excellence in these realms can be assessed, for example, by an undergraduate's entry into a desirable and competitive graduate training program, research publications of supervised students, and student success at obtaining research funding.

The minimum standards to receive a satisfactory rating for faculty assigned the minimum of one lecture class during the reporting period regardless of research assignment include the following:

1. Meets classes on a regular basis as scheduled.
2. Holds scheduled office hours.
3. Replies in a timely fashion to student inquiries, normally within 2 business days.
4. Provides accurate and effective advisement when requested.
5. Submits book orders on time as required by state legislation.
6. Provides clear and detailed course syllabi that meet university requirements.
7. Provides regular and timely evaluative feedback on student assignments.
8. Meets with students during the final examination period in compliance with university regulations.
9. Submits grades on time.
10. Provides evidence that courses are taught with appropriate content, learning objectives, and rigor.

Nominal Rating Scale for Teaching for Faculty Supervising Graduate Students

- a. **Outstanding:** Clearly exceptional achievements in the instruction and mentoring of students, including but not limited to successful supervision of student research,

and student advising. Provides strong evidence of teaching effectiveness by highlighting student learning, the use of evidence-based pedagogy, etc. Student ratings from lecture classes that are predominately (i.e. 60% or more) in the top two categories (“Excellent” and “Very Good”) of the rating scale, and timely passage of student supervisees through major hurdles such as the publication of research, presentation of conference papers, successful completion of comps, theses, dissertations, etc.

Example: Submission of documentation of a flipped classroom and service-learning components in classes. 73% of the overall student ratings a faculty member receives for INP 6317- Organizational Psychology and Motivation (a core graduate class) are in the “Excellent” and “Very Good” categories. Served as chair for two HIM theses, and supervised three graduate students’ research and/or dissertations.

- b. **Above satisfactory:** Conscientious and dedicated performance as an instructor including but not limited to successful supervision of student research, student advising, and student ratings that are between 50% - 59% in the top two categories (“Excellent” or “Very Good”) categories in the rating scale.

Example: 58% of the overall student ratings a faculty member receives for EXP 6506 Human Cognition and Learning are in the “Excellent” and “Very Good” categories. They serve as chair for two HIM theses, and serve on four graduate students’ research committees.

- c. **Satisfactory:** Acceptable performance as an instructor including but not limited to student ratings that are predominately in the middle category of the rating scale. Specifically, 51% or more are in the “Good” category, but not in the “Excellent” or “Very Good” category. Acceptable research supervision and/or advisement of students.

Example: 55% of the overall student ratings a faculty member receives for DEP 2004C Developmental Psychology and SOP 3723 Cross Cultural Psychology are in the “Good” category, and they supervise one HIM thesis or graduate student research and/or dissertation project.

- d. **Conditional:** Substantial shortcomings in teaching performance and/or research supervision requiring remedial action.

Example: 50% of the overall student ratings a faculty member receives for INP 3004C and SOP 3004C Social Psychology are below the “Good” category. They do not supervise HIM thesis or participate in graduate student research and/or dissertation projects.

- e. **Unsatisfactory:** Two consecutive years of conditional ratings in teaching performance.

Nominal Rating Scale for Teaching for Faculty Not Supervising Graduate Students

- a. **Outstanding:** Provides strong evidence of teaching effectiveness by highlighting student learning, the use of evidence-based pedagogy, etc. Conscientious and dedicated performance as an instructor including but not limited to student ratings that are predominately (i.e. 60% or more) in the top two categories of the rating scale (“Excellent” and “Very Good”) in addition to providing significant undergraduate student mentorship.

Example: Submission of documentation of a flipped classroom and service-learning components. 70% of the overall student ratings a faculty member receives for PSY 3204C Statistical Methods in Psychology that are in the “Excellent” and “Very

Good” categories, they serve as chair for two HIM theses, and sponsor the local Psychology Club.

- b. **Above satisfactory:** Conscientious and dedicated performance as an instructor including, but not limited to student ratings that are between 50% - 59% in the top two categories (“Excellent” or “Very Good”) categories in the rating scale.

Example: 52% of the overall student ratings a faculty member receives for EXP 3404C Basic Learning Processes that are in the “Excellent” and “Very Good” categories, they periodically present to local undergraduate student organizations on topics of interest.

- c. **Satisfactory:** Acceptable performance as an instructor including but not limited to student ratings that are 55% or more in the “Good” category, but not in the “Excellent” or “Very Good” category. Acceptable research supervision and/or advisement of students.

Example: 60% of the overall assessment student ratings a faculty member receives are in the “Good” category for PPE 3003C Personality Research. They are minimally involved in student engagement activities.

- d. **Conditional:** Substantial shortcomings in teaching performance and/or research supervision requiring remedial action.

Example: 50% of the overall student ratings a faculty members receives are below the below the “Good” category for PSB 3002 Physiological Psychology. Does not hold scheduled office hours.

Unsatisfactory: Two consecutive years of conditional ratings in teaching performance.

II. Research and Creative Activities:

In evaluating faculty research the Department looks for evidence that the research program has or will have significant impact on the field. Although a certain frequency of publication is generally necessary for establishing a research reputation, sheer number of publications is neither the only nor the most important index of research productivity. Efforts to secure external research funding are expected of all faculty with a research assignment and both the quality and success of grant proposals will be used in merit evaluations.

Documentation of research productivity will be provided on the Faculty Annual Report in the form of a list of publications, presentations, grant proposals submitted and grants/contracts awarded during the year.

Faculty are also encouraged to provide other documents that will allow assessment of quality and quantity of research activities. These might include letters from editors or reviewers, published reviews of books, and a personal statement that places the year’s work in the context of the individual’s overall program of research.

A primary mission of the Department of Psychology is to achieve international and national visibility for excellence in research. Consequently, the department expects all tenured and tenure earning faculty to demonstrate a sustained record of scholarly achievement. The evaluation of research excellence involves an examination of a number of standards. Of course, there is the evaluation of productivity.. However, evaluation of research excellence also

involves examination of research quality, its impact on the broader discipline, the continuity of the faculty member's research program, and the intellectual independence of the research program.

Quantity– In assessing productivity, primary emphasis is given to publications in refereed journals. Refereed book chapters will be considered positively in the context of a sustained record of refereed publications and where those chapters indicate evidence of national and international recognition. Textbooks can contribute to the scholarship of a field when they make a significant and demonstrable intellectual contribution. However, the contributions of book chapters and textbooks must be documented, and book chapters and textbooks are generally more useful for demonstrating scholarship at senior levels. Presentations at meetings are encouraged as a way of testing ideas in public forums but will not substitute for publications.

Impact and quality of research – The quality and impact of a faculty member's research will be an important component of the assessment of scholarly contribution. Where the impact of the faculty's work may be unclear to chair, the individual faculty have the responsibility of presenting journal reputation, impact and rejection rates, and other information for consideration in judgments of quality. Citation analyses are required in the annual report and can be useful, but those analyses must be done in the context of the citation expectations for top scholars in the candidate's area of research. Again, it is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to provide a context for this information so that the chair can properly evaluate this information.

Nominal Rating Scale for Research for Faculty with more than a 20 percent research assignment

(Publications appearing in press or in print during the reporting period and the previous two years are used in the count.)

- a. **Outstanding:** Clear evidence of scholarly achievement that achieves national or international visibility. Five publications in journals with significant impact as indicated by indexing in Psychinfo, or Pubmed, and the Department list of accepted journals. Submission of an external grant proposal or multiple internal proposals for funding count as the equivalent as a publication.
Example: A faculty member has five publications in journals indexed in Psychinfo, and the Department list of accepted journals, as well as one proposal under review at SAMSHA. The faculty member has several conference presentations during the current reporting period at APA and APS (SIOP, HFES, or ABCT).
- b. **Above satisfactory:** Clear scholarly achievement with the potential of achieving national or international visibility. Three publications in journals with significant impact as indicated by indexing in Psychinfo, or Pubmed, and the Department list of accepted journals.
Example: A faculty member has two publications in journals indexed in the Department list of accepted journals and one funding proposal under review. The faculty member also has a conference presentation during the current reporting period at APA (APS, SIOP, HFES, or ABCT).

- c. **Satisfactory:** Scholarly achievement but little evidence that there is a coherent research program that will achieve national or international visibility.
Example: The faculty member has published once in the last 3 years in journals indexed in Psychinfo or Pubmed and the Department list of accepted journals. They also have a conference presentation during the current reporting period at APA (APS, SIOP, HFES, or ABCT).
- d. **Conditional:** a deficient record of scholarship characterized by unacceptable quantity and/or quality of research.
Example: The faculty member has not published or presented at a National conference for two years.
- e. **Unsatisfactory:** Two consecutive years of conditional ratings in research performance.

Nominal Rating Scale for Research for Faculty with a 20 percent or less research assignment

(Publications appearing in press or in print during the reporting period and the previous two years are used in the evaluation.)

- a. **Outstanding:** A recipient of an outstanding evaluation would have an active research program and clear evidence of several research accomplishments which includes two publications.
Example: A faculty member has at least two publications in a journal indexed in Pubmed or Psychinfo. The faculty member has several National conference presentations during the current reporting period at APA (APS, SIOP, HFES, or ABCT).
- b. **Above satisfactory:** A typical recipient of an above satisfactory evaluation would have a promising research program with clear evidence of a research accomplishment such as a publication.
Example: A faculty has member published a paper in a journal indexed in Pubmed or Psychinfo, and has several National conference presentations during the current reporting period at APA (APS, SIOP, HFES, or ABCT).
- c. **Satisfactory:** Scholarly achievement with the prospect of a research accomplishment such as a publication.
Example: The faculty member has presented at SEPA during the reporting period and does not have any publications, but is working on a publication and can show progress on that publication over the year.
- d. **Conditional:** Scholarly achievement with little prospect of a research accomplishment such as a publication. No publications and no presentations at conferences. No evidence of progress on a publication over the year.
Example: The faculty member has not presented at a regional conference during the past year.
- e. **Unsatisfactory:** two consecutive years of conditional ratings in research performance.

III. Service:

All faculty are expected to provide service to the Department, the College, the University, and the Profession of Psychology. Faculty are expected to share in the governance and necessary activities of the department through committee assignments, teaching of service courses, and so on. However, involvement in service activities differs according to rank. Assistant Professors in their first term are only expected to provide service at the Department level. As a faculty member's career progresses, the nature of service activities is expected to change, with participation in activities at the Department, College, University, and profession levels. Faculty at the rank of Professor should be involved in leadership roles in service to the department and the profession. Professors are more likely than the other ranks to obtain high profile-positions as journal editors, editorial board members, executive board members of professional organizations. These activities bring recognition to UCF and should be encouraged.

Institutional service may include serving on committees or task forces, writing reports and other internal documents, mentoring junior faculty, attending UCF commencement exercises, and accepting major administrative assignments inside or outside the Department. Service to the profession may include reviewing manuscripts and grant proposals, serving in an official capacity within a professional organization, serving as an editor or member of an editorial board, and serving as an external reviewer for another institution. Faculty may also choose to provide professional service to the community, for example by serving on community boards or task forces, by consulting to public and private organizations, and by providing training or professional services to the members of the community. To be considered part of a faculty member's professional performance, community service should involve the application of professional expertise, not simply the contribution of time and effort. In general, service contributions may be documented by a list of activities undertaken during the year under review. Where a faculty member wishes service to be given special weight in merit evaluations, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate the importance of this activity in the narrative summary that accompanies the annual report.

Service to professional organizations is a component of service excellence and can involve activities as offices held in state, national or international societies. However, because service is not the primary responsibility of any faculty in this department, and this department has only a limited outreach role, it is not expected that service will ever be the most important component of faculty evaluation.

Since service assignments typically range from 5 to 15 percent for all faculty whether they are tenure earning, tenured, or lecturers the merit ratings are based on the same definitions.

The minimum standards to receive a satisfactory rating for service include the following:

1. Holds membership in at least 1 department committee.
2. Regularly attends and contributes meaningfully to the committee(s) assigned.
3. If tenured, provides evidence of contributions to at least one other form of institutional and/or community service (e.g., at least one college, university, or profession committee, serves on an editorial board).
4. Attend at least one commencement ceremony.

Nominal Rating Scale for Service for All Faculty

(Credit for Service on Committees requires regular attendance and participation.)

- a. **Outstanding:** Exceptional service contributions to the university, college, department and profession including, as a minimum, work on 3 or more

committees as a member or chair, and service on committees in professional organization in the faculty member's discipline.

Example: A faculty member Chairs the University Library committee and is a faculty sponsor of the campus Psi Chi student organization (directs a program, or a major regional campus initiative). They also serve on committees. An outstanding evaluation on service requires active participation that leads to clear contributions, not merely membership.

- b. **Above satisfactory:** Above average contributions to the university, college, or department and/or discipline through participation in 2 university committees and/or service on committees in professional organizations.

Example: The faculty member serves on the clinical MA graduate program committee and the College of Sciences P&T committee and participates in a way that leads to clear contributions, not merely membership.

- c. **Satisfactory:** Acceptable service including membership on at least 1 university, college or department committees or participation in professional organizations.

Example: The faculty member serves on the Undergraduate Program Committee department committee and participates in a way that leads to clear contributions, not merely membership.

- d. **Conditional:** a deficient record of service including but not limited to a failure to participate in essential activities expected of faculty (e.g. failure to attend committee meetings).

Example: The faculty member's missed at least half of the Clinical Program committee meetings and they are not engaged as indicated by participation in discussions or timely responses to email votes.

- e. **Unsatisfactory:** two consecutive years of conditional ratings in service.

IV. Other Assigned Duties - Clinical Service

Faculty members providing Clinical Service are expected to practice in a manner consistent with the profession's ethical and professional standards. Furthermore, it is expected that the direct delivery of care will inform student training whenever possible. This may take the form of student observation, co-therapist roles, or inclusion in other pedagogical activities.

It is noted that patient satisfaction, while important, is not the sole determinant of the quality of care. Therefore, faculty members providing clinical services are encouraged to provide other forms of evaluation, such as peer ratings.

The minimum standards for acceptable performance of clinical service are listed below:

1. Practices in a manner consistent with state and national ethical guidelines.
2. Utilizes empirically supported treatments whenever they are available.
3. Meets clients on a regular basis as scheduled.
4. Replies in a timely fashion to client inquiries, normally within 2 business days.
5. Maintains clinical records as required by the state licensing association and state laws.
6. Takes appropriate steps to secure compensation for services rendered.
7. Appropriate supervision of clinical services provided by students, including timely review of notes and reports.

Nominal Rating Scale for Clinical Services for All Faculty

- a. **Outstanding:** Clearly exceptional achievements in the delivery of clinical services. This includes satisfying each of the minimum standards for satisfactory performance as described above. Additionally, the faculty member demonstrates excellence in clinical service as demonstrated by any 3 of the below:
 - a. Patient Satisfaction Ratings (> 80% Above Satisfactory or Outstanding)
 - b. Peer Evaluations (rated as Outstanding by peer)
 - c. Documentation of specialized training in clinical services
 - d. Maintenance of a case load greater than the minimum assigned
 - e. Publication or presentation of case studies in a Department-approved outlet
 - f. Publication of clinical manuals or handbooks
 - g. Awards, certifications, fellowships or other recognition for clinical service.
 - h. Delivery of workshops for practitioners
- b. **Above Satisfactory:** Outstanding: Clearly exceptional achievements in the delivery of clinical services. This includes satisfying each of the minimum standards for satisfactory performance as described above. Additionally, the faculty member demonstrates excellence in clinical service as demonstrated by any 2 of the below:
 - a. Patient Satisfaction Ratings (> 80% Above Satisfactory or Outstanding)
 - b. Peer Evaluations (rated as Outstanding by peer)
 - c. Documentation of specialized training in clinical services
 - d. Maintenance of a case load greater than the minimum assigned
 - e. Publication or presentation of case studies in a Department-approved outlet
 - f. Publication of clinical manuals or handbooks
 - g. Awards, certifications, fellowships or other recognition for clinical service.
 - h. Delivery of workshops for practitioners
- c. **Satisfactory:** Clearly exceptional achievements in the delivery of clinical services. This includes satisfying each of the minimum standards for satisfactory performance as described above. Additionally, the faculty member demonstrates excellence in clinical service as demonstrated by any 1 of the below:
 - a. Patient Satisfaction Ratings (> 80% Above Satisfactory or Outstanding)
 - b. Peer Evaluations (rated as Outstanding by peer)
 - c. Documentation of specialized training in clinical services
 - d. Maintains assigned case load
 - e. Publication or presentation of case studies in a Department-approved outlet
 - f. Publication of clinical manuals or handbooks
 - g. Awards, certifications, fellowships or other recognition for clinical service.
 - h. Delivery of workshops for practitioners
- d. **Conditional:** A deficient record in the delivery of clinical service as evidenced by a failure to satisfy one or more of the minimum standards set forth above.
- e. **Unsatisfactory:** two consecutive years of conditional ratings in Other Duties – Clinical Service.