

**Department of Physics  
University of Central Florida**

**ANNUAL EVALUATION OF LECTURERS, INSTRUCTORS, AND VISITING  
FACULTY**

**Standards & Guidelines for Evaluation of Faculty**

APPROVED BY THE TENURED PHYSICS FACULTY ON APRIL 7, 2017  
REVISIONS REQUESTED BY DEAN JOHNSON (SUMMER 2017)  
REVISED VERSION PROPOSED BY THE REVIEW COMMITTEE ON NOV 28, 2017  
REVISIONS APPROVED BY THE TENURED FACULTY ON DEC 4, 2017  
Available for First Use 2018-19

**Basic Assumptions**

1. Faculty at the Lecturer or Instructor rank and Visiting Faculty are non tenure-earning and will normally not have a research assignment, but such an assignment may be provided upon agreement between the Chair and the faculty member. 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 gives general principles for the annual evaluation of faculty with the rank of Lecturer, Instructor, or Visiting Faculty in the Department. Part II lists the evaluation criteria classified as major or minor. Part III sets forth specific minimum points that guarantee an evaluation of Conditional, Satisfactory, and Above Satisfactory in the individual categories of Teaching, Research, Service, and Other Duties and how these are employed to determine the annual Overall evaluation. Part IV contains possible examples of the various evaluation categories.

The Department follows the rules set by the BOT/UFF collective bargaining agreements, and the guidelines set by the College of Sciences.

**Part I. EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

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

**A. Teaching**

High quality teaching is expected of each faculty member. Faculty must demonstrate dedication, effectiveness, and high standards in courses, student advising, and mentoring.

## **B. Research**

Lecturers, Instructors, and Visiting Faculty who receive a research assignment are expected to develop programs of high quality and demonstrate scholarly productivity.

## **C. Service**

Committee work at the Department, College, and University levels will be evaluated. Professional service and outreach will be recognized, as will exceptional service to the Department, College, and University.

## **D. Other**

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**

## **A. Teaching**

### **1. Classroom Instruction**

- a) Complete syllabi in compliance with university and departmental standards --- MAJOR
- b) Complete end-of-term course packs, consisting of syllabus, exams, major assignments, and grade distribution --- MAJOR
- c) Student Perception of Instruction scores and comments considered in the context of grade distributions and course characteristics --- MAJOR
- d) Other evidence of teaching effectiveness – MAJOR
- e) Peer evaluations if requested by the faculty member, following the guidelines in the Collective Bargaining Agreement Article 10 --- MAJOR

### **2. Directing Undergraduate Students**

- a) Supervision of honors theses --- MAJOR
- b) Supervision of directed research --- MAJOR
- c) Supervision of independent study --- MINOR
- d) Publications by students under the faculty member supervision --- MAJOR
- e) Conference presentations of students under the supervision of the faculty member --- MAJOR
- f) Awards received by students under the supervision of the faculty member --- MAJOR

### **3. Curriculum & Course Development**

- a) Major course initiatives or revisions --- MAJOR

- b) Development of teaching laboratories --- MAJOR
- c) Introduction and teaching of new courses --- MAJOR
- d) Introduction of new teaching or assessment methodologies --- MAJOR
- e) Publication of pedagogic articles, textbooks, and laboratory manuals --- MAJOR
- f) Development of web-based courses and materials --- MAJOR

#### 4. Grants & Contracts Supporting Teaching

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

#### 5. Supplemental Instruction

- a) Student mentoring --- MINOR
- b) Conducting help sessions for students --- MINOR
- c) Teaching outside a regularly scheduled course --- MINOR
- d) Coordinator of multi-section classes and laboratories --- MINOR

#### 6. Other

- a) Attendance in conferences and workshops with the objective of improving one's teaching and student learning --- MINOR
- b) Presentations in conferences and workshops about one's own teaching --- MINOR

### **B. Research**

#### 1. Scholarly Work

- a) Papers accepted or published in peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings listed in the ISI Web of Science --- MAJOR
- b) Publication of refereed scholarly books or chapters --- MAJOR
- c) Other publications --- MINOR
- d) Paper submitted but not yet accepted for publication --- MINOR
- e) Number of citations received in the evaluation period reported in the ISI Web of Science --- MAJOR
- f) Increase in the H (Hirsch) factor over the evaluation period, as reported in the ISI Web of Science --- MINOR
- g) Submission of research articles to refereed journals --- MINOR
- h) Contributed presentations in research conferences and workshops --- MINOR
- i) Invited presentations in research conferences and workshops --- MAJOR
- j) Invited seminars at other research institutions --- MAJOR
- k) Filing of patents --- MAJOR
- l) Disclosure of inventions --- MINOR

#### 2. Research Grants & Contracts

- a) Award of external grants or contracts as P.I./I. or co-P.I./co-I. --- MAJOR
  - b) Submission of proposals --- MINOR
  - c) Award of internal funds as P.I./I. or co-P.I./co-I. --- MINOR
  - d) Participation in external grants & contracts as non-P.I./I. or non-co-P.I./co-I. --- MINOR
  - e) Award of facility time in observatories, national laboratories, supercomputers, etc., or flight opportunities --- MAJOR
3. Award of fellowships, grants, and consulting contracts outside the university that enable research --- MINOR

### **C. Service**

#### 1. Service to the Department

- a) Leadership of departmental committees --- MAJOR
- b) Membership in departmental committees --- MINOR
- c) Exceptional activity in departmental committees --- MAJOR
- d) Oversight of major departmental facilities --- MAJOR
- e) Other non-assigned activities such as recruitment, advising, and departmental governance --- MAJOR
- f) Obtaining donations of major facility or equipment --- MAJOR
- g) Attendance at commencement ceremonies --- MINOR

#### 2. Service Outside the Department

- a) Service on College and University committees --- MAJOR
- b) Involvement in interdisciplinary and interdepartmental activities --- MAJOR

#### 3. Memberships on Thesis and Dissertation Committees --- MINOR

#### 4. Service to the Profession

- a) Editor of scholarly journals --- MAJOR
- b) Reviewing for scholarly journals and conference proceedings --- MINOR
- c) Serving on review panels for funding agencies and user facilities --- MAJOR
- d) Reviewing proposals for funding agencies --- MINOR
- e) Serving as an officer or committee member for professional organizations --- MAJOR
- f) Chairing conference sessions --- MINOR
- g) Organizing conferences, workshops, summer schools, and technical sessions --- MAJOR

#### 5. Professional-Related Service and Outreach to Elementary or Secondary Schools or the Community --- MAJOR

### **D. 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 LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE**

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. Points available for each evaluation category.

	MAJOR	MINOR	Maximum points
Teaching	17	8	109
Research	8	10	70
Service	12	6	78

The numerical scores that result will be used to determine the annual evaluation in each of the categories. Table 2 records the range of scores needed in each of the evaluation categories in order to achieve the indicated evaluation for that category, according to the faculty member group, as defined in Table 3.

All faculty in the Department of Physics are expected to meet the following minimum standards:

1. Teaching with appropriate content and learning objectives.
2. Meeting face-to-face and mixed mode classes on a regular basis as scheduled.
3. When teaching online courses, maintaining a regular online presence.
4. Holding scheduled office hours.
5. Replying in a timely fashion to student inquiries.
6. Providing advisement when requested.
7. Submitting book orders on time as required by state legislation.
8. Providing course syllabi that meet university requirements.
9. Providing timely evaluative feedback on student assessments (exams, quizzes, papers, homework), as requested.
10. Submitting final grades by the university deadline.

To be rated Satisfactory or better in Teaching requires carrying out all of the above and achieving the corresponding score in Table 2, below.

All faculty are expected to give appropriate service, as follows:

1. Participate effectively in any assigned committee or other assigned departmental or university service.
2. Attend faculty meetings.

To be rated Satisfactory or better in Service requires carrying out all of the above and achieving the requisite score in Table 2, below.

An evaluation of Outstanding will be based on the same criteria outlined in Part II, but without an assignment of specific minimum points to achieve that evaluation. Based on the overall performance in each category, a higher evaluation may be given than the one determined by the minimum points in Table 2.

Table 2. Point ranges and corresponding ratings for the evaluation categories according to the faculty group.

	Teaching T1 – T3	Research T1	Research T2	Service T1 – T3
Above Satisfactory	$\geq 20$	$\geq 7$	$\geq 4$	$\geq 10$
Satisfactory	19 – 11	6 – 3	3 – 2	9 – 5
Conditional	10 – 4	2 – 1	1	4 – 2
Unsatisfactory	$\leq 3$	0	0	$\leq 1$

Table 3. Faculty members may be placed in the following groups, depending on their teaching, service, and research loads:

Category	Teaching FTE	Research FTE	Service FTE	Course Load
<b>T1</b>	0.50 – 0.65	0.10 – 0.25	0.15 – 0.25	2 + 2
<b>T2</b>	0.80 – 0.90	0.00 – 0.10	0.05 – 0.10	3 + 3
<b>T3</b>	1.00	0.00	0.00	4 + 4

### Overall Evaluation

The Department 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 with different assignments. In no case will an individual receive an overall Outstanding evaluation if they do not 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 FTE work assignment for that activity times 100. For illustration, consider the four following examples.

1. An associate lecturer with an assigned research workload of 0.25 FTE and a rating of Above Satisfactory would receive 75 points for their research assignment.
2. An instructor with an assigned teaching workload of 0.90 FTE and a rating of Outstanding would receive 360 points.
3. A lecturer with an assigned service workload of 0.10 FTE and a rating of Satisfactory would receive 20 points.
4. An associate lecturer with an assignment of 0.30 FTE to other assigned duties and a rating of Above Satisfactory would receive 90 points.

The sum of these numbers (up to a maximum of 400 points) will be converted to an overall evaluation according to Table 4.

Table 4. Point ranges for the overall evaluation ratings.

Above Satisfactory	$\geq 266$
Satisfactory	265 – 176
Conditional	175 – 100
Unsatisfactory	99 – 0

## **Part IV. EXAMPLES OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS**

The examples below cover all possible ratings for all types of assignments for the three distinct groups of lecturer, instructor, and visiting faculty (T1, T2, and T3).

### **A. Examples for evaluation of INSTRUCTION & ADVISEMENT for Physics faculty members (T1-T3)**

Example #1 of Outstanding:

- Compliant syllabi and complete end-of-term course packs are readily available
- Student Perception of Instruction average scores were mostly “very good” or above
- Supervised research for several undergraduate students
- Students co-authored scientific publications
- Students presented their results in meetings.

Example #2 of Outstanding:

- Compliant syllabi and complete end-of-term course packs are readily available
- Student Perception of Instruction average scores were “good” or above
- Introduced innovative new courses
- Showed evidence of teaching effectiveness
- Presented papers at conferences dedicated to teaching reform (AAPT, APS, etc)
- Awarded a grant to support teaching (e.g., for curriculum reform).

Example #1 of Above Satisfactory:

- Compliant syllabi and complete end-of-term course packs are readily available
- Student Perception of Instruction average scores were “very good” or above
- Supervised an honors thesis
- Offered a new course

Example #2 of Above Satisfactory:

- Compliant syllabi and complete end-of-term course packs are readily available
- Supervised research for several undergraduate students
- Showed evidence of teaching effectiveness
- Submitted a grant proposal to support teaching (e.g., for curriculum reform)

Example #1 of Satisfactory:

- Compliant syllabi and complete end-of-term course packs are readily available
- Student Perception of Instruction average scores were “good” or above
- Conducted supplementary instructions (help sessions, extra office hours, etc)

Example #2 of Satisfactory:



- Compliant syllabi and complete end-of-term course packs are readily available
- Presented a paper at a conference dedicated to teaching reform (AAPT, APS, etc)
- Supervised research of an undergraduate student

Example #1 of Conditional:

- Noncompliant syllabi or incomplete end-of-term course packs
- Student Perception of Instruction average scores were “fair” or below
- Supervised an independent study

Example #2 of Conditional:

- Noncompliant syllabi or incomplete end-of-term course packs
- Conducted supplementary instructions (help sessions, extra office hours, etc)

Example #1 of Unsatisfactory:

- Noncompliant syllabi or incomplete or inexistent end-of-term course packs
- Student Perception of Instruction average scores were “poor”

Example #2 of Unsatisfactory:

- Noncompliant syllabi or incomplete or inexistent end-of-term course packs
- Evidence exists of unfulfilled course requirements (e.g., classes canceled, tests not administered, grading not following syllabus policy)

## **B. Examples for evaluation of RESEARCH for Physics T1 faculty members**

Example #1 of Outstanding:

- Published at least one paper in an indexed, peer-reviewed journal
- Gave a contributed presentation at a conference
- Received external funding

Example #2 of Outstanding:

- Published several papers in indexed, peer-reviewed journals
- Gave an invited talk at a conference
- Award facility time at a national laboratory, observatory, or telescope

Example #1 of Above Satisfactory:

- Published a paper in an indexed, peer-reviewed journal
- Gave a contributed talk at conference

- Award facility time at a national laboratory, observatory, or telescope

Example #2 of Above Satisfactory:

- Published a paper in a high-impact, indexed, peer-reviewed journal
- Gave an invited talk at another institution
- Gave a contributed presentation at a conference

Example #1 of Satisfactory:

- Published a paper in an indexed, peer-reviewed journal
- Gave a contributed presentation at a conference

Example #2 of Satisfactory:

- Published several conference proceedings
- Submitted one grant proposal

Example #1 of Conditional:

- Published only one paper in an indexed, peer-reviewed journal
- Did not give any contributed presentation at any conference

Example #2 of Conditional:

- Did not publish any paper in indexed, peer-reviewed journal
- Submitted a paper for publication in an indexed, peer-reviewed journal

Example #1 of Unsatisfactory:

- Did not publish any paper or conference proceeding
- Did not submit any grant proposal or received any funding
- Did not give any contributed presentation in any conference

### **C. Examples for evaluation of RESEARCH for Physics T2 faculty members**

Example #1 of Outstanding:

- Published at least one paper in an indexed, peer-reviewed journal
- Gave a contributed presentation at a conference

Example #2 of Outstanding:

- Gave an invited talk at a conference
- Received a large number of citations during the evaluation period

- Award facility time at a national laboratory, observatory, or telescope

Example #1 of Above Satisfactory:

- Published a few papers in indexed, peer-reviewed journals

Example #2 of Above Satisfactory:

- Gave an invited talk at an international conference

Example #1 of Satisfactory:

- Gave a contributed presentation at a conference

Example #2 of Satisfactory:

- Published in conference proceedings

Example #1 of Conditional:

- Submitted only one conference proceedings

Example #2 of Conditional:

- Submitted an internal grant proposal

Example #1 of Unsatisfactory:

- Did not publish any paper or conference proceeding
- Did not submit any grant proposal or received any funding
- Did not give any contributed presentation in any conference

#### **D. Examples for evaluation of SERVICE for Physics faculty members (T1-T3)**

Example #1 of Outstanding:

- Chaired several departmental committees
- Membership in at least one committee outside the department
- Served on a funding agency review panel
- Membership in several thesis committees

Example #2 of Outstanding:

- Major leadership in a departmental committee
- Involved in interdisciplinary activities outside the department

- Part of the department governance
- Served as an officer of a professional society

Example #1 of Above Satisfactory:

- Membership in several departmental committees
- Membership in several thesis committees
- Reviewed proposals for several funding agencies

Example #2 of Above Satisfactory:

- Membership in a departmental committee
- Reviewed manuscripts for several journals
- Involved in outreach activities to K12 schools

Example #1 of Satisfactory:

- Membership in a departmental committee
- Reviewed proposals for a few funding agencies

Example #2 of Satisfactory:

- Membership in a departmental committee
- Involved in outreach to K12 schools

Example #1 of Conditional:

- Membership in a departmental committee
- No service to the profession

Example #2 of Conditional:

- Ineffective membership in departmental committees
- Reviewed manuscripts for a journal

Example #1 of Unsatisfactory:

- Ineffective membership in departmental committees
- No service to the profession

