

# CEE Faculty Evaluation Philosophy and Guidelines

Civil and Environmental Engineering Dept.

November 28, 2006

The faculty pay raises will be directly tied to their annual evaluation. Therefore, it is imperative to establish clear guidelines to our faculty at the start of the evaluation year.

The basic philosophy of evaluation is to enhance our faculty's performance in all areas of teaching, research, service. A successful evaluation will reward our productive faculty on a year by year basis. Evaluation is also critical for promotion and tenure of our department's young faculty, and must provide them useful feedback on a continuous basis throughout their career. The final outcome should be an evaluation that works in the best interest of our department faculty as a whole and can advance the department's goals and objectives.

The following are guidelines for the faculty evaluation in a specific academic year, for example, 2006-2007:

- 1) In general, the evaluation of a faculty member will include his/her productivity in research, teaching, service and other assigned duties. Faculty members who exhibit outstanding productivity in the above areas will be considered outstanding, and will be rewarded with an evaluation of Outstanding. The specific productivity criteria for attaining this designation will be in line with the most recent CECS strategic plan. The specific items of importance in determining productivity are the following for each area of responsibility:
  - a. Research: In general, the faculty members attaining outstanding performance shall have attracted significant external funding in line with the CECS strategic plan and have had significant journal publications. Other criteria used in determining outstanding productivity include significant proposal submission activity, research release, federal research funding, GRA support, refereed conference submissions/presentations, and other significant activity. The specific definitions of these criteria are found in the attached matrix.
  - b. Teaching: In general, the faculty members attaining outstanding performance in teaching shall graduate doctoral students as advisor at a rate consistent with the CECS strategic plan, graduate master's thesis students at a rate consistent with the CECS strategic plan, have significant membership in thesis/PhD committees for students other than his/her own, achieve 80% Very Good or above on student perception ratings, be active in textbook publishing, attract teaching related funding, conducting workshops. Other criteria used to determine outstanding performance include course revisions or new preps, significant industry teaching partnerships, involvement in student club competitions, involvement in assessment activities, large SCH classes and teaching awards received. The specific definitions of these criteria are found in the attached table.

- c. Service: In general, the faculty member attaining outstanding performance in service shall serve on national or international boards, be active on professional organizations with responsible positions, be active in department service with responsible positions, provide leadership in department issues and serve as reviewer for technical papers and/or proposals. Other criteria to be considered in determining outstanding performance include being active in university service, serving on state and regional boards, journal editorship, involvement in student recruiting, and other significant activity. The specific definitions of these criteria are included in the attached table.
  - d. Other: Accommodations will be made for those faculty members that have been assigned duties other than teaching, research and service.
- 2) Weight factors breakdown between teaching, research, and service. The faculty and chair will meet to discuss which model will be used to assess the faculty member. In cases of disagreement, the chair will make the assignment. Any faculty member can automatically elect Model A but the decision to elect Model B must be discussed by both parties with the chair resolving any disagreement.
- Model A: Research Model (40% for teaching, 50% for research, and 10% for service).
- Model B: Teaching Model (75% for teaching, 15% for research, and 10% for service). This means teaching three courses per semester.
- 3) The following table is attached to serve as a guide to the Chair for the evaluations. It is expected that the numerical values of the criteria below will be re-visited annually with the expectations that they will be monotonically increased every year consistent with the CECS strategic plan.
- 4.) Instructors and visiting professors who are not on tenure track lines will be evaluated according to the part of the table that best describes their function while at UCF. For example, an instructor specifically assigned to teaching only will only be judged by the teaching criteria. Furthermore, they will be evaluated only by those line items which are applicable to their assigned duties.

## 1) Area of Responsibility: Teaching

Unsatisfactory	Conditional	Satisfactory	Above Satisfactory	Outstanding
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least four of the below are true</li> <li>• No involvement with theses/dissertation</li> <li>• More than 50% of student perception ratings are "Fair" or lower</li> <li>• No course revisions/new preps</li> <li>• No industry/educational partnership involvement</li> <li>• Does not meet classes as scheduled and/or does not give final exams during scheduled time period.</li> <li>• Does not provide and follow a syllabus that follows the current university guidelines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least two of the below are true</li> <li>• No involvement with theses/dissertation</li> <li>• More than 50% of student perception ratings are "Fair" or lower</li> <li>• No course revisions/new preps</li> <li>• No industry/educational partnership involvement</li> <li>• Does not meet classes as scheduled and/or does not give final exams during scheduled time period.</li> <li>• Does not provide and follow a syllabus that follows the current university guidelines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Membership in one theses/dissertation committees</li> <li>• Has achieved a 50% or more of student perception ratings of "Good" or higher</li> <li>• No course revisions/new preps</li> <li>• No industry/educational partnership involvement</li> <li>• Meets classes as scheduled and gives final exams during the scheduled time period.</li> <li>• Provides and follows a syllabus that follows the current university guidelines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Membership in two theses/dissertation committee</li> <li>• Advisor of 1 MS (thesis or non-thesis) to completion</li> <li>• Achieves 70% "Good" or higher ratings on student perception ratings</li> <li>• At least one course revision or one new prep</li> <li>• Active involvement in at least one industry/educational partnership.</li> <li>• Non-intensive involvement with student clubs or team competitions</li> <li>• Meets classes as scheduled and gives final exams during the scheduled time period.</li> <li>• Provides and follows a syllabus that follows the current university guidelines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• *Memberships in at least three theses/dissertation committees</li> <li>• * Advisor of 2 MS/yr (thesis or non-thesis) to completion (3-yr avg.)</li> <li>• * Advisor of one PhD student to completion</li> <li>• * Has achieved 80% "Very Good" or higher ratings on student perception ratings</li> <li>• * Has conducted at least one workshops on a technical or professional topic.</li> <li>• * Publication of at least one textbook</li> <li>• * Has attracted at least \$5,000 of teaching related funding</li> <li>• Had at least two course revisions or one new preparation.</li> <li>• Actively participates in at least two industry/educational partnership</li> <li>• Serves as faculty advisor or other similar function with at least one student club or team competition</li> <li>• Has produced more one standard deviation above the department average SCHs for the academic yr</li> <li>• Has received at least one teaching award</li> <li>• Active participation in assessment activities (part of committee)</li> <li>• Has attended at least one workshop related to teaching</li> <li>• Meets classes as scheduled and gives final exams during the scheduled time period.</li> <li>• Provides and follows a syllabus that follows the current university guidelines.</li> </ul>

## 2) Area of Responsibility: Research

Unsatisfactory	Conditional	Satisfactory	Above Satisfactory	Outstanding
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All of the below are true</li> <li>• Zero research funding</li> <li>• Zero journal / conference publication or submission</li> <li>• Zero proposal submission</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least two of the below are true</li> <li>• Zero research funding</li> <li>• Zero journal / conference publication or submission</li> <li>• Zero proposal submission</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• * Funding level of &lt; \$100K/year as single PI or percent credit as CO-PI (from ORC PTF form)</li> <li>• * One journal submission</li> <li>• One proposal submission</li> <li>• One national/ international conference presentation</li> <li>• Not more than two proceedings submission s</li> <li>• Faculty member has made at least one other presentations</li> <li>• Minimal involvement with research partnerships</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• * Funding level of \$100-\$150K/year as single PI or percent credit as CO-PI (from ORC PTF form)</li> <li>• At least one paper published in a journal</li> <li>• Presented at least two papers at international/national conferences</li> <li>• At least 2 proposal submitted during the year</li> <li>• Support 1 GRA</li> <li>• Submitted two journal publications</li> <li>• Submitted two papers to refereed international/national conferences</li> <li>• Has at least one other presentations</li> <li>• Is active in at least one research partnership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• * Funding level was one standard deviation above average for the department as single PI or percent credit as CO-PI (expenditures based on ORC PTF form)</li> <li>• * Number of journal publications to be above one standard deviation above department average for year.</li> <li>• Has submitted at least four proposals during year.</li> <li>• FTE of 0.25 or greater research release for at least one semester in academic year</li> <li>• Has attracted at least \$10,000 of federal research as PI or equivalent credit as Co-PI.</li> <li>• Support at least two GRAs</li> <li>• Has submitted at least three proposals during year.</li> <li>• Has submitted at least three papers to refereed international/national conferences</li> <li>• Has presented at least three papers in refereed international/national conferences.</li> <li>• Faculty member has made at least two other presentations</li> <li>• Has a leadership position or function in at least one research partnership</li> <li>• Other significant activity</li> </ul>

### 3) Area of Responsibility: Service

Unsatisfactory	Conditional	Satisfactory	Above Satisfactory	Outstanding
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All of the below are true:</li> <li>• No activity in professional organizations</li> <li>• No involvement in Department service</li> <li>• No involvement in University service</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two of the below are true:</li> <li>• No activity in professional organizations</li> <li>• No involvement in Department service</li> <li>• No involvement in University service</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• * Membership in at least one professional organizations with no position of responsibility</li> <li>• * Serves in at least two departmental committees or activities.</li> <li>• Serves in at least one University committee</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• * Membership in at least one professional organizations with position of responsibility</li> <li>• * Participates in at least three Department committees</li> <li>• Has peer-reviewed at least four articles for national or international journals or conferences or proposals</li> <li>• Serves in at least two University committees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Membership in at least three professional organizations with position of responsibility in at least one of these</li> <li>• * Participates in at least four Departmental committees with position of responsibility (Chair) in at least one of these.</li> <li>• * Leadership in department (associate chair, coordinator)</li> <li>• * Serves in at least one national or international board</li> <li>• *Has peer-reviewed at least six proposals and/or technical journal or conference papers</li> <li>• K-12 community service</li> <li>• Serves in at least two university committees with responsible positions in at least one. (Chair).</li> <li>• Serves in at least one state or regional board</li> <li>• Journal editorships</li> <li>• Takes leadership role in recruiting students</li> <li>• Other significant involvement</li> </ul>

## Notes

### 1. The meaning of (\*) in each category

The star (\*) under each category does not mean this item is required to qualify for this category (there are four categories: U for Unsatisfactory, C for Conditional, S for Satisfactory, AS for Above Satisfactory, or O for Outstanding). The star (\*) means that this is a “key area” of emphasis in the evaluation of such category. Therefore, it is not necessarily required that all items with star (\*) be achieved to qualify for a particular category.

### 2. Calculation of overall rating

A score from 0 to 3 will be assigned to each of the four categories as follows:

- A score of zero (0) is assigned for U category.
- A score of 0.5 is assigned for C category
- A score of (1) is assigned for S category.
- A score of (2) is assigned for AS category.
- A score of (3) is assigned for O category.

Then the percent weights of the chosen model (T, R, and S) as explained under item 2 above will be used to calculate the overall score. The overall score out of 3 determines the overall rating as follows:

If the calculated score  $\leq 0.50$  then the overall rating is Unsatisfactory (U).

If  $0.50 < \text{calculated score} \leq 1.00$  then the overall rating is Conditional ©

If  $1.0 < \text{calculated score} < 1.5$ , then the overall rating is Satisfactory (S).

If  $1.50 < \text{calculated score} \leq 2.50$  then the overall rating is Above Satisfactory (AS).

If the calculated score is  $> 2.50$  then the overall rating is Outstanding (O).

### 3. Sabbatical leaves and unpaid leaves

A faculty who is on sabbatical leave or unpaid leave will be evaluated using a different method subject to discretion of the CEE Chair.