



UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
& COMPUTER SCIENCE

School of Electrical Engineering & Computer Science

Section 3 – Annual Evaluation Standards & Procedures (AESP)

For the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (EECS) to realize its vision to be ranked at the top 50 EECS units nationally by 2010, certain performance measures are expected from each faculty member in terms of teaching, research and service activities. The EECS Director will use the primary performance measures outlined in this document for annual faculty evaluations.

The objective of this section is to provide the EECS faculty with the annual evaluation procedure, productivity measures and expected faculty performance, which will move the School forward and help us be recognized nationally.

3.1 Annual Faculty Evaluation Procedures:

The following procedures apply to all full-time faculty members in the School of EECS.

Procedures: Each EECS faculty member (tenured, tenure-track, visiting or lecturer) will prepare the required Faculty Annual Activities Report, describing his or her accomplishments in teaching, research, service and activities during the calendar year (January 1 – December 31). An up-to-date curriculum vitae (resume) is required with the annual report.

The report and CV will be due in the third week of January each year. The Director will use these summary reports, CV and other relevant information from peers and students to assign a set of ratings that describes the performance of each faculty member. In doing so, the school director will pay careful attention to the criteria outlined in this document.

For the annual evaluation, the Director of the School will have face-to-face meetings with all Assistant Professors and upon request with Associate and Full Professors. The face-to-face meetings will be to discuss:

- Productivity during the evaluation period (from January 1 – December 31)
- Rating of teaching, research and service
- Overall rating
- Next year's plan and goals
- Open time to discuss any other issues, needs or concerns

This meeting is followed by a written review on the Evaluation Form from the Director for each faculty member of the School within 90 days after the end of evaluation period. This review should provide feedback on research, teaching and service.

After the meeting with the Director, each faculty member will be asked to sign the Evaluation Form and may choose to respond in writing to the annual review. This response also becomes a part of that faculty member's file.

Since it is the responsibility of the Director to ensure that candid, constructive and appropriate feedback is given to the faculty, the Director may actively consult with other faculty members in the department, as he/she deemed appropriate.

Annual evaluations will be used primarily to determine faculty merit salary increases for the following year if raises are mandated.

3.2 Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty: Annual Cumulative Progress Evaluation

Unlike tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty will undergo additional annual evaluation known as "Cumulative Progress Evaluation" to be conducted by a sub-committee of the Tenure and Promotion Committee. This sub-committee, known as the Tenure Appraisal Sub-Committee, will evaluate each tenure-track faculty member based on his/her Faculty Annual Activities Report and CV. The director will consult with the chair of the P&T Committee to appoint at least five-person sub-committee, which subsequently will elect its own chair.

The Tenure Progress Evaluation Sub-Committee then will provide the P&T Committee with vote results and written comments concerning the progress of the faculty in research, teaching and service.

The tenure-track faculty member has the responsibility to prepare and maintain his/her annual report and updated resume.

The P&T Committee reviews the Tenure Appraisal Sub-Committee report and makes its final recommendation by completing the Cumulative Progress Evaluation (Form A-18 (b) – revised 4/05), signed by the P&T Committee and presented to the Director. The report will include an evaluation of whether the faculty member is on track, if he/she is making reasonable and appropriate progress toward tenure and will identify areas of strength and weakness.

The three-year review of tenure-track faculty follows the same process as the annual evaluation with the exception that the Tenure Appraisal Sub-Committee will be reviewing the tenure-track faculty contributions over three-year period. All the three-year review cases will be discussed and voted upon by the tenured faculty of the School. The Director will independently prepare his/her own written evaluation of each tenure-track faculty member's progress toward tenure.

After the reviews are completed, the Director will meet with the Tenure-track faculty member and discuss the reports and recommendations, giving candid and constructive feedback to the faculty member on his or her progress, and specifically identify areas needing strengthening.

The reports from the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Director will become a permanent part of the faculty member's tenure file. At the meeting with the Director, or within 5 days after the meeting, the tenure-track faculty member may respond in writing, and this response will become a part of the tenure file.

3.3 Sustained Performance Evaluations

The School of EECS will follow the guidelines provided in Article 10 of the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement in carrying out the faculty sustained performance evaluation as summarized in this section.

At the end of seven years of tenured service, and each subsequent seven year period, a faculty's sustained performance will be evaluated by the director, as appropriate. This evaluation will consist of a review of the annual evaluations for that seven-year period. If the faculty's performance is, on average, below satisfactory for that seven-year period in any are of assigned duties, then the faculty must be issued a performance improvement plan. For each area of assigned duties, the average shall be determined by assigning a value of 4 for Outstanding, 3 for Above Satisfactory, 2 for Satisfactory, 1 for Conditional, and 0 for Unsatisfactory to each of the faculty's evaluations in that area over the seven year period and computing the numeric average. A value below 1.5 shall be considered below satisfactory performance in that area of assigned duties.

A performance improvement plan shall be developed by the faculty in concert with the director and shall include specific measurable performance targets with target dates that must be completed in a period of three years. The performance improvement plan shall address only those areas of the assignment for which performance was found to be below satisfactory, provided that the faculty maintains satisfactory performance in other areas of the assignment.

When a faculty has a performance improvement plan, the director will evaluate the faculty's performance on the plan. The dean will also provide a separate evaluation of the faculty's performance on the plan.

It is the responsibility of the faculty to attain the performance targets specified in the performance improvement plan. Lack of success may result in dismissal. The faculty may attach a concise response to the evaluation, which will be included in the evaluation file.

4. Expected Performance Measures: All faculty members

Faculty evaluations will be based on expected productivity measures in teaching, research and service outlines in this section.

4.1 Teaching Activities:

The following is the list of teaching and other instructional activities that will drive the faculty evaluation in the teaching area:

- Ph.D. Dissertation, M.S. Thesis and B.S. Honors Thesis supervision
- Educational Journal and Conference publications
- Educational grants/partnerships/projects such as NSF CCLI, STEP, IGERT, CRCD, REU

- Teaching activities in wide range of courses and topics.
- Competitive regional, national and international teaching award
- Textbook and textbook chapter publications
- Curriculum development that includes course revisions and development, new preparations, lab development and seminar development
- Involvement of multi-media/FEEDS courses and creative instructional methods.
- Student teaching evaluations and peer evaluations (when available)
- Involvement with student team competitions, independent studies, as well as projects and student teams/organizations directed
- Industry/educational partnership involvement
- Ph.D. and M.S. committee participation
- Depth of knowledge in some specialty area

Expected Teaching Performance:

To become a strong and nationally recognized School of EECS in educational scholarship, on the average, the following are recommended expectations per full-time faculty member:

- Dissertation supervision to completion: 0.75/year
- Educational publications: 1/year
- Student teaching evaluations: Good - Very Good

Standards for ratings:

- **Outstanding:** An outstanding is earned by demonstrating a significant contribution in the following three areas: (1) significant activity with Ph.D. students as well as M.S. students, (2) carries on scholarly teaching activities outside the classroom, (3) is a knowledgeable and creative teacher with high student evaluations. In addition, the individual must have the breadth of knowledge needed to either cover several areas or relate the results of other areas to his/her own area of specialty, have depth of knowledge to awaken students' interests to at least one field of specialization within the disciplines of CS, CpE and EE, be innovative in the creation of learning activities, is both prompt and fair in giving students feedback and keeps abreast of the field and shares this new knowledge with students.
- **Above Satisfactory:** An Above Satisfactory rating is earned by completing — at minimum — two of the following three points: (1) graduating Ph.D. students as well as M.S. students, (2) carries on scholarly teaching activities outside the classroom, (3) is a knowledgeable and creative teacher. Earning an Above Satisfactory rating means the individual is considered to be a knowledgeable and creative teacher by both students and faculty, is innovative in the creation of learning activities and is both prompt and fair in giving students feedback. A significant activity in teaching will also help earn a rating of Above Satisfactory.
- **Satisfactory:** Does an adequate job of carrying out all teaching responsibilities assigned to her/him. Provides fair and prompt feedback on student performance.
- **Conditional:** Poor teaching performance.
- **Unsatisfactory:** Has performed poorly and has shown no willingness and/or ability to improve, **or** has neglected his or her assigned duties as a teacher. Has made no progress, has shown no initiative, has poor teaching evaluations and has shown no effort and/or ability to improve.

4.2 Research Activities:

The following is the list of research and other creative activities that will drive the faculty evaluation in the research area:

- Refereed Journal Publications
- Refereed Conference Publications.
- Funded Proposals as PI and as Co-PI plus External Research Funding by major agencies, especially Federal and other external sources
- Competitive regional, national and international research awards.
- Patent Innovation, innovative hardware and/or software inventions
- Invited papers in prestigious journals/proceedings
- Internal Research funds
- Involvement with research and industry partnerships
- Conferences/workshops/tutorials as PC/Keynote or invited Speaker
- Conference/workshop/tutorials as an instructor
- Proposal submission activities
- Involvement with interdisciplinary research

Expected Research Performance:

To be a strong and nationally recognized School of EECS in research scholarship, the following are recommended average expectations per full-time faculty member:

- Refereed Journal Publications and/or Conference Publications in print: 2-3/year (Conference Publications here refer to those that are recognized as maintaining high academic standards with an acceptance rate that is comparable to journals).
- Three-year average of research expenditures: \$200k/year
- Total refereed publications in print: 4-5/year

Standards for ratings:

- **Outstanding:** Produces high quality research as evidenced by publication in reputable journals and/or proceedings. Funded research grants/contracts in excess of the school average. Gives presentations/key note speeches at national meetings and in other forums which help to gain recognition for the individual, the school and the university that provide recognition and visibility..
- **Above Satisfactory:** Maintains an active role as a researcher and/or innovator. Publishes in quality journals, proceedings, texts, and/or nationally distributed innovative hardware or software. Has research funding at or near the department average.
- **Satisfactory:** Keeps current in area of research or creative endeavor. Is actively engaged in a project that leads to occasional papers or other form of dissemination of results and/or develops research grant proposals that have a reasonable degree of success.
- **Conditional:** Poor performance based on time allocated for creative efforts.
- **Unsatisfactory:** Has performed poorly and has shown no willingness and/or ability to improve or has neglected his or her assigned duties as a researcher.

4.3 Service Activities:

The following is the list of service activities that will drive the faculty evaluation in the service area:

- Editorials
- Leadership positions in Professional Organizations (national/international officer or committee member, being named Fellow of IEEE, ACM or similar organizations or NAE/NAS membership)
- Conference chair, technical program chair, member of technical program committee.
- Technical Reviewing and Panelist for funding agencies
- Reviewer for academically reputable journals and conferences
- School Service (chair/member of committee(s), undergrad/grad program coordinator) and School Support (registration, orientation, recruiting colloquia)
- College and University Service
- Serving on State, National and International Boards
- Faculty Mentoring and student societies (advisor, speaker at meetings)
- Publicity
- Special Projects, i.e. ABET, SACS, etc.
- Community Service: speaker at civic organizations/industry, public school speaker, assist public schools or related activities (i.e. judge at science fairs, etc.)

Standards for ratings:

- **Outstanding:** Provides national and international visibility to UCF School of EECS. Provides significant leadership involvement to at least one major EECS committee. When called upon, provides similar services to the college and university. Serves in roles such as reviewer, referee and/or organizer for national and international organizations and grant agencies. Is an active member of professional societies that are appropriate to his or her research interests
- **Above Satisfactory:** Is an active member of professional societies that are appropriate to his or her research interests. Is professionally active in the college, university, public schools, community or with student organizations, or is doing an especially good job on school committees.
- **Satisfactory:** Provides service willingly to the school and completes his/her service successfully.
- **Conditional:** Shows minimal involvement in the school and does not attend to his or her assignments in matters of school governance.
- **Unsatisfactory:** Has performed poorly in the past and has shown no willingness and/or ability to improve, or has neglected his or her assigned duties in the area of service.

5 Overall Performance

The overall rating of a faculty member's performance is to be determined by the school Director and is to be based on the ratings given to the individual's teaching, research and service (Other Assigned Duties will be considered under Service). The individual's teaching, research and service ratings will be based on the above performance measures when compared to school average productivity in each category. Since the primary duties of a faculty member in EECS are teaching and research, in general faculty with 2+1 teaching load will have 45% assignment. Faculty with other teaching loads will have adjusted percentile assignments. Whereas service to the School, University, and the profession, while valuable and necessary contributions, will carry

10% weight of the over all evaluation rating. Service percentile assignments will be adjusted to faculty with assigned administrative duties.

6 Final Remarks:

Depending upon the discipline within the School of EECS, joint authorships are usually as important as sole authorships. There is normally no senior versus junior author relationship. Moreover, in many sub-disciplines, there are a number of conferences for which the paper refereeing is every bit as selective as that found in the better journals. Whenever a question of quality arises, the school's Director must take the effort to seek out faculty and other professionals who can provide insight into the quality of the publications.

The faculty member under evaluation can provide supplemental information such as frequency and impact of citations of published papers, textbooks and other materials produced.

The Director may seek the help of other faculty in EECS, college or outside UCF to assess the quality of the productivity measures presented by the faculty.

The Director will also distinguish the faculty rank in terms of expected performance. Full Professors are expected to perform above the expectations for an Associate Professor; likewise, Associate Professors are expected to perform above those at the Assistant Professor level. Visiting and instructors will follow the evaluations and standards and procedure outlines here with the proper percentile assignment.

It is expected that all faculty will meet classes as scheduled, unless prior arrangements are made with the chair, gives the final during the scheduled final exam period, provide and follow up approved syllabus.

In cases where faculty evaluation is contested, the Director working with the School P&T Committee will follow UCF grievance procedure in place at that time.