

Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures
Department of Mathematics
(October 24, 2006)

These faculty annual evaluation standards provide guidance to both faculty and evaluators regarding the assignment of annual evaluation ratings in the areas of teaching, research, and service, and the assignment of an overall annual evaluation rating. The intent of these standards is to spell out the criteria in enough detail that faculty members are aware of expectations within the Department, can be reasonably sure of their own evaluation ratings, and can be assured that the standards are applied equally and equitably to all faculty within the Department. On the other hand, the standards are intended to leave enough flexibility that an evaluator can take certain special cases into account in the evaluation process.

The evaluation process within the Department of Mathematics is guided by three general principles:

1. Quality, not quantity, is the most important indicator. While applicable to all three areas, this is particularly true in evaluating research. An effort must be made on the part of the evaluator to assess the overall quality of the publication record or other research related achievements; conversely, the faculty member is responsible for justifying such quality. While objective measures like paper counts certainly have some merit, great care must be taken to put these measures into the proper context.
2. Efforts to contribute to the Department's goals are recognized. The time and effort that faculty put forth in the advancement of the Department's mission are extremely valuable. While some efforts (for example, receiving a research grant, or giving an invited lecture) are clearly prestigious, other efforts (receiving a conference grant, or refereeing papers) just as clearly serve the Department's goals, and must be recognized as such.
3. Evaluation should be reasonably flexible. To promote a well-balanced department having strong research, teaching, and service components, the evaluation process must recognize that individual faculty members have differing interests, priorities, and experience levels. As a particular and important case, the process must recognize that junior faculty will very likely fulfill fewer of the evaluation criteria than senior faculty.

To assist the evaluator, the faculty member is encouraged to (but is not obligated to) provide a bulleted list of data for the comments section of an annual evaluation form. (See the "Comments of the Chairperson" section of the *Chairperson's Evaluation Summary* Form AA-17.) These data would include the items the faculty member thinks are important in each evaluation category. It is then the evaluator's duty to assign ratings for the particular categories.

In assigning ratings in each category the notions of leadership roles and participatory roles are general (but not sole) delineating factors between an Outstanding rating and an Above Satisfactory rating. Likewise, the ratings of Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory may be determined by a willingness or unwillingness to perform assigned duties. At no time shall a faculty member receive a rating below Satisfactory in a given category if no assignment was made in that category.

In general, it is the faculty member's responsibility to properly document activities and accomplishments that contribute to the evaluation ratings. While the evaluator may be lenient across the board in enforcing this, he or she is only required to weigh activities and accomplishments that are presented to him or her. In the case of disagreement or grievance, the evaluator may request and must consider any additional evidence presented to him or her.

OVERALL RATING

The overall rating will be determined based on the following format.

<i>Overall</i>	<i>Teaching</i>	<i>Research</i>	<i>Service</i>
Outstanding	At least AS	O	At least AS
	O	At least AS	O
Above satisfactory	O	At least S	At least S
	AS	At least AS	At least S
Satisfactory	At least S	At least S	At least S
Conditional	At least one conditional		
Unsatisfactory	At least one unsatisfactory		

Faculty who has additional assignments in service such as the associate chair, graduate coordinator, and undergraduate coordinator may be evaluated using the following guidelines:

Outstanding: 2 Outstanding (in any two categories) and at least a Satisfactory in the third category.

Above Satisfactory: 1 Outstanding and at least a Satisfactory in the other two categories
 2 Above Satisfactory (in any two categories) and at least a Satisfactory in a third category.

Satisfactory: At least a Satisfactory rating in all three categories

Conditional: 1 or more category that is Conditional

Unsatisfactory: 1 or more category that is Unsatisfactory

It is important to note in the following guidelines for ratings that research is formatted differently than teaching and service. The reason is that teaching and service have assigned duties and uniform expectations, whereas research varies widely among faculty.

In the research section specific mention is given to publications. In mathematics, there are many ways that authors are listed. Traditionally alphabetical order is used. Often, students' names are first followed by advisor, and in some interdisciplinary areas often lead author denotes lead responsibility for the paper. Additionally, for co-authored papers all authors are each given 1 full paper credit. Although faculty members are encouraged to collaborate, they are also encouraged to publish some papers as sole authors.

TEACHING

Outstanding (Leadership)

It is expected that all of the activities in the satisfactory category are met. The following are bullets that are examples of activities that can earn an outstanding rating. It is important that some (not all) are required for this rating.

- Receive UCF or national teaching award **Major**
- Supervise Ph.D. dissertation or several M.S. theses year degree awarded: **Major**
otherwise: **Minor**
- Author textbooks, workbooks, manuals, or software
that support instruction. **Major**
- Outstanding student and peer evaluations while maintaining high
academic standards **Major**
- Obtain external educational grant. **Major**
- Develop new course **Major**
- Leadership in major teaching project. **Minor**
- Give workshops on teaching at the University level or nationally **Minor**

Above Satisfactory (Participation)

It is expected that all of the activities in the satisfactory category be met. The following are bullets that are examples of activities that can earn an above satisfactory rating. It is important that some (not all) are required for this rating.

- Supervising Undergraduate or M.S. research projects **Major**
- Delivering Colloquium or Seminar Talks related to teaching **Major**
- Evidence of significant efforts to improve student learning
(attending workshops, developing innovative pedagogy) **Minor**
- Assisting in writing the Qualifying Exams **Minor**
- Covering classes for colleagues when they are on travel or ill **Minor**

- Write educational grant proposals. **Minor**

Satisfactory

- Perform teaching duties (i.e. classes will meet as scheduled, including giving final during final examination period unless prior arrangements are made with the Chair) and hold regular office hours **Major**
- Overall satisfactory teaching performance (peer and student evaluations) **Major**

Conditional

- Overall poor teaching performance (peer and student evaluations) **Major**

Unsatisfactory

- Often cancels class, comes late, or cancels office hours **Major**
- Negative impact on student learning **Major**
- Documented problems with teaching **Major**
- Lack of willingness to teach courses based on departmental need **Minor**

RESEARCH

As research varies greatly across the department, the following list is in the order of importance to earning high ratings in the research category.

1. Publications

Publications will be counted during the calendar year of acceptance and again in the calendar year of publication. A paper that is both accepted and published in the same calendar year will count twice.

- Accepted papers in Refereed journals **Major**
- Research monographs **Major**
- Chapters in research monographs **Minor**
- Conference proceedings papers (non-refereed) **Minor**
- Submitted refereed journal papers **Minor**

2. Research Funding

- Award of external funds as PI or co-PI **Major**
- Award of multiple year federal grant as PI or co-PI counts as Major in each of the years that the grant is funded, except for no-cost extension.
- Award of internal funds as PI or co-PI **Minor**
- Submission of grant proposal(s) **Minor**

3. Lectures/Talks

- Invited lectures in national/international conferences **Minor**
- Colloquium talks at other universities **Minor**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributed talks in national/international conferences • Colloquium/seminar talks at UCF and at Department of Mathematics 	<p>Minor</p> <p>Minor</p>
4. Recognitions	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National/international research awards • Plenary speaker in national and international conferences • Patents • State/regional research awards • UCF research awards • Distinguished Visiting Researcher at Research I Institution or National Lab • Citation of works by other scholars 	<p>Major</p> <p>Major</p> <p>Minor</p> <p>Minor</p> <p>Minor</p> <p>Minor</p> <p>Minor</p>
5. Interdisciplinary Research projects that cross departments and disciplines	Minor

SERVICE

Activities

- serving on department, college, and/or university committees or subcommittees
- chairing any committee
- serving in the faculty senate or in other faculty governance roles
- serving as a sponsor for student activities and/or groups
- mentoring junior faculty and teaching assistants
- recruiting students
- recruiting faculty
- activity in professional organizations in one's discipline
- development of relationships beneficial to UCF with industry and government agencies
- consulting for other universities, colleges, or primary or secondary schools
- serving on committees or boards for federal or state government agencies
- organizing conferences or symposia
- organizing activities that promote public awareness of one's discipline
- serving as editor of professional books and journals
- refereeing papers
- reviewing promotion documents or Ph.D. theses
- reviewing grant proposals at the international, national, state or local level
- sharing one's academic expertise in the local, state, or national community

Assessment

- peer and administrative review of material presented in the annual report
- self evaluation
- input from colleagues, university leaders, committee members or chairs
- awards and honors
- letters or certificates of public service
- recognition of service from school districts, K-12 teachers, K-12 students or parents

Outstanding	Significant leadership contributions to the department, college, university, mathematics community, or community at large in a professional role.
Above Satisfactory	Significant participatory contributions to the department, college, university, mathematics community, or community at large in a professional role.
Satisfactory	Willingness to perform assigned service duties.
Conditional	Willingness to perform some assigned service duties
Unsatisfactory	Unwillingness to perform assigned service duties.