**UNF SoE Faculty Evaluation Guidelines**

These evaluation guidelines have been developed to assist the Director of the School of Engineering (SoE) in applying the University Criteria set forth in Article 18.4 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (***CBA 18.4*** - ***University Criteria for Annual Performance Evaluations***) during the performance evaluation process, and to provide guidance to SoE faculty members in achieving standards of performance corresponding to the evaluation ratings. Each faculty member shall be evaluated in each area of assigned duties consistent with the following rating categories: *Meets Expectations, Exceeds Expectations, Far Exceeds Expectations, Below Expectations, and Unsatisfactory.*

Each faculty member is required to submit a ***Faculty Annual Self Evaluation Portfolio (Annual Evaluation)***, in keeping with ***CBA 18.2(a)***. The Annual Evaluation shall be used by faculty to provide documentation and evidence to support the annual rating in the areas of teaching, research, service, and advising (for instructors only). Priorities and activities of a faculty member must be aligned with the Mission and Vision Statements of the SoE, which will be documented in the faculty member’s annual self-evaluation.

Failure to submit a self-evaluation, or submission of an incomplete self-evaluation may result in a rating of *Below Expectations* or *Unsatisfactory* for those areas of the assignment where evidence of faculty activity is either incomplete or not presented at all.

Each faculty member is also expected to perform all activities of their assignment in accordance with section ***CBA 10.3 - Academic Responsibility of Faculty Members***. Failure to maintain the professional decorum established in ***CBA 10.3*** may result in a rating of *Below Expectations* or *Unsatisfactory* in one or more areas of the evaluation which relate to the offending behavior, as determined by the director of the SoE.

**Teaching**

As part of the annual self-evaluation portfolio submitted in accordance with **CBA 18.2 (a)**, a faculty member shall include a narrative and evidence of the pedagogical activities engaged in during the previous academic year. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to provide clear and ample evidence to demonstrate how their pedagogical efforts enhanced knowledge and skills to facilitate student learning, critical thinking, and engagement.

**Ratings for Teaching:**

**Meets Expectations:** In addition to the standards set forth in CBA section 18.4**, f**aculty members must provide evidence of each of the following to achieve a rating of *Meets Expectations* for teaching:

* Demonstrating a commitment to student learning through the provision of proficient lectures, classroom experiences, laboratory experiences and laboratory supervision; and
* Meeting the normal performance standards for teaching which are: meeting classes as scheduled throughout the entire semester; covering the course content outlined in the course description and determined by program faculty; holding the required minimum number of office hours; and
* Demonstrating a commitment to cover all SoE established Course Learning Outcomes within the constraints of the given semester; and
* Actively participate in the ABET curriculum continuous improvement process through completion of course assessment forms and course action plans including demonstration of action/response resulting from feedback in the process, when appropriate.
* **Exceeds Expectations:** A rating of *Exceeds Expectations* will be demonstrated by a faculty member exceeding in quality the requirements for teaching rated *Meets Expectations*. Beyond the requirements presented for performance that *Meets Expectations,* faculty may support a case for elevated ratings in this category by providing evidence of student enhanced learning/engagement as a result of the following activities including, incorporation of new or novel pedagogical methods, community-based learning activities, development of new or significant redesign of a course or laboratory, incorporation of research or design projects into courses, or mentoring and/or working collaboratively with other faculty members in enhancing the learning environment for students in course(s) not assigned to the faculty member. Other activities aligned with the Mission and Vision of the School will be taken into account. The degree of implementation of measures to achieve this rating will be considered by the SoE Director and must be documented by the faculty member in their annual report.

**Far Exceeds Expectations:** A rating of *Far Exceeds Expectations* will be demonstrated by a faculty member exceeding in quantity and/or quality the requirements for teaching rated *Exceeds Expectations*, by providing clear evidence of excellence in student learning/engagement as a result of faculty’s efforts.

**Below Expectations:** A rating of *Below Expectations* will be demonstrated by a faculty member who fails to provide evidence of activity that meets any of the expected performance standards of teaching described above

**Unsatisfactory:** A rating of Unsatisfactory will be demonstrated by a faculty member for whom there is documentable evidence of engaging in practices that are detrimental to educating students as can be evidenced by persistent and justified student complaints, endanger the accreditation of the program, or otherwise diminish the reputation of the SoE and University.

**Research/Scholarship**

As part of the annual self-evaluation portfolio submitted in accordance with **CBA 18.2 (a)**, a faculty member shall include a narrative of research/scholarly activities engaged in during the previous academic year. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to provide clear and ample evidence to demonstrate research/scholarly activity appropriately related to the faculty member’s discipline, including the scholarship of teaching and learning. SoE faculty members with research assignments are required to conduct and maintain a research/scholarship program related to the SoE programs, and are strongly encouraged to pursue funding to support their research/scholarship program. The faculty member shall include any documentation or information that the faculty member thinks should be taken into account in the completion of his/her performance evaluation, including scholarly publications, books, book chapters, grant proposals, patents, pursuit of IRB approval, evidence of scholarly activity that has not yet resulted in publication and any other research/scholarly activity related to the faculty member’s discipline. Demonstration of the active involvement of UNF students in any of these activities, including co-authorship, may be used as evidence in support of a higher than *Meets Expectations* rating. Official *Community Scholar* designation is highly recommended if the research/scholarship program has a community component.

**Ratings for Research/ Scholarship**

**Meets Expectations:** Faculty members must provide evidence of each of the following to achieve a rating of *meets expectations* for research/scholarship:

* Demonstrating an active research/scholarship program at UNF that engages graduate and/or undergraduate engineering students in all phases of research / scholarship; and
* Demonstrating that the research/scholarship program has resulted (for completed and ongoing projects) or will (for ongoing and newly initiated projects) result in academic outputs, including:
  + Thesis by a UNF engineering graduate student who is a thesis advisee of the faculty member, or
  + One conference proceedings paper with student co-authors, or
  + One journal paper with UNF student co-authors, or
  + One journal paper on the scholarship of teaching and learning in engineering with all necessary approvals.

**Exceeds Expectations:** A rating of *Exceeds Expectations* will be demonstrated by a faculty member exceeding in quantity and/or quality the requirements for research/scholarship rated *Meets Expectations*. Beyond the requirements presented above for performance that *Meets Expectations,* faculty may support a case for elevated ratings in this category by providing evidence of (for completed and ongoing) activity including, one conference proceedings paper in a highly respectable international conference, one journal publication of higher quality (demonstrated through impact factor, acceptance rate or other pertinent information), multiple publications, pursuit of external funding (the competitive nature, quantity and source of which may be used assessing its relative value), multiple theses by UNF students, the receipt of research funding, or a combination of multiple academic outputs as listed in *Meets Expectations*. Other activities aligned with the Mission and Vision of the School will be taken into account. For ongoing and newly initiated projects a rating of *Exceeds Expectations* can be attained by documented efforts which will result in the academic outputs described above. Documentable efforts towards enhancing the research agenda of the School of Engineering and/or other faculty members, beyond one’s own research agenda, are valued and can in combination with other research efforts be used to receive a rating of Exceeds Exceptions. The degree of implementation of measures to achieve this rating will be considered by the SoE Director and must be documented by the faculty member in their annual report.

**Far Exceeds Expectations:** A rating of *Far* *Exceeds Expectations* will be demonstrated by a faculty member exceeding in quantity and/or quality the requirements for research/scholarship rated *Exceeds Expectations*. The degree of implementation of measures to achieve this rating will be considered by the SoE Director and must be documented by the faculty member in their annual report.

**Below Expectations:** A rating of *Below Expectations* will be demonstrated by a faculty member who fails to provide evidence of activity that meets any of the expected performance standards of research/scholarship described above.

**Unsatisfactory:** A rating of *Unsatisfactory* will be demonstrated by a faculty member for whom there is documentable evidence of engaging in practices that violate standards of research ethics, misappropriate funding or other resources, and are otherwise detrimental to the research mission and reputation of the SoE and University.

**Service**

As part of the annual self-evaluation portfolio submitted in accordance with **CBA 18.2 (a)**, a faculty member shall include a narrative and evidence of service activities performed during the previous academic year. It is incumbent upon the faculty member to provide clear and ample evidence to demonstrate their service efforts within the university and public service that extends professional or discipline-related contributions to the local community; the State, public schools, or the national and international community. The faculty member shall include any documentation or information that the faculty member thinks should be taken into account in the completion of his/her performance evaluation, including the type of service activity, committee, or organization; and a description of the degree of involvement including meeting attendance and any leadership roles the faulty member may have assumed.

**Ratings for Service**

**Meets Expectations:**

Faculty members must provide evidence of each of the following to achieve a rating of *Meets Expectations* for service;

* Participating in governance of the SoE through regular attendance of CCEC, SoE and program faculty meetings and program advisory committee meetings; and
* Serving on at least one SoE, CCEC,UNF, or UFF-UNF committee at any level of service within the academy or Faculty Association; and
* Providing a timely and complete response to queries by colleagues, program coordinator, SoE personnel; and
* Participating actively and timely in the preparation of program assessment and accreditation documents, including course assessments, course plans and program reviews.

**Exceeds Expectations:** A rating of *Exceeds Expectations* will be demonstrated by a faculty member exceeding in quantity and/or quality the requirements for service that are rated *Meets Expectations*. Beyond the requirements presented above for performance that *Meets Expectations,* faculty may support a case for elevated ratings in this category by providing evidence of activity including, serving on multiple UNF committees at any level; engaging in outreach to support SoE Mission; actively advising student clubs; actively participating in professional organizations or in the engineering community; or participating in educational efforts in the region or beyond. Other activities aligned with the Mission and Vision of the School will be taken into account.

**Far Exceeds Expectations:** A rating of *Far Exceeds Expectations* will be demonstrated by a faculty member exceeding in quantity and/or quality the requirements for service that are rated *Exceeds* *Expectations*, or through presentation of additional activities as described above.

**Below Expectations:** A rating of *Below Expectations* will be demonstrated by a faculty member who fails to provide evidence of activity that meets any the expected performance standards of service described above.

**Unsatisfactory:** A rating of *Unsatisfactory* will be demonstrated by a faculty member for whom there is documentable evidence of engaging in practices that are detrimental to the governance process and/or reputation of the SoE and University.

**Academic Advising**

This section only applies to Advisor/Instructors at the School of Engineering.

**Ratings for Academic Advising**

**Meets Expectations:** A rating of meets expectations will be based upon a satisfactory level of academic advising provided to undergraduate and/or graduate SoE students by:

* Demonstrating a commitment to providing students with accurate academic advice as they progress through their academic programs; and
* Completing all accreditation assignments related to academic advising in a timely and effective manner; and
* Maintaining the normal performance standards for academic advising which include:
  + Holding the required number of office hours for advising; and
  + Maintaining student academic records in a timely and accurate fashion; and
  + Processing transfer courses in a timely and accurate fashion; and
  + Tracking student academic probations and suspensions; and
  + Participating in curriculum development in his / her program; and
  + Actively participating on the SoE Undergraduate Curriculum Committee; and
  + Processing graduation reviews in a timely and accurate fashion; and
  + Enforcing all university and SoE academic policies and following all academic procedures; and
  + Meeting with students who were referred through academic alert; and
  + Submitting the required annual report by the established deadline.

**Exceeds Expectations:** A rating of *Exceeds Expectations* will be demonstrated by an academic advisor exceeding in quantity and/or quality the requirements for advising that are rated *Meets Expectations*. Beyond the requirements presented above for performance that *Meets Expectations,* an advisor may support a case for elevated ratings in this category by providing evidence of activity including, providing higher quality advising as evidenced by measures such as student feedback or peer evaluations; proactively working to provide advising solutions to students before issues arise; and/or actively participating in advising issues at the university and college level. Other activities aligned with the Mission and Vision of the School will be taken into account.

**Far Exceeds Expectations:** A rating of *Far Exceeds Expectations* will be demonstrated by an academic advisor exceeding in quantity and/or quality the requirements for service that are rated *Exceeds* *Expectations*, or through presentation of additional activities as described above.

**Below Expectations:** A rating of *Below Expectations* will be demonstrated by an academic advisor who fails to provide evidence of activity that meets any the expected performance standards of advising described above.

**Unsatisfactory:** A rating of *Unsatisfactory* will be demonstrated by an academic advisor for whom there is documentable evidence of engaging in practices that are detrimental to the governance process and/or reputation of the SoE and University.