

University of Central Florida  
Center for Distributed Learning  
**In-Unit Faculty**  
**Annual Evaluation Standards & Procedures (AESP)**

5/7/2025

Approved by faculty vote on 2/28/25, for first use during the  
May 8, 2025 – May 7, 2026, evaluation cycle.  
Available for first use academic year 2025-26.

## Guiding Principles

The purpose of this document is to provide standards for annual evaluations of in-unit faculty within the Center for Distributed Learning (CDL). The annual performance evaluation shall be based on the professional performance of assigned duties, with careful consideration given to the nature of the assignments and the quality of performance.

Evaluation evidence will include Annual Reports (AR), prior year's annual assignment (AA), project documentation, faculty feedback (solicited and unsolicited faculty, colleague or professional community input), and metrics demonstrating the success of instructional initiatives. Examples of evidence include the creation of high-quality online and blended courses, faculty development contributions, the implementation of innovative pedagogical approaches, and scholarly activities that enhance UCF's online and blended reputation and effectiveness. CDL faculty are encouraged to meet with their supervisor to clarify expectations and discuss unique activities to ensure alignment with the strategic mission.

Additional information about AESPs can be found in the current UCF BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement, primarily in Article 10.

## Areas of Assignment

Faculty are evaluated on the following areas of assignment:

- **Instructional Design**
- **Research & Creative Activities (non E&G)**

- **Service** (This includes contributions to the Division of Digital Learning, UCF, the professional community, and external stakeholders.)
- **Other Assigned Duties** (For most instructional designers, this will be blank unless assigned and documented in their annual assignment. Examples include but are not limited to administrative/coordinator assignments outside of typical instructional design responsibilities, union-related roles, and professional development and parental leave.)

## Performance Ratings

The performance ratings in each area of assignment are as follows:

- **Outstanding (4 points)** – Indicates that the faculty member has significantly exceeded the expected success level based on the criteria outlined in their annual assignment. Reserved for exceptional performance that demonstrates excellence in the profession and adherence to the highest standards.
- **Above Satisfactory (3 points)** – Indicates that the faculty member has exceeded the expected success level based on the criteria outlined in their annual assignment. Recognizes performance exceeding expectations for the assigned role.
- **Satisfactory (2 points)** – Indicates that the faculty member has achieved a success level consistent with the criteria outlined in their annual assignment. Documents performance that meets the expectations required for the faculty's annual assignment.
- **Conditional (1 point)** – Indicates that the faculty member was deficient in achieving a success level consistent with the criteria outlined in their annual assignment. Performance is below satisfactory for a single evaluation or fails to follow written improvement instructions after a below-satisfactory evaluation.
- **Unsatisfactory (0 points)** – Indicates that the faculty member was deficient in achieving a success level consistent with the criteria outlined in their annual assignment for the second consecutive year or demonstrated exceptionally deficient performance. Performance remains below satisfactory for two or more consecutive evaluations or fails to follow written improvement instructions after a below-satisfactory evaluation.

## Overall Rating Calculation

The overall rating is calculated by applying weighted values to the three areas based on the faculty member's Annual Assignment. The overall rating corresponds with the numerical ratings outlined above.

Percentages for each area are assigned by the faculty member's supervisor and may vary based on individual roles and responsibilities. The typical breakdown of assignments is as follows.

1. **Instructional Design:** 85%
2. **Research & Creative Activities (non E&G):** 10%
3. **Service:** 5%

As an example, if using this typical breakdown, the final rating would be calculated using the following formula:

$$(\text{Area 1 Numerical Rating} \times 0.85) + (\text{Area 2 Numerical Rating} \times 0.10) + (\text{Area 3 Numerical Rating} \times 0.05) = \text{Overall Rating}$$

Evaluators apply this formula to evaluate overall performance, ensuring that the final rating reflects contributions across all areas.

## Procedures

This section outlines the procedures for annual faculty evaluations and provides guidance on reporting professional performance, scholarship, and service activities in the Annual Report (AR).

- Information regarding annual evaluation procedures, such as due dates, is outlined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
- The faculty shall have the opportunity to discuss the evaluation with the evaluator prior to it being finalized.
- Upon written request from the faculty, the evaluator shall assist the employee in addressing any performance deficiencies.

### **Important Note about Documentation and Evidence**

Documenting means briefly identifying evidence which demonstrates how criteria have been met. Evidence should reflect the scope and impact of the work as represented by the individual's Annual Assignment (AA). Evidence may include, but is not limited to, citations, emails, artifacts, and letters from faculty and/or colleagues.

Referencing the exact location in the Annual Report (AR), when applicable, is highly recommended to facilitate the evaluation.

## Performance of Instructional Design Duties

Each faculty member shall meet with their supervisor prior to or at the beginning of the evaluation period to discuss professional responsibilities and expectations for the period.

Faculty members who are assigned tasks or assignments outside of their regular duties must meet with their supervisor to discuss and obtain approval for the additional responsibilities. This ensures clarity regarding the faculty member's role, time commitment, and expectations. Special assignments should be documented in the Annual Assignment (AA), signed, and agreed upon by both the faculty member and supervisor.

## Instructional Design Evaluation Criteria

Instructional design is a diverse and dynamic profession, so activities will vary greatly. For this reason, evaluators should consult each faculty member's annual assignment for specific details regarding assigned duties and expectations. Activities should be aligned with CDL expectations and UCF's Strategic Plan.

## Instructional Design Performance Ratings

The following selective list provides examples of common types of activities that may be considered when rating performance. This list is neither rank-ordered nor exhaustive, and activities are not equally weighted. Faculty performance is assessed holistically based on the quality and impact of contributions within their assigned responsibilities. The categories below outline general expectations for each performance rating:

**Satisfactory:** Meets expectations in all assigned duties as described in the annual assignment. Provides effective and reliable services to UCF/DDL/CDL users and stakeholders.

- Documentation of completing assigned duties effectively and on time.
- Evidence of ongoing involvement in faculty development activities.
- Participation in department or unit initiatives.

- Collaboration and communication with faculty on the design, development, delivery, evaluation, and revision of online and blended courses meet expectations. Provides timely and responsive support when faculty seek assistance. The impact of this work is focused on individual courses and specific instructional needs.
- Participation in workgroups supporting online teaching improvements.
- Professional expectations are demonstrated by meeting the majority of annual assignment goals as expected for the role.
- Updates skills and knowledge to maintain effective instructional design practices and support departmental objectives.

**Above Satisfactory:** Performs assigned duties competently while contributing to improvements in UCF/DDL/CDL services or operations and enhancing user experiences. Can demonstrate measurable impact and professional growth.

- Collaborates and communicates regularly with assigned faculty about clear goals to jointly develop and/or improve course components and integrate new teaching tools or strategies. Collaborations yield tangible improvements to course design and student experience.
- Recognition by peers within the division or university for professional expertise in area(s) of specialization.
- Professional growth is evidenced by exceeding more than one, but not the majority, of the annual assignment goals.
- Active participation in projects with improvements in user experience or operations.
- Active contributions to workgroups supporting online teaching improvements.
- Consistently integrates new skills and knowledge to enhance instructional design practices and contribute to the success of departmental objective

**Outstanding:** Indicates excellence in the profession and adherence to the highest standards, exceeding the criteria for above satisfactory. Demonstrates leadership, innovation, or significant impact in instructional design. Exceeds expectations in providing exemplary services, improving operations, or enhancing user experiences.

- Collaboration and communication with faculty is proactive, strategic, and sustained. Engages in high-impact projects (redesigns, innovations, programs going online) that improve student engagement and course quality. Results are showcased as models for others.
- Evidence of outstanding performance and significant impact may be represented in letters, emails, and other documentation.

- Recognition by peers beyond the university for professional expertise in area(s) of specialization.
- Professional growth is evidenced by exceeding the majority of the annual assignment goals.
- Awarded a grant supporting professional responsibilities (e.g., state or federal grants) as Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI).
- Leadership in a project with a strategic impact on the UCF community or beyond.
- Receipt of internal or external awards related to professional responsibilities.
- Demonstrates innovative impact in instructional design by integrating emerging technologies, developing novel pedagogical strategies, or implementing creative solutions that enhance learning experiences and engagement.
- Leading workgroups supporting online teaching improvements.
- Consistently acquires and applies new knowledge to significantly enhance project outcomes and drive impactful innovations within the organization.

**Conditional:** Indicates substandard performance of assigned duties; requires improvement in specific areas to meet the expectations of the role.

- Typically, performance that is less than satisfactory will be given a rating of conditional in the first year and unsatisfactory in subsequent years. However, as noted above, in rare instances where evidence of egregious deficiencies can be documented, an unsatisfactory rating may be given when first identified.
- When a conditional rating is given, a plan for success with specific written goals will be created by the evaluator in consultation with the instructional designer.
- A rating of conditional in Instructional Design will result in an overall rating of conditional.
- Examples of conditional performance:
  - Feedback highlighting areas requiring improvement or inconsistent performance.
  - Missed deadlines or incomplete deliverables affecting project timelines.
  - Lack of active engagement in professional development or assigned duties.

**Unsatisfactory:** Indicates substandard performance and significant deficiencies in performing core responsibilities as described in the annual assignment.

- An unsatisfactory rating may also be assigned when the instructional designer does not demonstrate significant improvement following a previous evaluation of conditional by failing to address written instructions for improvement created in consultation with the evaluator.

- In rare instances where evidence of egregious deficiencies can be documented, an unsatisfactory rating may be given when first identified.
- A rating of unsatisfactory in Instructional Design will result in an overall rating of Unsatisfactory.
- Examples of unsatisfactory performance:
  - Documented failure to meet baseline expectations for assigned duties.
  - Evidence of unresolved deficiencies following previous conditional ratings.
  - Significant, documented professional or interpersonal issues impacting responsibilities.

## Instructional Design Expectations by Rank

- **Assistant instructional designer:** Focuses on learning and applying skills with growing independence. Begins engaging in professional development at local, state, or regional levels.
- **Associate instructional designer:** Demonstrates a solid command of duties with some leadership in projects or initiatives. UCF, state, and national focus in the field. Engages in professional development that continues growth of knowledge and skills.
- **Senior instructional designer:** Demonstrates leadership in instructional design projects and initiatives, mentors colleagues, and significantly contributes to the strategic direction of DDL/CDL. UCF, state, national, and international focus in the field. Engages in professional development that elevates knowledge and skills.

## Instructional Design Additional Considerations

When assigning a rating for Instructional Design, evaluators will consider the following factors, which describe how the responsibilities agreed upon in the annual assignment are executed:

- Models best practices of the profession
- Displays competence and produces work that achieves or exceeds its intended goals
- Demonstrates judgment in performing professional responsibilities
- Demonstrates critical thinking, problem-solving, and decision-making skills
- Takes initiative in problem solving and decision making
- Applies creativity and innovation when engaging in professional responsibilities
- Models adaptable and flexible behavior

- Manages time well and is resourceful and dependable
- Displays professional communication skills
- Builds strong working relationships with instructional faculty
- Builds strong working relationships with colleagues
- Facilitates change in a positive manner
- Demonstrates openness to different perspectives and considers alternate opinions
- Cultivates a positive working environment
- Engages in professional development to gain new skills

**Note:** These factors will be considered in evaluations for Instructional Design only and will not be assigned a separate score.

## Research & Creative Activities (non E&G):

Evaluations of research and creative activities will prioritize quality over quantity, with an emphasis on innovation and impact. Instructional designers should demonstrate these qualities in the narrative portion of their annual report and provide supporting documentation where appropriate.

### Research & Creative Activities Evaluation Criteria:

Areas for consideration in performance include:

- **Nature of the activity** (scope, medium, time required to complete the activity, etc.)
- **Role in the activity** (solo or lead author vs. co-author, level of involvement, nature of contributions, etc.)
- **Impact of the activity** (venue, metrics, certification, etc.)

Please refer to the CDL Instructional Designer Unit Promotion Criteria (June 2021) for a range of research, scholarly, and creative work activities in which faculty may participate. It is recognized that peer-reviewed publications and presentations are more highly valued than non-peer-reviewed venues. Scholarship is expected to be progressive in nature and align with individual annual assignments and areas of specialization, as well as relevance to the CDL mission. Both collaborative and individual scholarly activities are valued and encouraged, as are creative activities that offer novel or innovative contributions.



Long-term projects, such as books, grants, Scholarship of Teaching and Learning projects, multimedia, and other research, scholarly, and creative activities may take several years to develop and complete. An expected timeline for such projects should be created in consultation with the instructional designer's supervisor(s) and documented in the instructional designer's annual assignment.

**Assessment of performance will consider progress made toward completion of the project(s) when specified in the annual assignment. Metrics for progress on long-term projects include:**

- Initial research activity leading up to submission
- Initial development of creative works such as multimedia products
- Acceptance by a journal or publisher
- Edits and completion of final draft or creative work
- Publication, completion, or acceptance by grantor

Credit may be awarded for items submitted but not accepted, especially for competitive publications, grants, and awards. Items submitted more than once cannot get credit multiple times unless the instructional designer can demonstrate that significant revision or progress was made.

## **Research & Creative Activities (non E&G) Performance Ratings**

**Satisfactory:** Meets the expectations for scholarly activity by engaging in publishing, presenting, or conducting research in appropriate venues. Produces work that aligns with professional standards and demonstrates measurable progress toward impact, consistent with rank.

**Above Satisfactory:** Demonstrates a strong commitment to scholarly activity by making meaningful contributions through publications, presentations, or research projects. Consistently exceeds basic expectations by producing high-quality work that advances the field, demonstrates innovation, or has a measurable impact consistent with rank.

**Outstanding:** Produces significant scholarly work that has an impact on the profession or discipline. Actively serves in leadership roles within scholarly communities, fostering collaboration, mentorship, and knowledge dissemination. Engages in strategic research, publishes in respected venues, and presents at prestigious conferences, consistent with the rank.

**Conditional:** Produces work that does not meet the expected standard for the role, with gaps in engagement, consistency, or quality.

- When a Conditional rating is given, a plan for success with specific written goals will be created by the evaluator in consultation with the instructional designer to support improvement.
- Typically, performance rated Conditional in the first year will result in an Unsatisfactory rating in subsequent years if significant improvement is not demonstrated. However, in rare instances where evidence of egregious deficiencies can be documented, an Unsatisfactory rating may be given immediately.

**Unsatisfactory:** Assigned when the faculty member does not engage in scholarly activities, or work does not meet professional standards. To receive a rating of unsatisfactory a faculty member needs to have no measurable or quantifiable research, scholarship, or creative activity.

- An unsatisfactory rating may also be assigned when the faculty member does not demonstrate significant improvement following a previous evaluation of Conditional by not addressing written instructions for improvement created in consultation with the evaluator.
- In rare instances where evidence of egregious deficiencies can be documented, Unsatisfactory ratings may be given when first identified.

### **Research & Creative Activities (non E&G) Expectations by Rank:**

- **Assistant instructional designer:** Begins engaging in scholarship, with publications or presentations at local, state, or regional levels.
- **Associate instructional designer:** Produces scholarship that demonstrates evidence of a scholarship and/or research agenda which displays a trajectory to national recognition.
- **Senior instructional designer:** Demonstrates a sustained record of impactful scholarship at national or international levels, contributing to the advancement of the profession.

## **Performance of Service Responsibilities**

Service involves contributions to the department, division, university, profession, and community. This may include committee work, outreach, participation in professional organizations, and delivering professional development.

### **Service Evaluation Criteria:**

Service involves contributions at the department, university, and professional levels, including committee work, outreach, and leadership roles. Instructional designers are expected to actively engage in service activities that support institutional and disciplinary advancement.

Performance is assessed on engagement, leadership, and contributions at local, regional, national, or international levels, with expectations growing as one advances in rank.

Both scholarship and service evaluations follow a structured rating scale—Outstanding, Above Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Conditional, and Unsatisfactory—with clear criteria for expectations and improvement when necessary.

For more details, refer to the CDL Instructional Designer Unit Promotion Criteria (June 2021) for recognized research, scholarly, and service activities.

## Service Performance Ratings

The following descriptions outline the characteristics and expectations for each performance level:

**Satisfactory:** Engages in expected service activities, fulfilling obligations to the department, university, profession, and community.

**Above Satisfactory:** Reflects a positive influence on service outcomes. The individual demonstrates innovative approaches to service challenges and makes active contributions that advance important initiatives. Is on a path to leadership in service activities and may have served in some leadership capacity.

**Outstanding:** Demonstrates exceptional leadership in service activities at the local, state, regional, national, or international levels, making meaningful contributions that significantly impact the profession.

**Conditional:** Demonstrates minimal involvement or insufficient contributions to service activities, requiring improvement to meet service expectations. This may include volunteering for service activities (e.g., committees) but offering no meaningful contributions.

- Typically, performance rated below satisfactory will receive a conditional rating in the first year and unsatisfactory in subsequent years. However, in rare cases where clear evidence of significant deficiencies exists, an unsatisfactory rating may be assigned immediately.

- When a conditional rating is given, the evaluator in consultation with the instructional designer will develop a success plan with specific written goals.

**Unsatisfactory:** Fails to participate in required service activities or makes no meaningful contributions to the department, university, or profession.

- An unsatisfactory rating may also be assigned if the instructional designer does not demonstrate significant improvement after receiving a conditional rating, particularly when failing to address written instructions for improvement developed in consultation with the evaluator.
- In rare cases where clear evidence of egregious deficiencies exists, an unsatisfactory rating may be assigned immediately.

### Service Expectations by Rank:

- **Assistant instructional designer:** Participates in service activities at the local or state level, demonstrating emerging service capabilities and making meaningful contributions to unit goals.
- **Associate instructional designer:** Takes on elevated service responsibilities, including leadership roles within the institution or professional organizations. Contributes valuable expertise, demonstrates initiative in identifying service needs, and actively works to address them.
- **Senior instructional designer:** Provides leadership and makes significant service contributions with a broad impact at the local, regional, national, or international levels.

## Other Assigned Duties

Other assignments encompass diverse responsibilities that require individualized evaluation approaches. While these assignments vary significantly in scope and focus, their evaluation emphasizes the quality, effectiveness, and impact of the individual's contributions. Each assignment requires the development of specific evaluation criteria that align with its unique objectives and challenges.

To ensure a fair and meaningful evaluation, the process includes several key components. First, a detailed position description outlines core responsibilities and expectations. This is complemented by annual assignment outcomes that specify both ongoing duties and special initiatives. For assignments that extend beyond CDL/DDL, the evaluation incorporates feedback from relevant UCF stakeholders to provide a comprehensive assessment of the individual's effectiveness and impact.

Professional Development Leave (PDL) - Evaluations of performance of professional responsibilities for IDs on professional development leave will follow the current Collective Bargaining Agreement.

### **Evaluation Standards for Other Assigned Duties**

Because of the individual nature of “other” assignment, no single set of specific criteria can be developed.