

**Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures for  
Tenure-Earning/Tenured Faculty and Instructors/Lecturers**

**Department of Health Sciences  
College of Health Professions and Sciences  
University of Central Florida**

**Approved by faculty by secret ballot on February 26, 2021**

**Reviewed and approved by Faculty Excellence on**

**For first use in the 2022-2023 academic year.**

**Department of Health Sciences**  
**College of Health Professions and Sciences**

**Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures for Tenure-Earning/Tenured Faculty and Instructors/Lecturers**

The purpose of this document is to provide standards and procedures to evaluate the annual performance of **tenure-earning** and **tenured faculty** and **instructors** and **lecturers** – hereon referred to as **'faculty'** – in the Department of Health Sciences. For further information on the evaluation process, please refer to the most current BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Assistant and associate professors must be aware that the criteria for Promotion and Tenure (P&T) are separate and distinct from the criteria in this Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP) document. Tenure-earning and tenured faculty must make themselves aware of any department, college, and university criteria for Promotion and Tenure (P&T).

**Instructors/Lecturers** must be aware that the criteria for promotion are separate and distinct from the criteria in this AESP document. Instructors and lecturers must make themselves aware of any department, college, and university criteria for promotion.

For all faculty, further information on P&T (tenure-earning and tenured faculty) and promotion (instructors, lecturers, and clinical assistant and associate professors) can be found through Faculty Excellence and university regulations 3.015, 3.0175, and 3.0176.

**General Guidelines**

Faculty, as academic and clinical professionals, are expected to contribute to the orderly and effective functioning of the University of Central Florida, the College of Health Professions and Sciences and the Department of Health Sciences. For satisfactory performance, all faculty are expected to maintain currency in and contribute to their appropriate discipline. Performance of these professional responsibilities, as well as the specific duties and responsibilities included in written annual assignments from the chair of the Department of Health Sciences, will be considered in evaluating faculty.

**Evaluation Categories**

Faculty are evaluated by examining contributions, competence, and scholarship in three main categories: "Instructional Activities", "Research & Creative Activities", and "Service (including Governance)". An additional category of "Other Assigned Duties" may be used to assign responsibilities that do not fit the three main categories. All relevant areas are evaluated with consideration of the faculty member's rank and assignment.

**Procedures**

At the beginning of each evaluation period, the faculty member and chair will discuss the percentage of their workload assigned to each of the categories outlined above. All faculty shall have measurable goals for accomplishment in all designated evaluation categories unless their contractual annual assignment does not include a category. Category omissions, when utilized, will be based on the collective needs of the unit or program and will reflect the teaching assignment of the individual. Each faculty will submit an Annual Report and any supporting documentation required to the chair following the procedures and timelines described in the most current Collective Bargaining Agreement. The Annual Report should accurately delineate their accomplishments in each category. The chair may use this Annual Report as well as other relevant information to fairly evaluate the faculty member.

## Assessment of Performance

Each faculty will be given an overall performance assessment based on the ratings in the categories outlined above. A point value will be given based on the rating in each category (see Category and Overall Evaluation Scale table below). The overall rating will be determined using a weighted formula that accounts for the rating and full-time equivalent (FTE) assigned in each category (see the Department of Health Sciences Workload Policy for typical assignments). Examples of calculations for typical tenure-earning and tenured faculty, and instructor and lecturer assignments in the Department of Health Sciences are shown below.

### Category and Overall Evaluation Scale

Evaluation	Category Points	Overall Rating
Outstanding	4.0	3.5 – 4.0
Above Satisfactory	3.0	3.0 – 3.49
Satisfactory	2.0	2.0 – 2.99
Conditional	1.0	1.0 – 1.99
Unsatisfactory	0	0 - .99

The **examples below** illustrate how the evaluation scale will be used for tenure-earning and tenured faculty and instructors and lecturers who may have different assignments.

**Example 1:** Dr. Denton Fender, a **tenure-earning or tenured faculty** member with **a research assignment of 0.4 FTE**, receives the following categorical ratings:

Category	Evaluation	Points	FTE	Overall Rating (Points x FTE)
Instructional Activities	Outstanding	4.0	.50	2.0
Research & Creative Activities	Satisfactory	2.0	.40	.80
Service (Including Governance)	Above Satisfactory	3.0	.10	.30
				<b>3.1 (Above Satisfactory)</b>

**Example 2:** Dr. Beau Aurcacy, a **tenure-earning or tenured faculty** member with **a research assignment of 0.3 FTE**, receives the following categorical ratings:

Category	Evaluation	Points	FTE	Overall Rating (Points x FTE)
Instructional Activities	Outstanding	4.0	.65	2.6
Research & Creative Activities	Satisfactory	2.0	.30	.60
Service (Including Governance)	Above Satisfactory	3.0	.05	.15
				<b>3.35 (Above Satisfactory)</b>

**Example 3:** Dr. Sonya Mind, an instructor or lecturer with a research assignment of 0.2, receives the following categorical ratings:

Category	Evaluation	Points	FTE	Overall Rating (Points x FTE)
Instructional Activities	Outstanding	4.0	.75	3.0
Research & Creative Activities	Satisfactory	2.0	.20	0.4
Service (Including Governance)	Above Satisfactory	3.0	.05	0.15
				<b>3.55 (Outstanding)</b>

**Example 4:** Dr. Sam Manilla, an instructor or lecturer with no research assignment, receives the following categorical ratings.:

Category	Evaluation	Points	FTE	Overall Rating (Points x FTE)
Instructional Activities	Outstanding	4.0	.95	3.8
Research & Creative Activities	N/A	0	0	0
Service (Including Governance)	Above Satisfactory	3.0	.05	.15
				<b>3.95 (Outstanding)</b>

FTE for each category will be **averaged across the total number of semesters** in which a faculty member received an assignment. For example, if a faculty member receives an assignment in “Instructional Activities”, “Research & Creative Activities”, and “Service (Including Governance)” during the **fall** and **spring**, but only receives an “Instructional Activities” assignment in the **summer**, the FTE for each category will be **averaged across all three semesters to calculate a weighted FTE and weighted rating (see below)**.

	Instructional Activities	Research & Creative Activities	Service (including Governance)	FTE
Summer	0.5	0	0	0.5
Fall	0.46	0.46	0.08	1.0
Spring	0.46	0.46	0.08	1.0
SUM	1.42	0.92	0.16	2.5
Weighted FTE	0.568	0.368	0.064	1.0
Evaluation Points	3.0	4.0	4.0	<b>Overall Rating</b>
Weighted Rating	1.704	1.472	0.256	<b>3.43</b>

**Above Satisfactory**

For faculty who did not receive any assignment during the summer, the FTE for each category will be **averaged across only the fall and spring semesters**.

All faculty are **required to receive a minimum rating of “Satisfactory”** in each area of assignment with an assignment of effort of five percent (5%) or more to receive an overall rating of “Satisfactory” or above.

## INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES EFFECTIVENESS

Evaluation in the category of “Instructional Activities” will include a review of the teaching activities, recognitions received, and contributions that the faculty member has made to the Department of Health Sciences, the college, the university, and individual professional organizations/programs.

### Evidence

Evidence for “Instructional Activities” effectiveness is provided through student evaluations, peer and chair evaluations, the annual report, and teaching portfolios when available.

- Student evaluations: Ratings on standardized university forms or other evaluation forms.
- Peer and chair evaluations: Evaluation of course syllabi, study materials, learning experiences, lectures, bibliographies, and audiovisual materials; clinical and classroom teaching using departmental/school forms.
- Teaching portfolios: A teaching portfolio may include, but is not limited to the following:
  - Statement of teaching and advising duties and responsibilities;
  - Enrollment information on types of courses, advising load;
  - Statement of philosophy of teaching;
  - Description of materials and methods used in achieving desired learning outcomes, including efforts to improve quality and effectiveness of teaching as well as the integration of evidenced-based research into course content;
  - Artifacts of teaching such as (evaluation of course syllabi, examples of students’ work, examples of lectures, seminar-facilitation notes, or web-based/CD-ROM based materials).

The following set of Universal Faculty Expectations align with the current Collective Bargaining Agreement and are required by all faculty for a rating of satisfactory or greater.

### Universal Faculty Expectations:

- Faculty will meet class/clinical assignments for the scheduled number of sessions as published in the university calendar and semester schedule, including the final examination period, unless a request to cancel a meeting during the final examination period has been approved by the department chair in advance;
- Each course/clinical assignment assigned to the faculty member must include and follow a syllabus that adheres to current university guidelines. Each faculty member must also provide an electronic version of the syllabus to the appropriate staff member in the department;
- Faculty will post and attend their required office hours according to current university, college, and departmental guidelines and use this time to advise/mentor students seeking guidance;
- Faculty will demonstrate current knowledge and expertise in assigned areas of teaching;

Approved by faculty by secret ballot on February 26, 2021. Reviewed and approved by Faculty Excellence on May 20, 2021. For first use in the 2022-2023 academic year.

- Faculty will cover appropriate course topics and reflect current knowledge in course presentations in assigned areas;
- Faculty will demonstrate the infusion of evidence-based practices into course materials, activities, and experiences where appropriate;
- Faculty will use appropriate instructional materials such as textbooks, readings, assessment tools, and other appropriate instructional materials;
- Faculty will integrate appropriate technology in course presentations (e. g., class e-mail, online course enhancement, videotapes, computer assisted instructions, simulations, etc.);
- Faculty will evaluate student performance in a fair, equitable, and timely manner;
- Faculty will use appropriate instructional techniques and evaluation and reporting formats;
- Faculty with academic advising duties will keep regular and special advisement/conference appointment hours, be well informed and professional in advising assigned students, and handle paperwork associated with advisement in a timely manner;
- Faculty will collaborate to support the implementation of the curriculum;

The following schema provides specific criteria for the evaluation of Instructional Activities for all faculty:

Rating	Criteria	Quality Indicators
<b>Outstanding</b>	In addition to the universal expectations listed above, to achieve a rating of OUTSTANDING, faculty must achieve <b>FOUR</b> quality indicators, <b>THREE</b> of which must be from the Instruction/Teaching and/or Mentoring categories.	<p><b><u>Instruction/Teaching:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Achieve “Very Good” to “Excellent” course/instructor evaluation ratings from at least 75% of students who completed an evaluation for the evaluation period.</li> <li>b. Develop a new course (e.g., study abroad course, online course, or other modality) based on department need and approval by chair or assignment by the chair.*</li> <li>c. Submit major revisions for an existing course to obtain certain university-recognized designations (e.g., Quality or High-Quality designations for mixed mode, online, and reduced seat courses; High Impact Practice - Integrative Learning Experience, Research Intensive, or Service Learning for mixed mode/face-to-face courses).</li> <li>d. Make major revisions to an existing course the faculty is assigned to teach based on department need and approval by chair.</li> <li>e. Serve as an <u>assigned</u> (by Department Chair) mentor/course leader for a designated Health Sciences course.</li> <li>f. Seek feedback on teaching effectiveness that demonstrates excellence. (This must be a formal review process that may be provided by FCTL or other formally established peer evaluation processes.) **</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Mentoring:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>g. Serve as chair on a student thesis, graduate thesis or dissertation*, capstone project, or other research project <b>completed</b> during the evaluation period.</li> </ul>
<b>Above Satisfactory</b>	In addition to the universal expectations listed above, to achieve a rating of ABOVE SATISFACTORY, faculty must achieve <b>THREE</b> quality indicators, <b>TWO</b> of which must be from the Instruction/Teaching and/or Mentoring categories.	
<b>Satisfactory</b>	In addition to the universal expectations listed above, to achieve a rating of SATISFACTORY, faculty must achieve <b>TWO</b> quality indicators, <b>ONE</b> of which must be from either the Instruction/Teaching or Mentoring category.	

Approved by faculty by secret ballot on February 26, 2021. Reviewed and approved by Faculty Excellence on May 20, 2021. For first use in the 2022-2023 academic year.

<p><b>Conditional</b></p>	<p>An evaluation rating of <b>CONDITIONAL</b> in “Instructional Activities” will be assigned if the faculty fails to achieve a rating of “Satisfactory”.</p>	<p>h. Serve as a committee member on a student thesis, graduate thesis or dissertation, capstone project, or other research project <b>completed</b> during the evaluation period.<sup>1</sup></p> <p>i. Mentor one or more students in the research process that produces a research-related outcome (e.g., accepted abstract, poster presentation at a student-oriented venue or a professional conference, manuscript submission/publication, or an internal/external grant proposal submitted for competitive funding).***<sup>2</sup></p> <p>j. Organize, conduct, or lead an <b>extracurricular</b> (i.e., outside of course responsibilities) professional development educational session/workshop for student benefit/student organization.<sup>1</sup></p> <p><b>Other:</b></p> <p>k. Serve as a consultant to other educational institutions to promote the scholarship of teaching and learning.**</p> <p>l. Disseminate content related to curriculum or teaching through a peer-reviewed publication.</p> <p>m. Disseminate content related to curriculum or teaching at a peer-reviewed state, regional, national, or international conference/professional development program.</p> <p>n. Receive recognition from the university (e.g., TIP Award, SOTL Award, Excellence in Teaching Award, etc.) or a national/international professional organization for teaching expertise (e.g., Society of Health Education Technology or Mentor Award, American Society for Nutrition Excellence in Nutrition Education Award, etc.).</p> <p>o. Submit or receive a grant or other funding that advances the department’s teaching mission (e.g., technology fee grant). <i>Note:</i> This does not include monies received by faculty for professional development (e.g., IDL6543 – Teach Online; Essentials of Online Teaching (EOT); etc.) or from the Office of Undergraduate Research (OUR) (e.g., High Impact Practice (HIP) coaches).</p> <p>p. Submit documentation of attendance at a professional development course to enhance teaching (e.g., continuing education, formal coursework, or Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning programs).**</p> <p>q. Serve as a guest speaker in another class or at another institution.**</p> <p>r. Other criteria outlined between faculty and chair in advance.**</p> <p><b>Notes:</b></p> <p>* Recognized as two Quality Indicators.</p> <p>** Written documentation may be required upon request by the department chair.</p> <p>*** If research-related outcome is selected here, the same research-related outcome cannot be counted under “Research &amp; Creative Activities”.</p> <p><sup>1</sup> Can only be used once per evaluation period for one Quality Indicator (i.e., if counted as one Quality Indicator under “Instructional Activities” it cannot be used again under “Research &amp; Creative Activities”.</p>
<p><b>Unsatisfactory</b></p>	<p>The faculty member will receive an <b>UNSATISFACTORY</b> rating upon their second consecutive <b>CONDITIONAL</b> rating and/or if poor performance in this area resulted in discipline or counseling.</p>	

		<sup>2</sup> This criterion is based on the number of outcomes/products produced, not the number of students mentored. For example, an abstract/poster presentation and an internal grant submission completed by one student will be counted as two Quality Indicators. An abstract/poster and an internal grant submission completed by a team of five students also will be counted as two Quality Indicators.
--	--	---

### **RESEARCH & CREATIVE ACTIVITIES EFFECTIVENESS**

Evaluation in the category of “Research & Creative Activities” will include a review of the scholarly activities, sponsored research, recognition, and contributions the faculty member has undertaken during the evaluation period.

**Evidence**

Evidence for “Research & Creative Activities” effectiveness is provided through a review of faculty documentation of research and creative activity, including, but not limited to, such evidence as letters of acceptance for journal articles, manuscripts, grant applications, and papers accepted for presentation or presented at professional conferences.

Papers, book chapters, books and presentations should be reported in the year they occur with full and complete citations so that they may be considered and cited in the department annual report for the college and for possible publicity. However, notice of acceptance may be reported and documented for credit towards evaluation. Each item may only be counted once (either when accepted or published, but not both).

**Universal Expectations for Tenure-earning and Tenured Faculty\***

Assistant/Associate/Professors
<b>Evidence of pursuing a focused research agenda; adherence to ethical principles in the development, conduct, and dissemination of research; and demonstration of effort toward publishing, presenting, and securing grants.</b>

\*Tenure-earning and tenured faculty must be aware that the criteria for Promotion and Tenure (P&T) are separate and distinct from the criteria in this AESP document. Tenure-earning and tenured faculty must make themselves aware of the department, college, and university criteria for P&T. Further information on P&T can be found through the office of Faculty Excellence.

## Expectations for Instructors and Lecturers

The Department of Health Sciences has several faculty members who do not fit the typical assignments commonly seen across the University. The Department of Health Sciences includes instructors and lecturers who may choose to be involved in research and creative activities due to accreditation expectations within their programs or to achieve personal and professional goals. Under certain conditions, these faculty may be assigned course release time with a reduction in their teaching FTE and a corresponding addition to their research FTE.

The following schema provides specific criteria and quality indicators for the evaluation of Research & Creative Activities conducted by **TENURE-EARNING** and **TENURED FACULTY**:

Rating	Criteria	Quality Indicators
<b>Outstanding</b>	To achieve a rating of <b>OUTSTANDING</b> in “Research & Creative Activities”, faculty must have at least <b>TWO peer-reviewed</b> manuscripts accepted/in-press as first or corresponding author <sup>1</sup> ; submit/receive/manage <sup>3</sup> at least <b>ONE</b> external grant or contract; and complete at least <b>THREE</b> additional quality indicators.	<p><b><u>Publication(s)/Authorship*</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Author an <b>ADDITIONAL</b> accepted/in press/published 1<sup>st</sup> author or corresponding author<sup>1</sup> article in a peer-reviewed journal.<sup>2</sup></li> <li>b. Co-author an accepted/in press/published article in a peer-reviewed journal.<sup>2</sup></li> <li>c. Author/co-author an accepted/in press/published 1<sup>st</sup> edition of a peer-reviewed textbook.<sup>2</sup></li> <li>d. Author/co-author an accepted/in press/published peer-reviewed textbook chapter, including development of ancillary materials for textbook/chapters.<sup>2</sup></li> <li>e. Author/co-author an accepted/in press/published peer-reviewed monograph or editorial.<sup>2</sup></li> <li>f. Present a peer-reviewed or invited presentation at a professional state, regional, national, or international conference.</li> </ul>
<b>Above Satisfactory</b>	To achieve a rating of <b>ABOVE SATISFACTORY</b> in “Research & Creative Activities”, faculty must have at least <b>ONE</b> peer-reviewed manuscript accepted/in-press as first or corresponding author <sup>1</sup> ; submit/receive/manage <sup>3</sup> at least <b>ONE</b> external grant or contract <b>OR</b> be the first or corresponding author <sup>1</sup> on at least <b>ONE</b> peer-reviewed presentation at the national or international level; and complete at least <b>THREE</b> additional quality indicators.	<p><b><u>Research Submission(s)/Award(s)*</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>g. Submit at least one <b>ADDITIONAL</b> internal research grant proposal as Principal Investigator.</li> <li>h. Submit at least one <b>ADDITIONAL</b> external research grant proposal as Principal Investigator.</li> <li>i. Receive internal or foundation funding for research as Principal Investigator.</li> <li>j. Receive external federal funding for research as Principal Investigator.</li> <li>k. Receive competitive award(s) for research from the college, university, professional organization and/or national body (i.e., Research Incentive Award (RIA), Excellence in Research, USDA, etc.).</li> </ul>

<b>Satisfactory</b>	To achieve a rating of <b>SATISFACTORY</b> in “Research & Creative Activities”, faculty must have at least <b>ONE</b> peer-reviewed manuscript (any author order), submit/receive/manage <sup>3</sup> at least <b>ONE</b> external grant or contract <b>OR</b> be the first or corresponding author <sup>1</sup> on at least <b>ONE</b> peer-reviewed presentation at the national or international level; and complete at least <b>TWO</b> additional quality indicators.	<p><b>Other:*</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>l. Mentor one or more students in the research process that produces a research-related outcome (e.g., accepted abstract/poster presentation at a student-oriented venue or professional conference; manuscript submission/publication; or an internal/external grant proposal submitted for competitive funding).**</li> <li>m. Serve on a national/federal grant review panel or study section.</li> <li>n. Serve as an editor for a peer-reviewed journal or guest editor for a peer-reviewed journal issue.</li> <li>o. Serve as a co-investigator or consultant on a funded internal or external research project.</li> <li>p. Other criteria outlined between faculty and chair in advance.</li> </ul>
<b>Conditional</b>	A rating of <b>CONDITIONAL</b> in “Research & Creative Activities” will be assigned if the faculty fails to achieve a rating of “satisfactory”.	<p><b>Notes:</b></p> <p><sup>1</sup> Corresponding author is the first author's chair of an undergraduate research thesis/project, Master’s thesis committee, or doctoral dissertation committee.</p> <p><sup>2</sup> A publication counted as “accepted” or “in press” in a previous year will not be counted in a subsequent annual review report when it is published.</p>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<p>A rating of <b>UNSATISFACTORY</b> in “Research &amp; Creative Activities” will be assigned upon the second consecutive <b>CONDITIONAL</b> rating and/or if poor performance in this area resulted in discipline or counseling.</p> <p>Faculty who receive an <b>UNSATISFACTORY</b> rating will not be eligible to receive a “Research &amp; Creative Activities” FTE assignment for one evaluation period.</p>	<p><sup>3</sup> Management of an external grant/contract will be evaluated in accordance with funding period/size/scale of award.</p> <p>* Item can only count once as either a Quality Indicator in “Research &amp; Creative Activities,” “Instructional Effectiveness Activities” <b>or</b> “Effectiveness in Service”. (i.e., if counted as one Quality Indicator under “Research &amp; Creative Activities” it cannot be used again under either of the other categories.</p> <p>** If selected here, cannot be counted in “Instructional Effectiveness Activities”.</p>

### **EFFECTIVENESS IN SERVICE (INCLUDING GOVERNANCE)**

Evaluation in the category of “Service” (including Governance) will include a review of the service activities, recognitions received, and contributions that the faculty member made to the university, college, department, profession, and local, state, regional, national, and international communities. Per the Collective Bargaining Agreement, service for United Faculty of Florida (UFF) activities is not considered university service and will not be evaluated.

Please note, an administrative assignment in the Department of Health Sciences, college or university is not viewed as a part of the service responsibility. Such assignments will be evaluated under the category of “Other Assigned Duties”.

Approved by faculty by secret ballot on February 26, 2021. Reviewed and approved by Faculty Excellence on May 20, 2021. For first use in the 2022-2023 academic year.

## Evidence

- Evidence for “Service” effectiveness is provided through faculty documentation of service, professional development, and governance activities, including brochures or programs identifying presentations and workshops; a description of committee activity (e.g., name of committee, number of meetings attended, role and contribution to the committee); consultant reports or products; and a description of substantial contribution to the effective functioning of a degree program.
- Documentation describing both the roles and responsibilities related to the service as well as active participation (e.g., how often it meets, etc.) is required. Indicators that are associated with more than one item within the teaching, research, and/or service domains must reflect a distinct accomplishment separate from other categories.
- Typically, consultations or other activities for which the faculty member receives payment will not be counted toward productivity in this area and will not count as a quality indicator. Moreover, such activities may require “Possible Conflict of Interest” reporting.

## Universal Expectations:

- Attend and participate in all departmental faculty meetings, faculty committees (as appointed or elected), and faculty retreats unless the faculty member has an emergency or unavoidable scheduling conflict. Faculty members who are ill and cannot participate in scheduled meetings are required to take sick leave. Attendance at meetings and/or events (e.g., all CHPS meeting and similar) as requested by the chair or CHPS/UCF administration, unless the faculty member has an emergency or unavoidable scheduling conflict, is expected.
- Attend a minimum of one UCF graduation ceremony per year. In circumstances where ceremonies for Health Sciences majors are held remotely, provide a 15 second (or less) video extending congratulatory remarks to Health Sciences graduates for at least one graduation ceremony per year.

The following schema provides specific criteria and quality indicators for Service, Professional Development and Governance for all faculty:

Rating	Criteria	Quality Indicators
<b>Outstanding</b>	To achieve a rating of <b>OUTSTANDING</b> in “Service, Professional Development and Governance”, faculty must meet all universal expectations; <b>participate fully as chair or committee member on at least ONE committee, task force or initiative at the department, college or university level</b> ; and readily respond to the service needs of the university, profession, and community by engaging in at least <b>THREE</b> (for tenure-earning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chair or serve as a committee member on an <b>ADDITIONAL</b> committee, task force or initiative at the department, college, or university level.</li> <li>Serve as a member on a student-focused committee (e.g., Honors undergraduate or Master’s thesis or Doctoral dissertation). (<b>Note: Must be in addition to a Quality Indicator used in Instructional activities.</b>)*</li> <li>Submit evidence of serving in an active role as a faculty advisor for a UCF registered student organization.*</li> <li>Coordinate or assist with a college, university and/or community activity/event that impacts students, alumni, faculty, staff, and/or the community.</li> <li>Give a presentation(s) and/or provide a service to public schools, healthcare agencies, and/or other higher education agencies. (<b>Note: May count more than once if it is not the same theme/presentation.</b>)</li> </ol>

Approved by faculty by secret ballot on February 26, 2021. Reviewed and approved by Faculty Excellence on May 20, 2021. For first use in the 2022-2023 academic year.

<b>Outstanding (cont'd)</b>	and instructors/lecturers faculty) or <b>FOUR</b> (tenured and senior faculty) quality indicators from the list.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>f. Serve in a leadership position at the local, state, regional, or national level for a professional and/or community organization impacting the profession and/or the people whom we serve.</li> <li>g. Present professionally related talks or speeches to UCF organizations or local, regional, or national/international groups/organizations in your field of expertise. (<b>Note: May count more than once if it is not the same theme/presentation.</b>)</li> <li>h. Prepare one or more documents (as requested by the Department Chair; CV does not count) required for the departmental academic program review process or other documents requiring substantial effort.</li> <li>i. Participate in planning a professional conference, workshop or seminar event at the local, state, regional, or national/international level.</li> </ul>
<b>Above Satisfactory</b>	To achieve a rating of ABOVE SATISFACTORY in “Service, Professional Development and Governance”, faculty must meet all universal expectations; <b>participate fully as chair or committee member on at least ONE committee, task force or initiative at the department, college or university level;</b> and readily respond to the service needs of the university, profession, and community by engaging in at least TWO (for tenure-earning and instructors/lecturers faculty) or THREE (for tenured and senior faculty) quality indicators from the list.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>j. Review abstracts for a local, state, regional, national, or international conference.</li> <li>k. Review at least one peer-reviewed journal manuscript.*</li> <li>l. Serve as a reviewer for a textbook/book chapter(s).*</li> <li>m. Serve as track/session chair/coordinator at a state, regional, national, or international professional conference.</li> <li>n. Participate in external reviews for faculty promotion and tenure.</li> <li>o. Receive an honor/award for professional service or accomplishment from a local, state, national, or international professional organization.</li> <li>p. Participate in community activities (e.g., fundraisers) aligned with professional or university goals, community health initiatives, or other forms of community service.</li> <li>q. Serve as a member of an editorial board/editor of a journal issue/editor of a textbook.</li> <li>r. Serve on a college/university grant/research review panel or study section.</li> <li>s. Conduct an external accreditation or academic program review(s) (uncompensated).</li> <li>t. Other criteria outlined between faculty and chair in advance.</li> </ul>
<b>Satisfactory</b>	To achieve a rating of SATISFACTORY in “Service, Professional Development and Governance”, faculty must meet all universal expectations; <b>participate fully as chair or committee member on at least ONE committee, task force or initiative at the department, college or university level;</b> and readily respond to the service needs of the university, profession, and community by engaging in at least <b>ONE</b> (for tenure-earning and instructors/lecturers faculty) or <b>TWO</b> (for tenured and senior faculty) quality indicators from the list.	<p><b>Notes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Quality indicator can only be used once per evaluation period for “Effectiveness in Service”.</li> </ul>

<b>Conditional</b>	An evaluation rating of <b>CONDITIONAL</b> in “Service, Professional Development and Governance” is assigned if the faculty fails to achieve a rating of “satisfactory”.	
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	A rating of <b>UNSATISFACTORY</b> in “Service, Professional Development and Governance” will be assigned upon the second <b>CONDITIONAL</b> rating and/or if poor performance in this area resulted in discipline or counseling.	

### OTHER ASSIGNED DUTIES

Assignment of any of the following titles (i.e., Program Director, Program Coordinator, Director of Clinical Education, and Clinical Education Coordinator) and their corresponding responsibilities will be evaluated to be consistent with the reporting of this activity in the Faculty Activity Report. Faculty will be provided with a description of the position and the course load reduction that usually accompanies such an assignment when the annual assignment is made.

The following schema provides specific criteria\* for Other Assigned Duties for all faculty:

Rating	Criteria
<b>Outstanding</b>	<p>To achieve an evaluation of <b>OUTSTANDING</b>, the faculty member must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ demonstrate strong leadership skills and excellence in judgment, decision-making, and initiative in completing assignments outlined by the department chair.</li> <li>▪ achieve outcomes that consistently demonstrate attention to detail and a commitment to ensuring that assignments are complete, accurate, of high quality and congruent with the standards of the university and other parties as appropriate.</li> <li>▪ consistently conduct themselves in a professional manner and provide evidence of working collaboratively and cooperatively with all stakeholders.</li> <li>▪ keep the department chair apprised of the status of projects/assignments.</li> <li>▪ demonstrate vision in recognizing opportunities, obstacles, and solutions.</li> <li>▪ perform responsibilities with minimal to no intervention by the department chair.</li> </ul>
<b>Above Satisfactory</b>	<p>To achieve an evaluation of <b>ABOVE SATISFACTORY</b>, the faculty member must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ demonstrate emerging leadership skills and good judgement, decision-making, and initiative in completing assignments outlined by the department chair at least 75% of the time.</li> <li>▪ complete assignments that show evidence of above average attention to detail, accuracy, and completeness.</li> </ul>

Approved by faculty by secret ballot on February 26, 2021. Reviewed and approved by Faculty Excellence on May 20, 2021. For first use in the 2022-2023 academic year.

<b>Above Satisfactory (cont'd)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ maintain standards consistent with the university and other parties as appropriate.</li> <li>▪ conduct themselves in a professional manner and provide evidence of working collaboratively and cooperatively with all stakeholders.</li> <li>▪ keep the department chair apprised of the status of projects/assignments.</li> <li>▪ complete assignments/projects without department chair intervention at least 75% of the time.</li> </ul>
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<p>To achieve an evaluation of <b>SATISFACTORY</b>, the faculty member must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ adequately complete the assignments in the position description during the period of evaluation in a manner that does not place the program in jeopardy with the university or other parties as appropriate or require substantial intervention by the department chair in the administration of the program.</li> </ul>
<b>Conditional</b>	<p>An evaluation rating of <b>CONDITIONAL</b> is assigned if the faculty fails to meet the standards of a <b>SATISFACTORY</b> rating and places the program or students at academic risk.</p>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<p>A rating of <b>UNSATISFACTORY</b> will be assigned upon the second <b>CONDITIONAL</b> rating and/or if poor performance in this area has resulted in discipline or counseling.</p>

\*Note: Additional criteria may be outlined in advance between the faculty member and the department chair.

In those cases where “Other Assigned Duties” (other than described above) are a significant part of evaluating a faculty member’s performance, the faculty member in consultation with the chair, will outline goals and expectations before the assignment is given.