

# Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures

## Introduction

The **annual evaluation** of faculty in the **School of Kinesiology and Rehabilitation Sciences (SKRS)** is a holistic process incorporating qualitative and quantitative considerations. Recognizing the diverse disciplines within SKRS, performance standards are designed to be flexible and broadly applicable. SKRS comprises three distinct accredited programs – **Athletic Training**, **Kinesiology**, and **Physical Therapy** – each with its own leadership.

The **School Director** conducts the evaluation process in collaboration with **Program Directors**. The School Director is responsible for the overall evaluation, while Program Directors perform individual assessments based on general guidelines and program-specific circumstances.

Please consult the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement ([CBA](#)) and University Regulation [3.015](#) and [3.0175](#) for more detailed information. The **Promotion and Tenure (P&T)** criteria are separate and distinct from the criteria outlined in this Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP) document. For more details on P&T, please refer to [Faculty Excellence resources](#).

## General Guidelines

Faculty members are expected to:

- Engage in high-quality teaching.
- Pursue scholarly research and creative activities.
- Provide service to the university and the broader community.
- Adhere to university policies and procedures.
- Maintain professional ethics and standards.

Annual evaluations will assess these professional responsibilities alongside any specific duties assigned by the School Director and Program Director. The focus is on the **quality**, **impact**, and **effectiveness** of each faculty member's contributions, rather than on rigid numerical targets.

## Evaluation Categories

Faculty are evaluated in three main categories:

1. **Instructional Activities**
2. **Research & Creative Activities**
3. **Service**

A fourth category, "**Other Assigned Duties**", covers responsibilities outside the main categories. This includes administrative roles (Program Director, Director of Clinical Education) or special projects. Evaluation of these duties considers leadership effectiveness, successful completion of tasks, impact on SKRS, and other relevant performance indicators.

## Evaluation Process & Procedures

### Assignment of Duties

The evaluation process begins with an initial meeting involving the faculty member, Program Director, and School Director. Assigned duties reflect program needs, faculty expertise, and availability. Faculty may request a meeting to discuss or negotiate these duties before signing their contract or assignment of duties form.

### Steps for Assignment of Duties:

1. **Initial Meeting:** Outline proposed duties and expectations.
2. **Review of Assignment:** Faculty verify the accuracy of the Assignment of Duties form.



3. **Negotiation:** Faculty may propose adjustments based on current scholarship, special projects or service roles. Faculty who believes their scholarship does not match standard criteria may consult with the School Director prior to finalizing duty assignments.
4. **Finalization:** Faculty sign the Assignment of Duties form once there is mutual agreement.
5. **Clarification:** Key evaluation expectations for each category are discussed and clarified before signing.

### Faculty Annual Report

Each faculty member submits an Annual Report via Interfolio at the end of the spring semester, as required by UCF and CHPS policy. The report documents accomplishments—with supporting evidence—in all assigned categories.

## Assessment of Performance

### Performance Ratings

For each category that constitutes at least 5% of the faculty member's assigned duties (averaged across each applicable semesters), the School Director (in consultation with the Program Director) will assign one of the following ratings:

- **Outstanding**
- **Above Satisfactory**
- **Satisfactory**
- **Conditional**
- **Unsatisfactory**

### An Overall Performance Rating is then determined. Generally:

- A faculty member is at least **Satisfactory** overall if they earn **Satisfactory** or higher in **all** categories.
- A faculty member is at least **Above Satisfactory** overall if they exceed expectations in their primary category (depending on rank/track) **and** at least one other category with FTE > 0.05.
- A faculty member is **Outstanding** overall if they demonstrate truly exceptional performance in their primary category **and** at least one other category with FTE > 0.05.

If these guidelines yield an ambiguous overall rating, the School Director determines the final rating considering the relative FTE weight of each assigned area.

### Performance Feedback

Each evaluation includes qualitative feedback identifying strengths and areas for growth. This feedback supports ongoing professional development and strategic goal setting.

### Annual Review Process

The School Director may invite faculty to an optional review meeting to discuss their evaluation, address any concerns, and set goals for the next year. Program Directors may participate as appropriate.

## Instructional Activities Evaluation

Excellence in teaching focuses on fostering student learning and success. **All assigned courses**, including those taught in the summer, are evaluated holistically.

### Evidence

Typical evidence of teaching effectiveness includes:

1. **Teaching Quality Indicators** such as student work samples, student perception of instruction (SPI) results, participation in pedagogical workshops, and feedback to/from students.
2. **Assessment Methods** demonstrating how learning outcomes are measured (sample exams, projects, and rubrics).
3. **Learning Outcome Achievements** that show measurable progress in student learning.
4. **Teaching Impact** via self-reflection, student testimonials, and engagement in teaching-related community initiatives.
5. **Pedagogical Innovation** including new course designs, major revisions of existing courses, interdisciplinary collaboration, or novel teaching techniques.

Faculty should briefly describe the **scope, magnitude, and impact** of each submitted item to help the School Director evaluate how these accomplishments improve student outcomes and support SKRS goals.

Performance Ratings and Criteria: Instructional Activities		
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Failure to meet <i>Minimum Expectations</i> for two consecutive annual periods.	
<b>Conditional</b>	Failure to meet <i>Minimum Expectations</i> during the current evaluation period.	
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Consistently meets <i>Minimum Expectations</i> for Instructional Activities.	<b>Minimum Expectations for Instructional Activities.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Student Satisfaction:</b> Majority of student feedback reflects effective teaching practices.</li> <li>• <b>Compliance with Policies:</b> Adherence to state, university, and SKRS teaching policies, including syllabus standards, office hours, and timely grading.</li> <li>• <b>Course Engagement:</b> Classes (or clinical experiences) are scheduled and completed through the entire term, with adjustments approved by the School Director if necessary.</li> <li>• <b>Feedback to Students:</b> Students receive timely, constructive feedback.</li> <li>• <b>Quality Improvement:</b> Faculty respond to identified areas of improvement needed in their teaching, as appropriate.</li> </ul>
<b>Above Satisfactory</b>	Exceeds <i>Minimum Expectations</i> by demonstrating additional noteworthy achievements in teaching that enhance the program quality.	To be Above Satisfactory, a faculty member exceeds <b>Minimum Expectations</b> by demonstrating notable achievements that enhance teaching quality or broaden its impact. Examples include (but are not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Consistently High Student Satisfaction</b> (e.g., 75% or more SPI ratings at <b>Very Good / Excellent</b>).</li> <li>• <b>Course Development or Curriculum Development</b> showing documented improvements and innovation.</li> <li>• <b>Professional Development in Teaching:</b> Completion of substantive pedagogical training or recognized teaching certifications.</li> <li>• <b>Student Mentorship:</b> Directing student capstone projects, or other high-impact learning experiences.</li> <li>• <b>Extracurricular Activities:</b> Designed and implemented or led substantive extracurricular student activities (e.g., interprofessional</li> </ul>



		<p>education, study abroad, service learning).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Instructional publications/Grants:</b> Producing scholarship related to teaching and learning. (cannot be counted in both teaching and research categories).</li><li>• <b>Teaching Awards or Honors</b> from university or external professional organization. (e.g., Teaching Incentive Program, Excellence in Teaching Award).</li><li>• <b>Certification Achievement:</b> Earning or renewing a certification that enhances teaching ability (e.g., specialty/industry certification, training in an area of contemporary expertise).</li><li>• <b>Course Designations:</b> Earning a High-Impact Course Designation or a Quality/High-Quality Course Designation.</li><li>• <b>Guest Lecturing:</b> Documented impact as a guest lecturer in a course where not the assigned instructor of record (non-evaluated activities listed as service).</li></ul> <p><b><i>Each type of achievement should discuss how this improved the quality and impact of their teaching.</i></b></p>
<b>Outstanding</b>	Far exceeds <i>Minimum Expectations</i> through exceptional teaching performance and significant positive impact on student success.	<p>An Outstanding rating signifies consistent Above Satisfactory performance plus evidence of exceptional impact on student success or teaching innovation. Such evidence may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Exceptionally positive SPI and comments</b> (e.g., At least 85% of all SPIs indicate “Very Good”/”Excellent” with &gt;60% of students reporting for a given course).</li><li>• <b>Receipt of Prestigious Teaching Awards</b> from the college, university, or professional organization (e.g., Teaching Incentive Program, Excellence in Teaching).</li><li>• <b>Development of Multiple High-Impact Courses</b> or recognized Quality/High-Quality Course Designations.</li></ul>

## Research and Creative Activities Evaluation

Expectations for research vary according to faculty track and assignment (Tenure-earning, tenured, clinical, or instructor/lecturer). Tenure-track or tenured faculty typically have higher research commitments, while those lower research FTE (e.g., clinical faculty, instructor/lecturer) may have more modest research expectations.

### Important Principles

- Evaluations consider both **quantitative** (e.g., number of publications, grant funding) and **qualitative** (e.g., journal quality, impact, significance of work) factors.
- Higher research assignments often correlate with more robust or extensive scholarly output.
- Faculty with a negligible research assignment (average < 0.05 FTE) are generally exempt from this category.

### Evidence

Faculty should provide comprehensive documentation of their research and creative activities.

Typical examples:

1. **Grant Activity:** Details on funded projects and proposals (role, funding amounts, scope, potential impact)
2. **Peer-reviewed publications:** Highlight journal standing (e.g., quartile rankings) and contribution (first, corresponding, or co-author), emphasizing the significance of the work.
3. **Conference Presentations:** Delivered at state, regional, national, or international levels, including invited talks.
4. **Research Mentorship and Collaboration:** Student mentorship resulting in scholarly outputs; interdisciplinary collaborations.
5. **Professional Recognition:** Awards, citations, invited presentations, and fellowship appointments demonstrating recognition of research expertise.

### Journal Quality and Other Venues

- Faculty may reference discipline-specific metrics (e.g., Q1-Q4, impact factor, h-index) to demonstrate the **visibility, rigor, and influence** of their research.
- Scholarly books, edited volumes, and book chapters are evaluated based on publisher prestige and contribution scope.
- Innovations such as community-engaged research, new methods, or interdisciplinary collaborations may also demonstrate high impact.

Performance Ratings and Criteria: Research and Creative Activities		
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Failure to meet <i>Minimum Expectations</i> for two consecutive annual periods.	
<b>Conditional</b>	Failure to meet <i>Minimum Expectations</i> during the current evaluation period.	
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Meets <i>Minimum Expectations</i> by showing consistent engagement with research, producing peer-reviewed or otherwise recognized outputs.	<b>Minimum Expectations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faculty show <b>ongoing engagement</b> in research/creative activities aligned with their FTE assignment. Indicators could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least one peer-reviewed publication, conference presentation, or external grant proposal (as PI, Co-PI, or collaborator), as appropriate for the faculty member's role/FTE.</li> <li>Documented participation in research mentorship (students or colleagues).</li> <li>Overall demonstration of <b>quality and impact</b> (e.g., published in recognized venues, or contributing meaningfully to a broader research project).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Above Satisfactory</b>	Clearly exceeds <i>Minimum Expectations</i> through higher-quality or greater-impact scholarship and evidence of professional recognition.	To be evaluated as Above Satisfactory, faculty typically exhibit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Substantial Scholarly Contributions</b> beyond the minimum, such as multiple peer-reviewed works, higher-tier journal publications, or meaningful external funding that supports the research mission.</li> <li><b>Clear Evidence of Impact</b>, potentially reflected by invitations to present at major conferences, significant collaborations, or awards for scholarly excellence.</li> <li><b>Mentorship of Students and Colleagues</b> leading to co-authored publications, external recognition, or notable research outcomes.</li> </ul>
<b>Outstanding</b>	Demonstrates extraordinary research achievement with transformative contributions or high-profile recognition in the field.	An outstanding rating indicates truly exceptional research or creative output with a high level of external validation and influence. Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Major External Funding</b> commensurate with research assignment, particularly as PI or Co-PI.</li> <li><b>High-Profile Publications or Presentations</b> (e.g., invited keynote at a national or international conference; multiple Q1 publications).</li> <li><b>Prestigious Awards, Fellowships, or Recognition</b> demonstrating significant leadership in the discipline.</li> <li><b>Transformative Mentorship</b>, leading to student success in lead-authored articles or major grant awards.</li> </ul>

### Flexibility and Additional Considerations

Faculty may present non-traditional scholarship or other high-impact activities not explicitly listed above. When describing these, it is crucial to explain the significance, scope, and potential influence of the work. Peer evaluations (internal or external) and other qualitative assessments may be used to gauge its impact. Such activities might include groundbreaking innovations that advance the field, the development of widely adopted research methodologies, or impactful interdisciplinary work that spans multiple domains.



## Service Evaluation Framework

Service includes contributions at the program, school, college, university, professional, and community levels. The quantity and quality of service activities should be evaluated in the context of the amount of FTE assigned.

### Evidence

Faculty should document service activities, focusing on **meaningful impact** and the outcomes achieved:

- **Unit-level:** Committee contributions leading to policy improvements, successful faculty searches, or strategic initiatives.
- **Institutional:** Program creation or significant policy revisions at the college/university level.
- **Professional Leadership:** Roles in professional organizations (conference planning, editorial boards).
- **Community Engagement:** Outreach programs advancing SKRS's mission, with clear measures of impact.

Service Performance Ratings: Service		
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Failure to meet <i>Minimum Expectations</i> for two consecutive annual periods.	
<b>Conditional</b>	Failure to meet <i>Minimum Expectations</i> during the current evaluation period.	
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Meets <i>Minimum Service Expectations</i> by showing regular engagement and some positive outcomes or contributions.	<b>Minimum Service Expectations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Consistent Participation:</b> Regularly attends program, division, and SKRS meeting (with advance notice when absent)</li> <li>• <b>Essential Service Engagement:</b> Contributes to required committee work or assigned service tasks.</li> <li>• <b>At least One Graduation Ceremony Annually</b> (approval required if unable to attend).</li> <li>• Demonstrates <b>meaningful impact</b> of service via documented outcomes (e.g., improved processes, successful projects).</li> </ul>
<b>Above Satisfactory</b>	Demonstrates leadership and impact that exceed typical expectations for the faculty member's role.	Above Satisfactory denotes a <b>substantial impact</b> of service beyond baseline expectations. For instance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leading or co-chairing committees with demonstrable results (new policies, program improvements).</li> <li>• Active role in professional societies or associations leading to visible outcomes.</li> <li>• Development or execution of community engagement initiatives that significantly promote the SKRS mission.</li> </ul>
<b>Outstanding</b>	Reflects exceptional service achievements that significantly advance organizational goals and benefit multiple stakeholders.	Outstanding service reflects <b>extraordinary leadership</b> and notable influence. Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leading major institutional or professional initiatives that result in broad-based improvements or innovations.</li> <li>• Founding or directing new programs, partnerships, or significant outreach efforts with high visibility and clear benefits.</li> <li>• Serving in key leadership roles (e.g., president of a professional organization) with substantial accomplishments.</li> </ul>

## Other Assigned Duties Evaluation

### Definition

Other Assigned Duties cover responsibilities that do not fit into Instructional Activities, Research and Creative Activities, or Service. This category may include:

*Approved – Faculty Excellence – XXXX*

*Available for first use in the academic year 2025-26*



- Program Director
- Director of Clinical Education
- Leading special projects

### Evaluation Criteria

When faculty have assigned duties here, evaluation focuses on:

- **Completion of Assigned Tasks:** Meeting deadlines and achieving objectives.
- **Leadership Effectiveness:** Demonstrating strong decision-making, communication, and team guidance.
- **Impact on Program or SKRS:** Specific improvements or successes attributed to these additional duties.
- **Performance Indicators:** Relevant qualitative or quantitative measures of effectiveness (feedback from stakeholders, documented outcomes).

### Performance Ratings

The performance ratings for Other Assigned Duties align with those in other categories:

- **Outstanding**
- **Above Satisfactory**
- **Satisfactory**
- **Conditional**
- **Unsatisfactory**

A **Satisfactory** rating indicates the responsibilities were carried out effectively. **Above Satisfactory** recognizes going beyond these expectations, while **Outstanding** indicates exceptional leadership and transformative impact in the assigned role.

### Summary

This Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP) document provides **flexible, impact-oriented guidelines** for faculty in SKRS. While quantitative measures (e.g., publications, SPIs, grants) remain relevant, the ultimate emphasis is on the **quality, significance, and impact** of faculty contributions within each assigned category. By including opportunities for narrative explanation and recognizing diverse forms of excellence, SKRS aims to maintain high standards while honoring the unique strengths and roles of its faculty.