Annual Evaluation Standards and Procedures (AESP) for the School of Visual Arts and Design

Overall Evaluation

The overall annual evaluation of each faculty member will be based on the four categories of evaluation weighted by the FTE assigned for each category (teaching, service, and research/creative activity, as applicable) for the regular academic year. Employees will not be evaluated in areas where they had no assignment.

Teaching Evaluation

Overview

Teaching is central to UCF's mission and essential to a faculty member's assigned duties. Therefore, evidence of sustained teaching excellence is a significant component of the annual evaluation. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate their teaching effectiveness across several dimensions by clearly documenting their contributions to student learning, course development, and teaching innovation.

Faculty under evaluation are required to present a Faculty Annual Report (FAR) along with evidence and justifications in a self-evaluation format. For detailed guidelines on the self-evaluation process, please refer to Appendix A (Self Evaluation).

Performance Levels and Criteria

Faculty members will be evaluated on the following scale:

4. Outstanding
3. Above Satisfactory
2. Satisfactory
1. Conditional
0. Unsatisfactory

Evaluation Criteria

Outstanding	Demonstrates significant evidence of the quality of student achievement, both within and beyond course learning objectives, including student awards, high-quality work, or outcomes that exceed expectations. Demonstrates expertise in the subject area and uses innovative techniques to enhance learning. Designs courses where materials, activities, and assessments fully align with learning outcomes, with clear evidence of student achievement. Regularly updates materials to reflect advances in the field, when appropriate. Additionally, it provides evidence of impactful teaching and mentorship beyond the course, contributing to students' broader academic or professional development.
Above Satisfactory	Demonstrates a solid understanding of the subject matter and regularly updates content and teaching methods to reflect current developments. Exhibits strong course management skills, including timely submission of required materials (e.g., syllabi, grades) and clear communication of expectations to students. Effectively aligns the majority of course materials, activities, and assessments with learning outcomes, with some evidence of student achievement that meets or occasionally exceeds expectations. Incorporates innovative techniques in some areas, when appropriate, enhancing student learning and engagement where appropriate.
Satisfactory	Demonstrates a competent understanding of the subject area and communicates knowledge effectively. Ensures that students meet course learning objectives through standard assessments and assignments. Course materials and assessments are generally aligned with learning outcomes, and teaching practices meet basic expectations without significant issues.
Conditional	Displays gaps in subject knowledge or ineffective communication that impact student learning. Provides limited or inconsistent evidence of student achievement, with results showing gaps in meeting course learning

	objectives. Course materials, assessments, or teaching methods may lack alignment with outcomes, leading to uneven student progress.
Unsatisfactory	Lacks sufficient subject knowledge or is unable to effectively communicate course content, resulting in poor student learning outcomes. Fails to provide evidence of student achievement or demonstrate alignment with course learning objectives. Does not engage in professional development or shows no effort to improve teaching practices, leading to ongoing issues with course management and student progress.

Evidence for Teaching Evaluation

Faculty members may provide comprehensive evidence demonstrating excellence across all relevant teaching categories. As outlined in Appendix A (self-evaluation), faculty are encouraged to document and present both visual and written justifications showcasing how their work meets or exceeds the standards in the following areas, highlighting quality and impact in their justification:

- Knowledge and Communication
- Student Engagement
- Innovation and Development
- Course Organization and Management
- Evidence of Student Learning
- Professional Development
- Mentorship

Written Justifications

Written justifications may include:

- Detailed descriptions of teaching strategies and curriculum innovations.
- Explanations of mentorship activities and how these efforts lead to measurable student success.
- Documentation of how professional development is incorporated into teaching.
- Contributions to interdisciplinary or collaborative teaching initiatives.

Visual Evidence

Visual evidence may include tangible artifacts such as:

- Syllabi and course materials.
- Student work samples.
- Multimedia resources highlight innovation and effectiveness.
- Data from student evaluations and peer reviews.
- Recognition (e.g., awards or grants) validates the impact of teaching.

To demonstrate outstanding work, faculty should make clear, compelling connections between their teaching practices and student outcomes, providing specific evidence of how their efforts lead to exceptional learning experiences and overall student success.

Statement on Evolving Teaching Practice

We recognize that teaching methods evolve alongside the changing dynamics of our student body and educational advancements. While foundational practices in teaching remain critical, educators are encouraged to continuously adapt and refine their approaches to meet emerging needs and opportunities. This document is designed to guide faculty through the process of documenting and evolving their teaching practices, providing a structured roadmap for success.

The Teaching Examples and Guidelines section serves as a critical resource for faculty success at SVAD. It outlines a framework to guide faculty collect evidence to demonstrate excellence in teaching. Faculty are not expected to meet every indicator of exemplary evidence; rather, the information below points them in a direction to achieve teaching success. By establishing expectations and providing exemplary evidence across various teaching categories, it assists faculty in aligning their efforts with institutional goals while fostering student success.

Faculty are encouraged to regularly seek mentorship, both assigned and unassigned, and to utilize UCF resources such as the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning (FCTL) and the Center for Distributed Learning (CDL) to incorporate best practices. This continuous development, supported by peer and area feedback, ensures that SVAD faculty remain at the forefront of pedagogical innovation while maintaining core values of excellence in teaching.

Through these guidelines, SVAD promotes a culture of teaching excellence, continuous improvement, and collaborative success, fostering fair faculty evaluations and providing the tools necessary for professional growth and achievement.

Teaching Examples and Guidelines

Knowledge and Communication

Expectations: Faculty should possess comprehensive knowledge of their subject and communicate it clearly to students, with evidence of high student achievement.

Exemplary Evidence:

- Updated Syllabi: Syllabi featuring clear learning objectives and course content aligned with industry standards, regularly refreshed to reflect the latest developments, research, or trends in the field. Syllabi are posted in accordance with university policies and procedures.
- Detailed Course Plans: Clearly articulated learning outcomes with descriptions of how each course activity and assessment supports those outcomes. Ensuring all course materials are clear for students to find due dates, class information, expectations, and examples of anticipated outcomes are present.
- Alignment with Learning Objectives: Course content and assessments are directly tied to learning objectives/outcomes, showing logical progression from introductory to advanced concepts.
- Curriculum Mapping: Curriculum maps or flowcharts demonstrating how individual courses or modules support the overall program's learning outcomes.
- Assessment Construction: Well-designed exams, projects, or papers to assess specific learning outcomes, each accompanied by rubrics or evaluation criteria aligned with course objectives.
- Grading Rubrics: Clear, transparent rubrics provided to students, outlining how their work will be evaluated to learning objectives.
- Feedback to Students: High-quality feedback on assessments, delivered to students in a timely fashion, indicating how student work aligns with learning outcomes and areas for improvement.
- Student Feedback: Strong Student Perception of Instruction (SPOI) scores with positive comments highlighting clear and effective instruction. Consideration is given to class size, modality, survey response rates, and course level.

- Peer Feedback: Evaluations from peer observations, focusing on content clarity, structured lessons, and effective use of examples.

Student Engagement

Expectations: Faculty should engage students through various methods and foster an interactive and dynamic learning environment.

Exemplary Evidence:

- Active Learning Strategies: Utilization of interactive techniques such as group discussions, simulations, or real-world problem-solving activities.
- Student Participation: Evidence of high levels of student participation in classroom activities or projects.
- Engagement in Online Platforms: Effective use of digital platforms to create interactive environments in online or hybrid classes.
- Student Feedback: SPOI comments and course evaluations that emphasize engagement, motivation, and active involvement in learning.

Innovation and Development

Expectations: Faculty should contribute to curriculum development by introducing new programs, courses, or innovative pedagogical approaches. New programs and courses must be approved by the supervisor and routed through normal curricular revision procedures for the school, college, and university.

Exemplary Evidence:

- Implementation of Innovative Strategies: Evidence of employing techniques like flipped classrooms or case studies that lead to measurable improvements in student outcomes.
- Use of Educational Technologies: Incorporation of online learning platforms, interactive tools, quizzes, or simulations to deliver assessments that effectively measure learning outcomes.
- Development of New Technologies: Incorporation of new techniques or approaches or innovative strategies for supporting student learning and/or project development.
- Academic-Industry Collaboration: Evidence of partnership through curriculum or classroom-based efforts with external partners/organizations.

- New Course Development: Proposals outlining the rationale for new course offerings and their alignment with departmental goals. This includes writing or revising courses (when supported by supervisor in such activities).
- Course Revisions: Evidence of ongoing improvements to course materials and assessments based on student performance data, feedback, or advancements in the field.
- Interdisciplinary Initiatives: Development of courses that bridge multiple disciplines, fostering cross-departmental collaboration and offering a more positive and comprehensive learning experience.
- Unassigned Teaching, Peer Collaboration, Interdisciplinary Teaching: Participation in team-taught courses, interdisciplinary projects, open studios, collaborative grants, hosting others outside your class, or guest lectures, demonstrating exemplary practice in collaborative teaching even outside your assigned duties. (Guest lectures should be uncompensated unless approved in UCF's Conflict of Interest system.)
- Achieving Quality, High-Quality Courses or High Impact Course (HIP) Designations.Receiving Teaching related accolades or awards (Internal TIP, Faculty Excellence) and external awards related to the area of teaching.

Course Organization and Management

Expectations: Faculty should demonstrate effective course management, ensuring well-structured courses with clear communication of expectations and timely evaluations.

Exemplary Evidence:

- Course Structure: The faculty member structures and delivers course material that fosters clear connections between syllabi, objectives that lead to outcomes
- Timely Feedback: Return of student work with detailed feedback that helps students improve. Feedback should be returned within a reasonable timeframe given the parameters of the class (e.g., class size and other factors) as determined by the supervisor.
- Course Adaptability: Adjustments to course content or delivery methods based on student feedback or evolving best practices.
- Administrative Responsibilities: Timely submission of grades, book orders, and course syllabi, adhering to UCF expectations and policies.
- Course Administration
  - Use of Material and Supply (M&S) fees: If applicable, faculty members utilize/spends material and supply fees appropriately and in a timely manner

to align with course objectives and outcomes. Faculty update M&S fee supply lists appropriately when needed.
- o Learning Space/Classroom/Studio Management: Faculty coordinate equipment training and day-to-day maintenance of use & upkeep. Faculty are actively involved in discussions for space improvements. This could include rearranging space (spatial planning) to create elevated learning opportunities/outcomes.

Evidence of Student Learning

Expectations: Faculty should provide clear evidence that students are meeting or exceeding learning objectives.

Exemplary Evidence:

- Student Achievement: High-quality student work (e.g., projects, papers, portfolios) that demonstrates competency and mastery of learning objectives.
- Assessment Data: Regular use of assessment tools that provide data on student progress and outcomes.
- Student Work Samples: Student Awards: Documentation of students' academic or creative work (under the faculty's guidance) receiving awards or recognition.
- Capstone Projects: Successful completion of thesis, dissertations, or other major projects, demonstrating the application of knowledge and skills.
- Examples of Student Work: Collected examples of student projects, papers, or exams that demonstrate the achievement of learning outcomes, with clear ties to the course materials and assessments. Faculty regularly showcase high-quality student projects, demonstrating mastery of learning objectives and creativity.

Professional Development in Teaching

Expectations: Faculty should engage in continuous professional development to enhance their teaching practices.

Exemplary Evidence:

- Certifications: Completion of certifications like UCF's IDL/ADL or receiving quality or high-quality course designations.
- Workshops and Seminars: Active participation in teaching-focused workshops, especially those related to new technologies or inclusive practices.
- SOTL Conference Presentations: Presenting at teaching focused conferences (e.g., SXSWEDU, EDUCAUSE, ISTE) on innovative strategies or classroom technologies.

- Teaching Grants: Securing grants aimed at improving pedagogy, such as those related to classroom technologies or inclusive teaching practices.

Mentorship and Student Development

Expectations: Faculty may occasionally or routinely mentor their students in research, creative projects, or professional development, contributing to their academic and career success.

Exemplary Evidence:

- Student Research: Supervising student research projects or theses that lead to successful defenses or publications.
- Internship Supervision: Overseeing student internships with documented progress and skill development. Specific faculty efforts in internship supervision should be documented in their annual report and/or self-evaluation documents.
- Career Outcomes: Letters or documentation showing students' acceptance into graduate programs or securing professional roles due to faculty mentorship.
- Student Awards: Students, under the faculty's mentorship, receive recognition or awards for their academic or professional achievements. Since faculty mentorship may be collaborative, faculty should carefully document their own individual efforts toward these students' academic or professional achievements.

Research and Creative Evaluation

Performance Levels and Criteria

Faculty members will be evaluated on the following scale:

- 4. Outstanding
- 3. Above Satisfactory
- 2. Satisfactory
- 1. Conditional
- 0. Unsatisfactory

Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation criteria for performance ratings in research and creative activities are listed below.

Evaluation Criteria (All Areas)

Outstanding	Significantly exceeds expectations set by the Director of the School and national standards in the discipline. Research or creative work demonstrates exceptional quality and impact, directly contributing to the university's mission. Faculty provide clear, compelling evidence of how their research practices have led to notable, field-defining contributions, including publications, presentations, or exhibitions in highly prestigious venues. The faculty's work not only advances their discipline but also creates meaningful societal or academic impact.
Above Satisfactory	Exceeds the criteria for a Satisfactory rating, demonstrating progress in research or creative work that reflects innovation and ongoing discipline-related professional development. Faculty show clear evidence of advancing toward completion of significant scholarship or creative projects, even if they have not yet received formal recognition. Contributions go beyond standard expectations, and appropriate documentation is provided to showcase how the faculty's work is making meaningful strides within the discipline.
Satisfactory	Demonstrates a competent level of achievement in research, scholarship, or creative work. Faculty provide adequate evidence that their contributions meet the expected standards for quality and impact in the discipline.

	Work shows alignment with disciplinary norms, making contributions that reflect some degree of innovation and relevance. Faculty may have earned recognition at a local or regional level, but evidence of broader impact may be limited. Visual and written documentation are provided to demonstrate the alignment of their work with the required criteria.
Conditional	Falls short of meeting the Director's expectations for a Satisfactory rating. The faculty member's research, scholarship, or creative work demonstrates deficiencies in quality, impact, or progress, with limited evidence of meaningful contributions to the discipline. Documentation of achievements may be incomplete or lacking in key areas, and there is minimal innovation or recognition of the work. Efforts toward meeting the expected standards are insufficient or inconsistent.
Unsatisfactory	Fails to meet the basic expectations for research, scholarship, or creative work, showing significant deficiencies in quality, impact, or progress. The faculty member provides little to no evidence of meaningful contributions to the discipline. Previous deficiencies identified in a Conditional evaluation have not been addressed, or the faculty member's performance has deteriorated further. There is a lack of engagement in research activities, with no substantial documentation or recognition of achievements, resulting in exceptionally poor performance.

Evidence for Research Evaluation

In Appendix A (Self Evaluation) faculty will submit a narrative summary supporting their assigned self-evaluation for research and creative activity. Additional evidence of research accomplishments may also be requested by the faculty supervisor.

Written Justifications

Written evidence may include:

- Detailed descriptions of research innovations.
- Documentation of professional development.
- Contributions to interdisciplinary or collaborative research initiatives.
- Process documentation about workflow or research in progress.

Visual Evidence

Visual evidence may include tangible artifacts such as:

- Publication or exhibition materials.
- Research samples.
- Multimedia resources (films, animations, photography, etc.) highlighting innovation and effectiveness.
- Reviews of research and creative works.
- Recognition (e.g., awards or grants) validates the impact of research.

Evaluation of Impact

The following lists of research and creative activities in each section are not rank ordered, equally weighted, or exhaustive. Activities are ranked according to institutional standards of accepted levels of adjudication, audiences reached, and established venues (e.g., international, national, regional, statewide, and local). The complexities of audience and scope will be considered by the Director during the evaluation process. For example, a conference may be international in audience, but local in scope. Similarly, a regional conference may be highly competitive even though it happens to be located in Central Florida for a given year. When possible, faculty members are encouraged to obtain data from organizers attesting to the competitiveness of conferences, exhibitions, publications, grant awards, and other relevant deliverables and venues.

All Disciplinary Areas

Research Activities

Research and Creative work is given the same type of rigorous external review by which scholarly work is judged, but this type of review may take different forms, including exhibitions, performance, publication, and presentations in respected venues combining a variety of approaches and media.

The annual evaluation process may necessarily have some variance due to the school's academic diversity, as it is impossible to list every possible activity appropriate for its faculty members. As a result, faculty members may engage in activities not discussed herein but have the burden of demonstrating their appropriateness to their research or creative agenda. All activities that may be unique or non-traditional must be clearly documented for evaluation and discussion with the Director and/or faculty mentors.

The following activities are appropriate research and creative activities for all areas of SVAD:

a) Presentation of research or creative activities; invited keynote presentations

b) Grant awards or funded projects involving competitive peer review or

jurying

c) Published reviews, media, or press coverage

d) Creative or scholarly publications

e) Work showcased in curated or juried exhibitions and festivals (film or media festivals; solo, invitational; public art, etc.)

f) Competitive fellowships, competitions, scholarly awards, or research accolades

g) Curating exhibitions or curatorial work

h) Commissioned works funded by public or private entities (local, regional, national, or international)

Collaborative Authorship

Not all faculty members will participate in collaborative activities. However, creative or research activities that are collaborative—especially on major projects—are not uncommon. Accordingly, the school recognizes and rewards the contributions made by individual faculty. In these cases, each artist is to receive accurate credit proportional to their effort for purposes of evaluation. Accordingly, it is extremely important for the faculty members to clarify what role they played on a particular project as well as justify the overall quality and impact of the project. It is the responsibility of the candidate to substantiate all claims with clear and compelling evidence.

Cases where the faculty member had creative responsibility for the entire project will be ranked higher than other cases when their role might have been that as part of a team.

Impact Considerations

Faculty are encouraged to seek publication or exhibition venues of note. While not exhaustive, some factors to consider may include length of operation, competitiveness, and rigor of selection. In order of prestige, venues may include:

a) Publishing houses, journals, festivals, galleries, museums, and conferences with prestigious reputations that have been in continuous operation for more than a decade, which have exceedingly low, peer-reviewed acceptance rates (single digits); selected from a national/international applicant pool; and attract national/ international

sponsorship, judges, speakers, and audience

b) Publishing houses, journals, festivals, galleries, museums, and conferences that have been in operation for more than three (3) years which have low, peer-reviewed acceptance rates (35% or less); select from an international applicant pool; and attract national sponsorship and/or speakers

c) New publishing houses, journals, festivals, galleries, museums, and conferences that have been in operation for two (2) years or less. These venues may have moderate acceptance rates (greater than 35%), may only draw from a local applicant pool, and attract local sponsorship and/or audience

Citations are another measure of research impact in some areas of the school (when peer-reviewed publication is a typical activity). Citation counts relate to the frequency with which the candidate's research work is cited or serves as a platform for another researcher.

Evidence of Research Progress

Faculty may include ongoing projects (e.g., large-scale efforts) in their evaluations to demonstrate progress. However, repeated inclusion over time without periodic exhibitions or deliverables will reduce their impact. For example, evaluative weight may be given for works-in-progress for upcoming contracted solo exhibitions of distinction, or greater or lesser evaluative weights may be given due to the nature or complexity of the creative work. For large scale projects, faculty should document their ongoing progress which may include updates about contributions to all phases of production and distribution. Faculty are encouraged to balance new initiatives with the completion of long-term projects to reflect growth.

Architecture

Research Activities

In addition to the activities listed in the "all disciplinary areas" section of this document, architecture research and creative activities include, but are not limited to:

a) Achieving a professional NCARB license and/ or obtaining other relevant certifications or accreditations relevant to enhancing research in the field of architecture.

b) Completion of one or more of the following (as a consultant, designer, etc.):

a. conceptual design

b. design development

   c. construction documents

   d. construction administration/process

   e. constructed projects

c) The advancement of innovative or intellectual processes in architecture, leading to progress in both theoretical and technical aspects of the field.

d) Projects including unbuilt designs, installations, competition entries, charrettes, or other relative design activities.

Art History

Research Activities

In addition to the activities listed in the "all disciplinary areas" section of this document, art history research and creative activities include, but are not limited to:

a) Peer-reviewed publications (scholarly books, textbooks, book chapters, essays, and journal articles) in relevant art history domains

b) Catalog or museum entries

c) Reviews of discipline-related publications or exhibitions

d) Published bibliographies and encyclopedias

e) Conference proceedings papers (i.e., for publication or conference panel)

f) Archival or collections research

Emerging Media

Research Activities

In addition to the activities listed in the "all disciplinary areas" section of this document, emerging media research and creative activities include, but are not limited to:

a) Commercial distribution for creative activities

b) Development of new emerging media technologies/techniques that lead to peer-reviewed, curated, or otherwise externally reviewed materials or technologies

c) Reproduced work in publications and online

d) Patents

Studio Art

Research Activities

In addition to the activities listed in the "all disciplinary areas" section of this document, studio art and emerging media research and creative activities include, but are not limited to:

a) Exhibition/representation in a gallery, museum, or festival

b) Solo exhibitions at museums or galleries

c) Two or three-person invitational exhibitions

d) Juried or curated group exhibition

e) Public artwork commission

f) Competitive residencies

g) Work accepted into museum or gallery permanent collections

h) Reproduced work in publications and online

Service Evaluation

Overview

Service is an essential aspect of faculty responsibilities, encompassing contributions to the university, professional community, and the broader public. Faculty members are evaluated on the quality and impact of their service in these areas. Below are the expectations and evaluation criteria for service activities. These efforts must be active and documented.

- Service to the unit, division, or university
- Service to the professional community (local, regional, or national)
- Service to the public community (local, regional, or national)

Faculty will be allowed to provide evidence and justification of service which will be presented in a self-evaluation format (Appendix A).

Performance Levels

Faculty members will be evaluated on the following scale:

4. Outstanding
3. Above Satisfactory
2. Satisfactory
1. Conditional
0. Unsatisfactory

Evaluation Criteria

Outstanding	Demonstrates exceptional leadership in service, initiating and leading impactful efforts that strengthen the unit, university, or professional community. Actively contributes to institutional development by shaping policies, programs, or initiatives that significantly elevate the institution's profile. Regularly chairs committees or takes on major roles, with service efforts often recognized through awards or formal acknowledgment. Shows a deep, consistent commitment to service that goes far beyond basic expectations, fostering both institutional and professional growth.

Above Satisfactory	Regularly and actively participates in committees and contributes to departmental or institutional improvements. Demonstrates initiative by developing or enhancing existing programs or projects that benefit the unit or university. Engages in mentorship efforts, supporting colleagues or students and contributing meaningfully to the growth and improvement of the institution beyond routine service expectations.
Satisfactory	Participates in assigned service activities at the department, college, or university level, fulfilling all expected duties. Communicates effectively, responding to emails and inquiries as needed, and actively engages in committee work and community events. Submits required documentation of service activities, demonstrating competent and reliable performance in fulfilling service responsibilities.
Conditional	Displays limited participation or inconsistent engagement in committee work or service activities, with contributions that are often insufficient. At times, these contributions may be detrimental to the progress of service work, causing delays or hindering the overall effectiveness of the committee or initiative. Engagement is sporadic, and there is little evidence of meaningful or sustained involvement in service efforts.
Unsatisfactory	No participation in service activities at the department, college, or university level, or a failure to fulfill assigned service responsibilities. When participation does occur, it frequently delays committee progress and hinders overall effectiveness. There is little to no evidence of engagement in committees, projects, or community initiatives, resulting in a lack of contribution to the institution's mission/goals -.

Expectations for Service Performance

Faculty members are expected to provide comprehensive evidence that demonstrates excellence across all relevant service categories. In their self-evaluations (Appendix A), faculty may present both written and visual justification showcasing how their work meets or exceeds the standards as defined in the Service Activities.

- Written Justifications should include detailed descriptions of service activities at the School, College, and University levels. Faculty should document how they engaged in this service, the specific roles they held (e.g., committee member, chair, organizer), the amount of time dedicated, the impact or outcomes of their contributions (e.g., program improvements, community outreach), and any leadership or mentorship roles taken on. Faculty should also explain how these service activities align with institutional goals and contribute to the broader professional and academic community.

- Visual evidence may include tangible artifacts such as letters or emails for confirming participation in external service, particularly noting leadership roles, documentation of significant contributions or leadership during meetings, drafts or final reports of projects, initiatives, or proposals the faculty member has led or contributed to. It may also include proof of organizing department or university events (e.g., conferences, guest lectures, symposia), such as promotional materials, event schedules, images, or thank-you letters. While not required, these artifacts can provide valuable support in demonstrating service contributions.

Service Activities

Below are examples of service activities that contribute to the evaluation of faculty members:

- Committee Leadership: Takes on leadership roles such as chair in SVAD, CAH, or UCF committees, demonstrating strong organizational and decision-making skills, guiding the committee's work, and ensuring successful outcomes.
- Committee Membership: Serves as an active member on any SVAD (School of Visual Arts and Design), CAH (College of Arts and Humanities), or UCF (University of Central Florida) committee, contributing to institutional initiatives and supporting the goals of the organization.
- Coordination of Programs: Leads or coordinates special SVAD areas or academic programs, or other educational initiatives within the unit, division, or university, ensuring the successful planning, execution, and impact of these programs.
- Community Professional Services: Provides professional services to the community, such as delivering lectures or seminars, serving as a judge for competitions, or moderating events for local groups, organizations, or schools, sharing expertise and fostering public engagement.

- Organizational Leadership: Serves on a committee or board as an officer for a local, regional, or national organization related to their profession, contributing to the leadership and growth of the organization through strategic decision-making and community involvement.
- Student Engagement in Community Projects: Involves students in community projects related to the faculty member's academic area, providing mentorship and fostering practical experience, helping students apply academic learning in real-world settings.
- Faculty Mentorship: Acts as a mentor to junior faculty members, colleagues, or interns, providing guidance and support in their professional development, helping them navigate career advancement and academic challenges.
- Professional Organization Membership: Holds membership in international, national, regional, statewide, or local professional or community arts/design organizations, actively engaging with the professional community and staying informed about industry standards and developments.
- Leadership in Professional Organizations: Serves as an officer for local, regional, state, national professional arts organizations, contributing leadership to the advancement of the arts and design professions, influencing the direction and growth of the organization.
- Collaboration and Representation: Meets with representatives from other institutions or vendors to foster collaboration, exchange ideas, and develop partnerships that benefit the institution or profession.
- Guest Speaker and Special Services: Consults or delivers special services on campus, such as (uncompensated) guest speaking in courses or lectures, presentations related to the profession, or offering expertise in specific areas of the institution's needs. Compensated activities may also be included if they align with appropriate service categories in this section and are fully approved in the university's conflict of interest system.

Other Duties as Assigned

Overview

Some faculty members engage in "Other Assigned Duties" which are activities outside of standard categories. These activities should be relevant to the faculty member's expertise and the institution's mission. In their Faculty Annual Reports, faculty must provide a brief description of these activities, outlining their relevance and impact. These duties will be evaluated based on the expectations and outcomes as outlined in the criteria below.

Evaluation Criteria

Outstanding	The faculty member demonstrates exceptional leadership and initiative in their assigned duties, significantly enhancing the department, college, or institution. They consistently initiate, lead, or innovate projects or programs that align with their expertise and elevate the institution's profile. Outcomes of their efforts are notable for their impact, receiving formal acknowledgment or awards. The faculty member often takes on complex roles that require considerable responsibility and fosters a positive environment that advances the institution's mission and strategic goals. Their service is transformative, going beyond basic expectations and setting a standard for excellence.
Above Satisfactory	The faculty member regularly and actively participates in assigned duties, contributing meaningfully to the institution's advancement. They take initiative by improving existing projects, processes, or programs, often suggesting enhancements that benefit the unit or university. Their involvement is marked by reliable and proactive support, including mentorship or support to colleagues or students. While not always at the forefront, their contributions reflect a strong commitment and add considerable value to the institution. They demonstrate a consistent and positive impact that exceeds routine expectations.
Satisfactory	The faculty member fulfills all expected responsibilities within their assigned duties, completing tasks effectively and on time. They communicate promptly, respond to

	inquiries, and actively engage in committee work or projects as required. Their participation is reliable and steady, meeting established goals and timelines. Documentation of their service activities is provided as needed, and their work is competent, demonstrating consistent fulfillment of their assigned roles without the need for intervention or additional guidance.
Conditional	The faculty member's engagement in assigned duties is inconsistent, with limited participation or insufficient contributions that sometimes affect project or committee progress. Their involvement may appear minimal or lacking in initiative, with participation that does not fully meet the expectations agreed upon. Delays or gaps in performance occasionally impact the effectiveness of the assigned duties. There is evidence of basic engagement, but improvements in consistency, communication, and commitment to responsibilities are needed.
Unsatisfactory	The faculty member shows a lack of professionalism, with minimal to no participation in assigned duties, often failing to meet the responsibilities or expectations of their role. When present, their contributions are insufficient or disruptive, hindering the progress of projects or committees and requiring intervention to maintain effectiveness. There is little to no evidence of sustained engagement or meaningful contribution to the institution's mission through these duties, resulting in a noticeable lack of service fulfillment.

Appendix A: Self-Evaluation

When submitting their Faculty Annual Reports (FARs) at the end of each reporting period, faculty members must also submit a self-evaluation document. This document will be divided into sections based on assignment of duties and will also include an overall self-assessment summary. The self-evaluation must contain the following information:

1. Teaching

Reflection on Practices: Provide a brief narrative reflection focused on your teaching practices over the past year, including any new methods, innovations, or pedagogical approaches. Specific content in this narrative may include:

- Student Feedback: Summarize the Student Perception of Instruction (SPOI) feedback, contextualizing strengths and areas for improvement.

- Improvements Made: Detail any specific changes you made, for example, in response to student feedback, mentoring, or your self-reflection of your teaching performance.

- Challenges Faced in Teaching: Note any difficulties you encountered in teaching, and describe how you managed these challenges.

- Future Goals for Teaching: Set teaching-related goals for the next academic year.

Self-Evaluation (Teaching). Using the SVAD AESP evaluation rubric for teaching, assign yourself a rating (outstanding, above satisfactory, satisfactory, conditional, or unsatisfactory) for your teaching performance. Justification should exist in the narrative above.

---

2. Research and Creative Activities (If Applicable)

Summary of Activities: Provide a brief narrative summary of your research activities over the past year, including any publications, exhibitions, grants, or other notable achievements. Specific content in this narrative may include:

- Achievements: Highlight key achievements, including awards, recognitions, or completed projects.

- Challenges Faced: Discuss any challenges or obstacles you encountered in your research and how you addressed them.

- Future Goals: Outline your research goals for the upcoming academic year.

Self-Evaluation (Research). Using the SVAD AESP evaluation rubric for research and creative activity, assign yourself a rating (outstanding, above satisfactory, satisfactory, conditional, or unsatisfactory) for your research contributions this year. Justification should exist in the narrative above.

3. Service

Overview of Contributions: Provide a brief narrative overview of your service activities, both within the department and in the wider academic or professional community. Specific content in this narrative may include:

- Impact of Service: Describe the impact of your service work on the department, university, or community.

- Challenges in Service: Mention any difficulties faced in carrying out service activities.

- Future Service Goals: Outline your planned service contributions for the upcoming year.

Self-Evaluation (Service). Using the SVAD AESP evaluation rubric for service, assign yourself a rating (outstanding, above satisfactory, satisfactory, conditional, or unsatisfactory) for your service contributions. Justification should exist in the narrative above.

4. Overall Self-Evaluation

Overall Reflection on Your Performance: Provide a brief narrative reflection on your overall performance this year, combining research, teaching, and service. Specific content in this narrative may include:

- Strengths: Identify your strengths across all areas of responsibility.

Areas for Improvement: Address areas where improvement is needed and outline your plan for addressing these areas.

Overall Self-Evaluation Rating: Using the SVAD AESP evaluative rubric, assign yourself an overall rating for the year. Justification should exist in the narrative above.