1.06-1 Written Annual Evaluation

Each faculty member at the University of Georgia, regardless of rank or responsibilities, must receive a written annual evaluation of their performance. Tenure-track faculty, tenured faculty, and faculty outside of the tenure process should be evaluated based upon their academic discipline-specific criteria. All changes to performance criteria must be updated in the faculty handbook and policies in a timely fashion. These updates must be done in advance of the next review cycle and allow time for faculty to incorporate those expectations into the preparation of their review documents.

Each evaluation must address the components outlined in the following framework and encompass continuous professional growth appropriate to the institution’s sector and mission, school or college, and department. However, evaluators may use their own format and include additional components if they wish. Teaching, research, service, and administrative activities should be noted, including student success activities, as applicable and as further defined in discipline-specific criteria.

The faculty member is responsible for providing an annual activity report from UGA Elements and any additional documentation and materials required or allowed by the discipline-specific annual evaluation criteria and process. The evaluator will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member’s annual written evaluation and their progression toward achieving future milestones. The faculty member will sign a statement to acknowledge that they have been apprised of the content of their annual written evaluation.

A faculty member may respond to their annual evaluation in writing within 10 working days; any such response will be attached to the annual written evaluation. Within 10 working days of the faculty member’s response, the evaluator will acknowledge in writing the receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made as a result of the faculty member’s written response. This acknowledgement will also become part of the official personnel records. Annual reviews are not subject to discretionary review or appeal.

All USG annual faculty evaluations must utilize the following 5-point scale:

1 – Does Not Meet Expectations
2 – Needs Improvement
3 – Meets Expectations
4 – Exceeds Expectations
5 – Exemplary

Noteworthy achievement as referenced in BOR Policy 8.3.7.3 is reflective of a 4 or a 5 on the above 5-point scale. Deficient and unsatisfactory performance is reflective of a 1 or a 2 on the above 5-point scale.
If the performance overall or in any of the assigned areas of effort is judged to be a 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations or a 2 – Needs Improvement, the faculty member must be provided with a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) to remediate their performance during the next year. The evaluator will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member. The PRP must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs. The PRP will become part of the official personnel records.

The PRP must include the following components:
1. Clearly defined goals or outcomes,
2. An outline of activities to be undertaken,
3. A timetable,
4. Available resources and supports,
5. Expectations for improvement,
6. Monitoring strategy

Two meetings each during the fall and during the spring must be held to review progress, document additional needs/resources, and consider planned accomplishments for the upcoming semester. After each meeting, the evaluator should summarize the meeting and indicate if the faculty member is on track to complete the PRP. Consequences for failing to meet the expectations of the PRP must be stated at the conclusion of each meeting.

A tenured faculty member evaluated as a 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations or a 2 – Needs Improvement in any one of the assigned areas of effort, for which the assigned allocation of effort exceeds 10%, for two consecutive annual evaluations will participate in a corrective post-tenure review, as described in the Policy for Review of Tenured Faculty. Note that the deficiency does not have to be in the same area but could be in a different area from one year to the next.

An editable copy of the evaluation framework is posted on the Office of Faculty Affairs website.

[YEAR] ANNUAL EVALUATION
To: [Faculty Member’s Name]
From: [Dean/Department Chair/Center Director’s Name; for those schools with departments, the dean should be cc’d]
Date: [Must be before March 31 of the calendar year; for those colleges/schools with departments, the dean should set an earlier deadline with sufficient opportunity to review and provide feedback on a draft.]
Attachment(s): UGA Elements annual activity report [plus any self-assessments or other reports, as required by each academic unit]

This constitutes your annual written evaluation required by Section 8.3.5.1 of the Board of Regents Policy Manual and Section 4.4, Faculty Evaluation Systems, of the University System of Georgia Academic and Student Affairs Handbook. Your assigned allocation of effort this year
was [x\%] scholarship, [y\%] teaching, [z\%] service, and [zz\%] administration (or other ____________).

The following 5-point scale describes the scores in each category below:

1 – Does Not Meet Expectations
2 – Needs Improvement
3 – Meets Expectations
4 – Exceeds Expectations
5 – Exemplary

[The faculty member should be evaluated in each category below and should include involvement in student success activities, as defined in Academic Affairs Policy Manual 1.10-10, in a particular area, or across the four, area(s) of effort. Faculty should be evaluated based upon their Promotion and Tenure Unit’s discipline-specific criteria for annual evaluations. Faculty activity and productivity in each of the areas of assigned effort below may be briefly summarized as necessary by the evaluator. However, more extensive data or summaries or self-assessments by the faculty should be attached to the evaluation].

Teaching [1 – 5]
[Evaluation should be more than just the number of classes taught and must include an assessment of quality of teaching (e.g., peer reviews, student evaluations, demand for classes from students, enrollments, development of innovative teaching approaches), and involvement in student success activities such as mentoring, advising, supervising independent study.]

Scholarship/Research/Creative Work [1 – 5]
[Evaluation should present quantitative data where applicable (e.g., impact of journals, numbers of publications, amounts of external grant funding and sources, original creative works judged/reviewed) together with an assessment of the importance of the scholarship/research/creative work to the field, and involvement in student success activities such as mentoring, directing research, co-publishing.]

Service [1 – 5]
[Evaluation should assess the impact of achievements in professional service to the institution, community, or discipline (e.g., documented impact of service on audiences served), and involvement in student success activities such advising a student organization, preparing letters of recommendation.]

Administration or Other [1 – 5]
[Evaluation should assess the progress of the unit administered toward its strategic goals with measurable outcomes that document achievement of these objectives, and involvement in student success activities such as supporting curriculum development, advising, and scheduling; developing policies and student support initiatives.]
OVERALL EVALUATION [1 – 5]

[This section should provide an overall assessment of performance in relation to the individual’s assigned allocation of effort. If a majority of the faculty member’s assigned time receives a rating of a 1 or a 2, the overall evaluation must be unsatisfactory.

The overall evaluation should also indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward the next level of review appropriate to their rank, (i.e., promotion and/or tenure as appropriate). A statement should be included to indicate that satisfactory progress in any one year does not guarantee that the faculty member will be successful in promotion and/or tenure, nor does a statement of unsatisfactory progress predetermine that the faculty member will be unsuccessful in promotion and/or tenure, or post-tenure review.]

Please sign below to acknowledge that you have been apprised of the content of your annual written evaluation. Your signature only acknowledges receipt of your written annual evaluation and does not imply agreement. You may respond to this report in writing, including by noting any factual errors and/or errors in omission. That response must be submitted within 10 working days of the date of electronic or other documented delivery of your evaluation. Any such response will be attached to your annual written evaluation. Your evaluator will acknowledge in writing the receipt of your response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made as a result of your written response, within 10 working days. Any written responses by you and your evaluator will become part of the official personnel records.

_________________________________________
Name and Title of Evaluator

___________________________________________
Signature of Evaluator

___________________________________________
Signature of Evaluated Faculty Member, acknowledging receipt

Sources:

• Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.5.1
• Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure
• https://www.usg.edu/academic_affairs_handbook/section4/C2845
• AAPM 1.10-10 Student Success Activities
• List of additional examples of Student Success Activities on OFA webpage