Department of Statistics
Written Annual Evaluation Policy
November 17, 2022

1. Introduction

Each regular faculty member in the Department of Statistics at the University of Georgia, regardless of rank or responsibilities, will receive a written annual evaluation of their performance in one or more of the four areas of effort—research, teaching, service, and administration. The written evaluation will include an assessment of each faculty member's involvement in student success activities. The goal of the annual evaluation is to provide constructive feedback to faculty members on their performance in each area of effort. Workload percentages for faculty roles and responsibilities will be factored into the performance evaluation model in a consistent manner.

For tenure-track faculty, this document provides performance-assessment ratings, metrics, and standards that are consistent with the *Promotion and Tenure Criteria for the Department of Statistics*. For non-tenure-track faculty, this document provides performance-assessment ratings and metrics that are consistent with the *Guidelines for Appointment and Promotion of Lecturers.* Emphasis is placed on the quality and impact of contributions in each area of effort rather than quantity. The annual evaluation will also contain a statement indicating whether a faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward the next level of review appropriate to his/her rank (i.e., promotion and/or tenure as appropriate). Written annual evaluations are included in third-year review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review materials.

The evaluation of a faculty member with a joint appointment in another PTU or a secondary appointment of at least 25% in an Institute should involve consultation between the head/director of both units, according to the procedures outlined in the faculty member's memorandum of understanding (if one exists).

2. Evaluation Process and Ratings

By the third week of January of each year, each faculty member is responsible for submitting (to the Department Head) a detailed activity report for two calendar years (the current evaluation year and the previous one) generated from the UGA Elements, an updated curriculum vitae (CV), a short report on Student Success Activities, and a narrative (at most two pages) of achievements in the area(s) of effort over the past three calendar years (current evaluation year and previous two). The narrative can also include, for example, a description of the faculty member's teaching accomplishments, role in research publications and their citations, involvement in collaborative research, attempts at securing external funding, involvement in service activities, goals for continuous professional growth, and other noteworthy accomplishments.

Subsequently, the Department Head will share with the Faculty Review Committee (FRC) the annual evaluation documents submitted by the faculty members who have not yet reached their highest rank, namely, the Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Academic Professional Associates, Academic Professionals, and full-time Instructors. According

to the Statistics By-Laws, the FRC consists of at least three tenured senior faculty (preferably Full Professors) and one senior non-tenure-track faculty member whose primary responsibility is instruction.

Based on these documents and the performance assessment metrics to be outlined in Section 3, the Department Head will draft a preliminary assessment of *all* faculty members and give one of the following five ratings for each of the area(s) of effort:

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

The FRC will conduct a review of the faculty members who have not yet reached their highest rank. For each of these faculty members, the FRC will draft a written assessment report, assign one of the five performance ratings for each of the area(s) of effort, and provide a statement on progress towards promotion. The FRC will share their reports with the Department Head.

Subsequently, the Department Head will convene a meeting with the FRC to discuss their evaluations and finalize the evaluations. The non-tenure track faculty in the FRC will neither evaluate nor participate in the discussion of tenure-track faculty members. Annual performance evaluation letters will reflect the consensus of the FRC and the Department Head; it will provide a summative or overall evaluation of performance. A template of the written annual evaluation is given in the Appendix.

As the new Academic Affairs policy 1.06-1 states, the Department Head 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 to acknowledge that they have been apprised of the content of their annual written evaluation. This signature only acknowledges receipt of written annual evaluation and does not imply agreement.

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 Department Head 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.

The following sections describe the metrics, standards, student success activities, and the steps taken to handle unsatisfactory performance.

3. Metrics

Faculty members in the Department of Statistics are engaged in a wide variety of activities appropriate to their rank. In what follows, a list of metrics to assess the performance in each area

of effort—research (when applicable), teaching, service, and administration (when applicable)—is provided. The lists are not exhaustive; rather they are meant to be representative of the myriad ways in which faculty members may demonstrate their performance. Faculty members will be evaluated on their areas of effort according to their workload percentages.

3a. Research Metrics:

Academic research in Statistics focuses on developing statistical methodologies, associated theories, and interdisciplinary applications. Research is primarily evaluated based on the quality of publications appearing in reputable peer-reviewed journals/conference proceedings. The review times for statistical journals are considerably longer than those in many other disciplines. This has been a continuing issue for our discipline that has been documented repeatedly over the years. The external funding environment in Statistics is not only limited but also extremely challenging, particularly for researchers with a more theoretical focus on research. Keeping all these in mind, the research productivity and grant activity will be evaluated over a two-year period (the current evaluation year and the previous one). Given below is a list of metrics to measure the quality of research.

- Research publications in peer-reviewed statistics/probability journals or interdisciplinary journals or reputed conference proceedings as lead/corresponding authors.
- Other publications, such as books, review articles, book chapters, book reviews, contributions to discussions.
- The quality and impact of the publications are far more important than their quantity.
- Evidence of independent research.
- For faculty who have not yet achieved the highest rank, publications developing ideas and directions beyond the faculty member's doctoral dissertation serve as indicators of continued growth of the research program.
- Number of citations (excluding self-citations) of published articles along with an H-index.
- Documentation of seeking external grants and/or contracts as PI or Co-PI or Co-I (with significant support/effort). Documentation of ratings or recommendations of these submissions is *optional*.
- Current external funding through grants and/or contracts, including the amount of funding.
- Leadership roles in research grants.
- Presentation of invited and contributed research papers at international and national meetings/workshops.
- Seminar presentations at other universities or institutions.
- Organizing invited sessions in professional meetings and workshops
- Research-related activities for government institutions.
- Successful direction of undergraduate student research.
- Evidence of PhD/MS student supervision.
- Editorial board membership in reputable research journals;
- Editorial work and peer review as related to research and other creative activities, including grant proposal and peer-reviewed conferences;
- Awards and honors from professional societies;

- Elected or appointed positions in professional societies and organizations.

3b. Teaching Metrics:

Teaching helps students develop knowledge, skills, and abilities within their chosen discipline and dispositions to continue learning. The University distinguishes between routine classroom performance and contributions to teaching that draw upon the teacher's depth and breadth of scholarly knowledge and his/her teaching expertise. Teaching includes not only formal classroom instruction, but also advising or mentoring students. Effectiveness in teaching is reflected by student learning and development as well as in improvements in the learning environment and curriculum. The value of effective teaching is enormous. It enhances a student's knowledge, makes a positive impact on a student's life and academic career, and increases the educator's own understanding of the field. Needless to say, effective teaching helps grow the enrollment and hence increase the overall credit hour production. Given below is a list of metrics to measure the quality of teaching.

- A list of courses taught
- Demand and enrollment for classes
- Information from student end-of-course surveys teaching evaluations including student comments
- Peer evaluations of teaching (when applicable)
- Involvement in undergraduate teaching
- Course revision or development of a new course or a program
- Innovative instructional development;
- Development of new pedagogical methods;
- Development or significant improvement of programs
- Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments
- Research publications related to teaching
- Textbooks, curriculum materials, published lecture notes, abstracts, or peer-reviewed articles or reviews that reflect a candidate's teaching contributions and teaching scholarship
- Adoption of a candidate's instructional materials such as textbooks and online materials, especially repeated adoption, by institutions
- Receipt of competitive grants/contracts to fund innovative and evidence- based educational activities or to fund stipends for students
- Mentorship/Leadership roles
- Successful direction of individual students in independent studies, special student projects, or student seminars
- Participation in special teaching activities outside the University
- Participation in teaching professional development that aligns with the candidate's efforts to improve their teaching
- Providing special opportunities or professional enhancement for students
- Participation in national or international teaching workshops and conferences
- Membership on PhD/MS committees

- Service on departmental, College, or University primarily concerned with curriculum or instruction-related matters
- Collaborative work on courses, programs, and curricula within the University or across institutions
- Placement of graduate/undergraduate students; student mentoring; other evidence of teaching effectiveness

3c. Service Metrics:

Service is broadly divided into departmental service, service to the university, and service to the profession. Each member of the faculty is expected to participate fully in the service activities of the department, the university, and the profession.

- Service on departmental committees
- Service on college-level committees
- Service on university-wide committees
- Service on committees in professional societies
- Service in relevant specialized sections of professional societies (e.g., IMS, ASA sections)
- Invited session organization for national/international conference
- Conference/Workshop organization
- Participation in AP Statistics reading
- Referee work for peer-reviewed journals
- Referee work for peer-reviewed conferences
- Review of grant proposals
- Any other service that impacts the department, university, or profession

3d. Administration Metrics (when applicable):

- List of tasks undertaken
- Number of tasks completed
- Timely completion of tasks
- New tasks undertaken
- Attention to details
- Independence
- Number of personnel issues handled
- Interpersonal and leadership skills
- Help with progress toward department's strategic goals with measurable outcomes

3e. Metrics for Associate Director of the Statistical Consulting Center (SCC):

- Evidence of skillful SCC administration
- Number of SCC clients met
- Number of SCC Consulting Assistants trained
- Number of SCC reports generated

- Amount of annual income generated by the SCC
- Number of research publications
- Number of grant submissions
- Current external funding through grants and/or contracts
- Consulting related professional development
- Number of SCC Consulting Assistants supported
- Honors or special recognitions for statistical consulting accomplishments.
- Research publications related to statistical consulting.
- Participation in special statistical consulting activities outside the University
- Participation in professional development that aligns with the candidate's efforts to improve their statistical consulting
- Providing special opportunities or professional enhancement for students
- Participation in national or international statistical consulting workshops and conferences

4. Standards for determining evaluation ratings

4a. Research (when applicable): Rubrics for evaluation ratings are given below. **Note:** *A faculty member in the evaluation rating categories 3, 4, or 5 would normally be expected to achieve the targets for research metrics listed in the respective categories **over a two-year period (current year and the previous one)**, but a less impressive performance in one area can be ameliorated by better performances in other research metrics. For example, an assistant professor may meet all the targets listed in the evaluation rating 4 (Exceeds expectations) except that s/he may not be supervising a doctoral dissertation. In this case, the assistant professor should receive an Exceeds expectations rating.*

Ratings	Research
1 = Does not meet expectations	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 2 or above will receive a "Does not meet expectations" evaluation rating if there is no evidence of research activity or engagement in scholarship as assessed by the quality metrics listed in Section 3. The narrative neither describes the reasons for the lack of productivity nor states the efforts taken to improve scholarship significantly.
2 = Needs improvement	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 3 or above will receive a "Needs Improvement" evaluation rating if the research activity and scholarship falls short of the quality metrics listed in Section 3. This happens when, over a two-year period (the current evaluation year and the previous one), there is no publication data, no working paper submission to pubic research repositories, no evidence of seeking external funding, no research presentations at conferences or at universities, and the narrative provides some details of the efforts taken to improve research productivity.
3 = Meets expectations	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 4 or above will receive a "Meets expectations" evaluation rating if productivity and engagement in scholarship meets the quality metrics

	stated in Section 3. The targets for *meeting expectations* in research are listed below:
	1. Evidence of at least one research article under review in a peer-reviewed journal/conference proceeding; (OR) Submission of at least two research articles to public research repositories; (OR) Publication of at least one article in a reputable peer-reviewed journal/conference proceeding. Note that publications include "accepted/to appear" articles (OR) Submission of an external grant/contract (OR) having an active or a recently-ended (within a year of the evaluation year) external grant/contract as PI/Co-PI/Co-Investigator. 2. Evidence of supervising at least one student doctoral dissertation/Master's thesis (OR) Evidence of refereeing at least two research articles (OR) Evidence of at least one contributed/invited talk at professional meetings/conferences or invited seminars at departmental/center level or higher. 3. The narrative describes the reputation and/or the impact of research and good efforts to improve areas of weakness in scholarship.
4 = Exceeds expectations	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 5 will receive an "Exceeds expectations" evaluation rating if productivity and engagement in scholarship *exceed* the quality metrics stated in Section 3. The targets for *exceeding expectations* in research are listed below:

	1. Having at least one currently active or recently-ended (within a year of the evaluation year) federal (e.g., NSF, NIH) external grant/contract as PI/Co-PI (regardless of efforts) or PI of federal subawards from other institutes (at least 15% FTE or two months of salary in total) (OR) Having at least two currently active external grant/contact as Co-Investigator with at least 10% financial support. (OR) Receiving a highly prestigious research award (e.g., Distinguished Research Professor, the COPSS Award, ASA/IMS Fellowship). (OR) Having at least two research publications/conference proceedings in the top-tier outlets in the discipline or interdisciplinary journals/conference proceedings. (OR) Having at least three research publications/conference proceedings in the reputable outlets in the discipline or interdisciplinary journals. Note that publications include "accepted/to appear" articles. It is expected that the faculty member is a lead/corresponding author in a significant proportion of these publications or a sole author in at least one of the publications. 2. Evidence of supervising at least one student doctoral dissertation. 3. Strong evidence of editorial work related to research, including serving as an Associate Editor in a reputable journal, grant proposal review, and at least two invited talks at professional meeting/conferences or invited seminars at departmental/center level or higher. 4. The narrative describes the reputation and/or the impact of research and efforts taken to broaden research focus, scholarly progress, and grant activity.

5 = Exemplary	A faculty member will receive an "Exemplary" evaluation rating if productivity and engagement in scholarship *significantly exceed* the quality metrics stated in Section 3. The targets for *significantly exceeding* the research metrics are:
	1. Having at least one currently active federal (e.g., NSF, NIH) external grant/contract as PI and providing financial support to one or more Research Assistants from the faculty member's grant/contract.
	2. Having at least three research publications/conference proceedings in the top-tier outlets in the discipline or interdisciplinary journals.
	(OR)
	Having at least four research publications/conference proceedings in the reputable outlets in the discipline or interdisciplinary journals.
	Note that publications include "accepted/to appear" articles. It is expected that the faculty member is a lead/corresponding author in a significant proportion of these publications or a sole author in at least one of the publications.
	(OR)
	Receiving a highly prestigious research award (e.g., Distinguished Research Professor, the COPSS Award, ASA/IMS Fellowship)
	3. Evidence of supervising at least two student doctoral dissertations.
	4. Strong evidence of editorial work related to research, including serving as an Associate Editor in a reputable journal, grant proposal review, evidence of at least three invited talks or two keynote addresses at professional meeting/conferences.
	5. The narrative describes the reputation and/or the impact of research and efforts taken to broaden research focus, scholarly progress, and grant activity.

4b. Teaching: Assessment of teaching effectiveness is based on end-of-course teaching evaluations and another form of evidence, such as *self-reflection* that describes the collection and analysis of data (e.g., exam or assignment scores, recurrent themes in student survey responses, peer observation results). Data on percentages of "Excellent", "Good", "Average", "Below Average", and "Inadequate" ratings on "Overall Teaching Evaluation" and "Overall Course

Quality" from the end-of-course teaching evaluations will be used in the tables below. **Note:** *A faculty member in the evaluation rating categories 3, 4, or 5 would normally be expected to achieve the targets for teaching evaluation averages stated in the respective categories, but a less impressive performance in average ratings can be ameliorated by, e.g., the adoption of innovative teaching methods or creation of new courses.*

4b(i). Teaching rubrics for tenure-track faculty members:

Since 8000-level classes have significantly smaller enrollments than the 3000-, 4000-, or 4000/6000-level classes and the latter courses typically receive lower student evaluations, distinctions have been made in the thresholds for percentages of student ratings for each annual evaluation rating.

Evaluation Ratings	Teaching
1 = Does not meet expectations	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 2 or above will receive a "Does not meet expectations" evaluation rating.
2 = Needs improvement	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 3 or above will receive a "Needs improvement" evaluation rating if the average of all percentages of "Below Average", "Average", "Good", and "Excellent" ratings on "Overall Teaching Evaluation" and "Overall Course Quality" is at least 95 for 8000-level courses or at least 85 for 3000- or 4000- or 4000/6000-level classes or at least 90 for a faculty member who teaches both types of classes, and majority of the student written comments express concerns about teaching. The narrative provides minimal evidence of quality of the courses taught and minimal evidence of efforts to improve teaching.
3 = Meets expectations	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 4 or above will receive a "Meets expectations" evaluation rating if the average of all percentages of "Average", "Good", and "Excellent" ratings on "Overall Teaching Evaluation" and "Overall Course Quality" is at least 50 for 8000-level courses or at least 40 for 3000 or 4000 or 4000/6000-level classes or at least 45 for a faculty member who teaches both types of classes, and the majority of the student written comments are good. In addition, the self-reflection data and the narrative provide good evidence of quality of the courses taught and good efforts to improve teaching based on peer and/or student evaluations, or other feedback from students.
4 = Exceeds expectations	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 5 will receive an "Exceeds expectations" evaluation rating if the average of all percentages of "Good" and "Excellent" ratings on "Overall Teaching Evaluation" and "Overall Course Quality" is at least 85 for 8000-level courses or at least 80 for 3000 or 4000 or 4000/6000-level classes or at least 82 for a faculty member who teaches both types of classes, and the majority of the student written comments are excellent. In addition, the self-reflection data and the narrative provide strong evidence of quality of the courses taught in terms of efforts to

	improve effectiveness in teaching, adoption of innovative teaching methods and/or seeking relevant professional development to improve as needed.
5 = Exemplary	A faculty member will receive an "Exemplary" evaluation rating if the average of all percentages of "Excellent" ratings on "Overall Teaching Evaluation" and "Overall Course Quality" is at least 85 for 8000-level courses or at least 80 for 3000 or 4000 or 4000/6000-level classes or at least 82 for a faculty who teaches both types of classes, and almost all the student written comments are outstanding. In addition, the self-reflection data and the narrative provide exceptional evidence in terms of efforts to improve effectiveness in teaching, adoption of innovative teaching methods, or evidence of teaching awards/recognition/grants received, or seeking relevant professional development to improve teaching.

4b(ii). Teaching Rubrics for non-tenure-track faculty members:

For each annual evaluation rating, here the distinctions in the thresholds for percentages of student ratings have been made based on class sizes.

Evaluation Ratings	Teaching
1 = Does not meet expectations	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 2 or above will receive a "Does not meet expectations" evaluation rating.
2 = Needs improvement	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 3 or above will receive a "Needs improvement" evaluation rating if the majority of all percentages of "Below Average", "Average", "Good", and "Excellent" ratings on "Overall Teaching Evaluation" and "Overall Course Quality" are at least 95% for courses with less than 20 students per lecture and at least 85% for courses with 20 or more students per lecture, and the majority of the student written comments express concerns about teaching. A combination of self-reflection described in the narrative, student success activities and other educational contributions provides minimal evidence of quality of the courses taught and minimal evidence of efforts to improve teaching.
3 = Meets expectations	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 4 or above will receive a "Meets expectations" evaluation rating if the majority of all percentages of "Average", "Good", and "Excellent" ratings on "Overall Teaching Evaluation" and "Overall Course Quality" are at least 50% for courses with less than 20 students per lecture and at least 40% for courses with 20 or more students per lecture, and the majority of the student written comments are good. In addition, a combination of self-reflection described in the narrative, student success activities and other educational contributions provides good evidence of quality of the courses taught and good efforts to improve teaching based on peer and/or student evaluations, or other feedback from students.

4 = Exceeds expectations	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 5 will receive an "Exceeds expectations" evaluation rating if the majority of all percentages of "Good" and "Excellent" ratings on "Overall Teaching Evaluation" and "Overall Course Quality" are at least 85% for courses with less than 20 students per lecture, at least 80% for courses with 20-100 students per lecture and at least 70% for courses with more than 100 students per lecture, and the majority of the student written comments are excellent. In addition, a combination of self-reflection described in the narrative, student success activities and other educational contributions provides strong evidence of quality of the courses taught in terms of efforts to improve effectiveness in teaching, adoption of innovative teaching methods and/or seeking relevant professional development to improve as needed.
5 = Exemplary	A faculty member will receive an "Exemplary" evaluation rating if the majority of all percentages of "Excellent" ratings on "Overall Teaching Evaluation" and "Overall Course Quality" are at least 85% for courses with less than 20 students, at least 80% for courses with 20-100 students and at least 70% for courses with more than 100 students per lecture, and almost all the student written comments are outstanding. In addition, a combination of self-reflection described in the narrative, student success activities and other evidence of educational contributions provides exceptional evidence in terms of efforts to improve effectiveness in teaching, adoption of innovative teaching methods, or evidence of teaching awards/recognition/grants received, or seeking relevant professional development to improve teaching.

4c. Service: Although Statistics faculty members are not budgeted for service, many of them spend a substantial amount of time in service to the department, the college, the university, the discipline, granting agencies, and other organizations. These are essential for the academic system to function. For all faculty members there is a minimal expectation to attend departmental meetings and to have some limited service on student and departmental committees. To recognize these service contributions, for the purposes of the annual evaluation, we propose to shift X% (TBD) of a faculty member's workload from research and teaching to service.

Ratings	Service
1 = Does not meet expectations	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 2 or above will receive a "Does not meet expectations" evaluation rating.
2 = Needs improvement	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 3 or above will receive a "Needs improvement" evaluation rating if service responsibilities and contributions fall short of the metrics listed in Section 3 in terms of meaningful service contribution to the department, university committee, and the profession.

3 = Meets expectations	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 4 or above will receive a "Meets expectations" evaluation rating if service responsibilities and contributions meet the metrics listed in Section 3 in terms of service contribution to the department, university, and the profession. The narrative describes good effort to evaluate service contributions to the department, university, and the profession and to make improvements as needed.
4 = Exceeds expectations	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 5 will receive an "Exceeds expectations" evaluation rating if service responsibilities and contributions exceed the metrics listed in Section 3 in terms of service contribution to the department, university, and the profession. The narrative describes excellent effort to evaluate service contributions to the department, university, and the profession and to make improvements as needed.
5 = Exemplary	A faculty member will receive an "Exemplary" evaluation rating if service responsibilities and contributions are exceptional in terms of service contribution to the department, university, and the profession. The narrative describes outstanding efforts to evaluate service contributions to the department, university, and the profession, some of which culminating in national /international service awards, recognition, and/or high-level leadership.

4d. Administration

Ratings	Administration
1 = Does not meet expectations	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 2 or above will receive a "Does not meet expectations" evaluation rating. Responsibilities are listed without information about satisfactory completion of duties and the quality/impact of work.
2 = Needs improvement	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 3 or above will receive a "Needs improvement" evaluation rating if the responsibilities are listed but the information about satisfactory completion of duties and the quality/impact of work fall short of the metrics listed in Section 3.
3 = Meets expectations	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 4 or above will receive a "Meets expectations" evaluation rating if the overall performance on completion of duties and the quality/impact of work satisfactorily meets the metrics listed in Section 3. In addition, the faculty member performs administrative duties with a good level of independence and leadership.
4 = Exceeds expectations	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 5 will receive an "Exceeds expectations" evaluation rating if the overall performance on completion of duties and the quality/impact of work exceeds the metrics listed in Section 3. In addition, the faculty member performs administrative duties with a high level of independence and leadership.

5 = Exemplary	A faculty member will receive an "Exemplary" evaluation rating if the overall performance on completion of duties and the quality/impact of work is exceptional. In addition, the faculty member performs administrative duties with an exceptionally high level of independence and leadership.

4e. Associate Director of SCC

Ratings	Research & Administration
1 = Does not meet expectations	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 2 or above will receive a "Does not meet expectations" evaluation rating.
2 = Needs improvement	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 3 or above will receive a "Needs improvement" evaluation rating if information is provided on research and administrative efforts but the details on completion of duties and the quality/impact of work fall short of the metrics listed in Section 3.
3 = Meets expectations	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 4 or above will receive a "Meets expectations" evaluation rating if the overall performance on research, administrative efforts, and the quality/impact of work satisfactorily meets the metrics listed in Section 3. In addition, the faculty member performs administrative duties with a good level of independence and leadership.
4 = Exceeds expectations	A faculty member who does not receive an evaluation rating of 5 will receive an "Exceeds expectations" evaluation rating if the overall performance on research, administrative efforts, and the quality/impact of work exceeds the metrics listed in Section 3. In addition, the faculty member performs administrative duties with a high level of independence and leadership.
5 = Exemplary	A faculty member will receive an "Exemplary" evaluation rating if the overall performance on research, administrative efforts, and the quality/impact of work is exceptional. In addition, the faculty member performs administrative duties with an exceptionally high level of independence and leadership.

5. Student Success Activities (SSA)

Student success activities is a comprehensive term for teaching faculty effort expended to support the short- and long-term academic and professional achievements of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students and trainees. Student success is supported by in class as well as outside of class efforts. Involvement in student success activities is not predicated upon additional allocation of effort but is included within the faculty member's allocation of effort in instruction, research, service, and administration, as applicable. Assessment of student success will focus on documenting a faculty member's quality involvement in a small number of student success activities to maximize effectiveness and engagement.

Examples of SSA, by area of effort, may include but are not limited to, the following; see **link** for additional examples of SSA.

- **Teaching and student success activities:** Mentoring and advising of undergraduate, graduate students, and professional students; organizing and attending study groups; supervising independent study; course development, including experiential learning activities and active learning courses; developing, supervising, or managing internships or practicum opportunities
- **Research and student success activities:** Mentoring of undergraduate students, graduate students, professional students; directing undergraduate research; co-authoring or co-presenting with students; sponsoring students to attend professional meetings and conferences
- **Service and student success activities:** Sponsoring coffee hours/social events; sponsoring study abroad programs; sponsoring professional development activities for students (e.g., skills workshops); nominating students for awards; serving as faculty advisor for student clubs/organizations; course and career advising; preparing letters of recommendation and assisting with applications; supporting student recruitment and retention; graduate student professionalization; student care and outreach; student health and wellness
- **Administration and student success activities:** Support for curriculum development; student advising; course scheduling and development of academic calendar, policies, and student support

6. Steps to handle unsatisfactory performance

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 will be provided with a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) to remediate their performance during the next year; however, remediation cannot be required of a faculty member outside of the contract period.

The Department Head will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member. The PRP's goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable within the time frame, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member. 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

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.

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 Department Head will 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.

Appendix

A template of the written annual evaluation is given in the appendix.

[YEAR] **ANNUAL EVALUATION**

To: [Faculty Member's Name]

From: [Department Head; Franklin College Dean should be cc'd]

Date: [Must be before March 31 of the calendar year; allow sufficient time to review and provide feedback on a draft.]

Attachment(s): UGA Elements annual activity report, Curriculum Vitae, report on Student Success Activities, and a two-page narrative

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.]

Research [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 research 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 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 (Evaluation of Personnel/Faculty)
- University System of Georgia Academic & Student Affairs Handbook 4.4 (Faculty Evaluation Systems)
- UGA Academic Affairs Policy Manual 1.06-1 (Written Annual Evaluation)
- UGA Academic Affairs Policy Manual 1.10-10 (to be added) (Student Success Activities)
- List of additional examples of Student Success Activities on OFA webpage