



# UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences

*Department of Animal and Dairy Science*

## **Policy for Annual Evaluation of Faculty**

### **Department of Animal & Dairy Science**

November 28, 2022

The policy for written annual evaluation complies with the **University of Georgia Academic Affairs Policy 1.06-1 Written Annual Evaluation**.

#### **Overview**

The Department of Animal & Dairy Science developed and adopted the following Annual Evaluation Policy (AEP) to assure all faculty are evaluated based upon clear, transparent, and academic discipline-specific assessment criteria and rubrics that ensure academic freedom. This policy is based on UGA Academic Affairs Policies 1.06-1 Written Annual Evaluation and 1.10-10 Student Success Activities. Should any modifications to UGA policies result in contradictions to Department of Animal & Dairy Science AEP, the UGA policy will supersede the departmental AEP, and the Department will adjust and approve changes to the departmental policy to comply with UGA policies.

#### **Annual Review Materials**

ADS faculty members are required annually submit electronic copy of UGA Elements annual activity report, a one-page ADS Student Success and Teaching Activities, a one-page summary achievements for the year, and a one-page document of goals for the upcoming year. These evaluation documents are due to the Department Head by January 15 (or Monday thereafter if the date falls on a weekend)

Failure to submit the required evaluation information will result in an evaluation rating of “1” for each area of responsibility lacking the required documentation. The department head will meet and discuss annual performance on a yearly basis during the spring semester. This meeting will also serve as an opportunity to review and if needed, adjust the Allocation of Effort of the faculty member. The meeting will also serve as an opportunity for faculty members to share their goals for the current calendar year. A written summary report of the annual evaluation will be given to and must be signed by the faculty member. Failure to sign the evaluation will not negate the evaluation. Your signature only acknowledges receipt of your written annual evaluation and does not imply agreement.

#### **Criteria for Evaluating Performance for Annual Review**

Annual evaluation 5-point scale:

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

*Edgar L. Rhodes Center | Athens, Georgia 30602*

*Telephone 706-542-1852 | Fax 706-542-2465*

*An Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action, Veteran, Disability Institution*

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.

The overall evaluation is the rating in each category multiplied by the percentage of effort the faculty member is to allocate toward that category. The resulting values are then summed to give a total rating. Ratings are rounded following standard conventions (i.e., tenths digit <5, round down; if tenths digit is  $\geq 5$ , round up). If student success activities have not been documented as described above, the overall rating drops by one level.

**Example calculation:** Professor ABC earns a 5 rating for research and a 2 rating for teaching, and they have a 67/33 split of research and teaching responsibilities. This amounts to a contribution of 3.35 for research ( $5 \times 0.66$ ) and a 0.66 for teaching ( $2 \times 0.33$ ), for an overall evaluation rating of 4.01, which is rounded to a 4. Professor XYZ earns a rating of 3 for research ( $3 \times 0.5$ ) and 4 for teaching ( $4 \times 0.5$ ) and has a 50/50 split, for an overall evaluation of 3.50, which is rounded to a 4.

If a faculty member fails to report their involvement in student success activities as part of their research, teaching, and/or service work, and effort to implement at least 1 student success activity in ways that are consistent with its effectiveness, their overall evaluation rating will drop by one point.

#### Faculty Response to Review

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.

#### Content of Written Annual Review

The attached annual evaluation letter template, including specific rubric components, was adopted by the Animal & Dairy Science faculty and will be utilized to assure compliance with USG and UGA policy in the annual evaluation components and process requirements (i.e. 5-point rating scale for all applicable rubric components and documentation of contributions towards Student Success Activities)

As per USG and UGA policy, Performance Remediation Plans (PRP) will be developed and implemented as needed for all faculty, including tenure track and non-tenure track faculty. Failure to comply with a PRP will result in a corrective post-tenure review, as described in the Policy for Review of faculty. In cases where a Performance Remediation Plan is required, it will be developed, implemented, and evaluated as described in UGA Academic Affairs Policies 1.06-1 Written Annual Evaluation with the following additions. Development of the PRP must occur within two weeks of the evaluation. The four required meetings will be conducted with the two meetings in the spring semester being held in January and April, and the two meetings in the fall semester being held in August and October.

#### Developmental Response to 1 and 2 Ratings –

To provide an independent perspective in instances where a faculty member does not meet expectations, an Evaluation Committee composed of three faculty (full professor, associate professor,

assistant professor) plus a lecturer, research scientist, or public service associate if the faculty member being evaluated is on one of those tracks. In the instance where there is not more than one a lecturer, research scientist, or public service associate in the department the Evaluation Committee will be composed of three faculty (full professor, associate professor, assistant professor). The committee members will be elected for three-year terms by the faculty to serve in two roles. First, if the Department Head anticipates assigning a 1 or 2 rating in an area of work that would result in the development of a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP), the committee will review the evaluation and provide their perspective on the appropriateness of the rating. Second, the committee will participate in the PRP process as described below.

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 help improve 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 Evaluation Committee will review each PRP and provide revisions if the PRP falls short of these expectations. 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 evaluator should summarize the meeting and indicate if the faculty member is on track to complete the PRP. At the request of the faculty member, the Evaluation Committee will review the summaries and evaluation of whether the faculty member is on track. 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 1 or 2 rating does not have to be in the same area but could be in a different area from one year to the next.

#### Relationship of the annual review to promotion and tenure

Written annual evaluations are included in third-year review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review materials.



UNIVERSITY OF  
**GEORGIA**

College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences

*Department of Animal and Dairy Science*

**202X FACULTY ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

**To:** [Faculty Member's Name]

**From:** Francis Fluharty, Ph.D., Department Head, Animal & Dairy Science

**Date:**

**Attachment(s):**

- UGA Elements annual activity report
- Requested supplemental materials (prepared by the faculty)
- Checklist for Student Success and Teaching Activities

---

This constitutes your annual written evaluation required by Section 8.3.5.1 of the Board of Regents Policy Manual. Your assigned allocation of effort this year was \_\_\_% teaching, \_\_\_% research, \_\_\_% extension and 5% service. There is a departmental expectation of service to the department, College, University, and the profession that all faculty members must meet; an expectation that faculty members are actively engaged in professional department, research, and grant-seeking.

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

**Teaching**

[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.]

*Rating for Teaching = [1-5]*

## **Research**

[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.]

*Rating for Research = [1-5]*

## **Extension**

[Evaluation should assess the development of programs relevant to the needs of Extension clientele with measurable outcomes that document achievement of these objectives, involvement in activities that provide professional development for county-based Extension personnel, involvement in seeking extramural funding to support Extension initiatives and programs, participation in applied research within the faculty member's area of expertise, and provide scholarship in appropriate scientific journals, Extension Bulletins.]

*Rating for Extension = [1-5]*

## **Service**

[Evaluation should assess the impact of achievements in professional service to the institution, community, or discipline (e.g., service on committees and review panels, documented impact of service on audiences served, membership in professional societies, reviewing scientific manuscripts), and involvement in student success activities such as, but not limited to, advising a student organization, mentoring undergraduate and graduate research and preparing students for presentations and job interviews, and preparing letters of recommendation.]

*Rating for Service = [1-5]*

## **OVERALL EVALUATION**

[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.]

DRAFT

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 because of your written response, within 10 working days. Any written responses by you and your evaluator will become part of the official personnel records.

*Overall Rating = [1-5]*

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Faculty Member Signature**  
(Acknowledging receipt)

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Department Head Signature**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

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



UNIVERSITY OF  
**GEORGIA**

College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences

*Department of Animal and Dairy Science*

## Faculty Annual Evaluation Rubric

Approved XX December 2022

Annual evaluations will focus on the primary year with consideration given to prior 2-year (3 years total) window for evidence of workflow patterns.

### RESEARCH

Rating	Criteria: Evidence of research effort, output, and impact appropriate with area of discipline or sub-discipline (for proportionate EFT) showing growth or maintenance of regional, national, or international reputation.
1 = Does not meet expectations	<p><b>Outputs - primarily documented in Elements report, secondarily documented in faculty narrative.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. No evidence of the faculty member's attempt to publish research output in referred journal articles, or other externally peer reviewed or evaluated materials (e.g., bulletins) or research products (e.g., patents, computer programs, producer/stakeholder tools, other publications)</li><li>2. No evidence of the faculty member's attempt to secure extramural funding to support research activities (i.e., no proposal submitted, grants received, gifts received)</li><li>3. No participation or attempt to participate in professional and scientific meetings and workshops</li><li>4. No commitment to advising/mentoring of undergraduate or graduate students as evidenced by the lack of chairing/co-chairing, or participation in committees</li></ol> <p><b>Quality/Impact – primarily documented in faculty narrative, secondarily documented in Elements report</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Faculty member's research outcome lacks documented evidence of quality and/or impact</li></ol> <p><b>Professional development – primarily documented in faculty narrative, secondarily documented in Elements report</b></p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No documented evidence of the faculty member’s participation in professional development activities (e.g., continuing education at societal meetings, workshops, mentorship)</li> </ol>
<p>2 = Needs improvement</p>	<p><b>Outputs – primarily documented in Elements report, secondarily documented in faculty narrative.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Failure of the faculty member to achieve an adequate average publication rate (average over 3-year review period) <u>or</u> to document a clear effort towards achieving an adequate research outcome adequate for faculty in their first 3 years. Publications are as enumerated in point (1) of the outputs on the “Does Not Meet Expectations” section above.</li> <li>2. Faculty member has inadequate extramural funding to support his/her research program <u>and</u> shows no attempt/effort to improve the situation through the submissions of grant proposals and research contracts.</li> <li>3. Lack of a minimum effort by the faculty member to disseminate research outcomes at appropriate professional and scientific venues (e.g., meetings, workshops, blogs, etc.)</li> <li>4. Faculty member only demonstrates minimal activity <u>or</u> effort towards mentoring undergraduate or graduate students in research endeavors (chair, co-chair, active committee membership)</li> <li>5. Faculty member does not participate in reviewing peers research outcome (e.g., review of journal articles, review of contributions submitted to meetings/workshops, etc.)</li> </ol> <p><b>Quality/Impact - primarily documented in faculty narrative, secondarily documented in Element’s report</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack of documented evidence of quality and/or impact of research outputs by faculty member as appropriate for faculty member’s rank, discipline or sub-discipline <u>and</u> research program although outputs are sufficient</li> </ol> <p><b>Professional development - primarily documented in faculty narrative, secondarily documented in Elements report</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack of documented evidence that faculty member sought professional development activities (e.g., continuing education at societal meetings, workshops, mentorship) <u>or</u> failed to document how they have put into practice professional development activities</li> </ol>
<p>3 = Meets expectations</p>	<p><b>Outputs - primarily documented in Elements report, secondarily documented in faculty narrative</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A demonstrated pattern of publication in referred journal articles, or other externally peer reviewed or evaluated materials (e.g., bulletins) or research products (e.g., patents, computer programs, producer/stakeholder tools, other publications). A minimum of one</li> </ol>



	<p>publication/output per year over a rolling 3-year review period is required. <u>For faculty members in their first 3 years</u>, a documented effort towards the same goal is required</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Faculty demonstrates adequate extramural funding to support their research program including cost of research, student assistantship support, and publication of research outputs over the 3-year review period <u>or</u> shows sufficient attempt/effort in the submission of grants to garner extramural funding to support their research efforts</li> <li>3. Faculty member or those under his/her supervision are actively working to disseminate research outcome at appropriate professional and scientific venues (e.g., meetings, workshops, blogs, etc.) during the 3-year review period</li> <li>4. Faculty member is actively involved in mentoring undergraduate students, graduate students post-doctoral associates, and/or visiting scholars</li> </ol> <p><b>Quality/Impact - primarily documented in faculty narrative, secondarily documented in Elements report</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Impact and extension of research outputs (publications, seminars, presentations, etc.) indicates regional, national, or international reach appropriate for the faculty member’s rank, discipline or sub-discipline, <u>and</u> research program</li> <li>2. Research outputs are of enough quality to advance the knowledge and understanding within the discipline or sub-discipline and/or potentially have an impact and be adopted within the discipline or sub-discipline of the faculty member</li> </ol> <p><b>Professional development - primarily documented in faculty narrative, secondarily documented in Elements report</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If desired to maintain or increase productivity level, the faculty member may need to acquire/improve skill sets. Documented attempts of professional development (sabbaticals, workshops, short-term trainings, grant development workshops, mentor/mentee programs, continuing education conferences, etc.) is required</li> </ol>
4 = Exceeds expectations	<p><b>Outputs - primarily documented in Elements report, secondarily documented in faculty narrative</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A demonstrated consistent pattern of publication of referred journal articles, or other externally peer reviewed or evaluated materials (e.g., bulletins) or research products (e.g., patents, computer programs, producer/stakeholder tools, other publications). that meets or exceeds a minimum of one publication/output per year over the 3-year review period</li> <li>2. An adequate and continuous extramural funding level capable of supporting the faculty member’s research program</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Active dissemination of research outcomes at appropriate venues (e.g., conferences/meetings, research presentations, seminars, workshops, etc.) over the three-year review period</li> <li>4. Active and continuous involvement in mentoring/advising of undergraduate students, graduate students (chair/co-chair, committee member), post-doctoral associates, and/or visiting scholars in research endeavors</li> </ol> <p><b>Quality/Impacts - primarily documented in faculty narrative, secondarily documented in Elements report</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Impact and extension of research outputs (publications, seminars, presentations, etc.) indicates regional, national, or international reach appropriate for the faculty member’s rank, discipline or sub-discipline, <u>and</u> research program; <u>and/or</u> a growth in prominence from one level to the next (i.e., regional to national or national to international)</li> <li>2. Research outputs have a documented impact or adoption within the discipline or sub-discipline of the faculty member, <u>and/or</u> advance the knowledge and understanding within the discipline or sub-discipline</li> </ol> <p><b>Professional development - primarily documented in faculty narrative, secondarily documented in Elements report</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If desired to maintain or increase productivity level, the faculty member may need to acquire/improve skill sets. Documented attempts of professional development (sabbaticals, workshops, short-term trainings, grant development workshops, mentor/mentee programs, continuing education conferences, etc.) is required</li> </ol>
5 = Exemplary	<p><b>Outputs - primarily documented in Elements report, secondarily documented in faculty narrative</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A demonstrated consistent pattern of publication of referred journal articles, or other externally peer reviewed or evaluated materials (e.g., bulletins) or research products (e.g., patents, computer programs, producer/stakeholder tools, other publications) that clearly exceeds one publication/output per year over the 3-year review period</li> <li>2. An adequate and continuous extramural funding level capable of supporting the faculty member’s research program; <u>and</u> extramural funding from Federal funding source (e.g., USDA, NSF, NIH, etc.)</li> <li>3. Active dissemination of research outcomes at appropriate venues (e.g., conferences/meetings, research presentations, seminars, workshops, etc.) over the three-year review period</li> <li>4. Active dissemination of research outcomes at appropriate venues (e.g., conferences/meetings, research presentations, seminars, workshops, etc.) over the three-year review period</li> <li>5. Active and continuous involvement in mentoring/advising of undergraduate students, graduate students (chair/co-chair, committee member), post-doctoral associates, and/or visiting scholars in research endeavors</li> </ol>

	<p>6. Leadership or prominence in the discipline or sub-discipline as evidenced by one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Leadership roles in societal organizations;</li> <li>- Editorship roles for books or scientific journals</li> <li>- Panelist/Ad-hoc reviewer to Federal or international funding agencies</li> <li>- Faculty member and/or mentee receives award(s) for research efforts</li> <li>- Teaching international courses for graduate students and scientists</li> </ul> <p><b>Quality/Impacts - primarily documented in faculty narrative, secondarily documented in Elements report</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Impact and extension of research outputs (publications, seminars, presentations, etc.) indicates national, or international reach; and/or a growth in prominence from one level to the next (i.e., regional to national or national to international)</li> <li>2. Research outputs have a documented impact or adoption within the discipline or sub-discipline of the faculty member, and advance the knowledge and understanding within the discipline or sub-discipline</li> </ol> <p><b>Professional development - primarily documented in faculty narrative, secondarily documented in Elements report</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If desired to maintain or increase productivity level, the faculty member may need to acquire/improve skill sets. Documented attempts of professional development (sabbaticals, workshops, short-term trainings, grant development workshops, mentor/mentee programs, continuing education conferences, etc.) is required</li> </ol>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## TEACHING

Rating	Criteria: Clear evidence of teaching that fosters student learning and development and pursues improvements in the learning environment and curriculum.
1 = Does not meet expectations	<p><b>Outputs (documented in Elements report and described in the narrative). The faculty member does <u>not</u> do either of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teach assigned courses, as appropriate for EFT.</li> <li>2. Mentor undergraduates, graduate students, and/or postdocs</li> </ol> <p><b>Quality/impact/professional development (documented in course evaluations and described in narrative). There is no evidence for <u>a</u> majority of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Course evaluations (assuming response rate of &gt;50%) or other student correspondence indicate a persistent and prevalent pattern of teaching/mentoring problems or issues.</li> <li>2. Self-reflection does not indicate any attempt to improve teaching/mentoring.</li> <li>3. The faculty member has not sought professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) on teaching or mentoring.</li> <li>4. No attempt to participate in Student Success Activities.</li> </ol>
2 = Needs improvement	<p><b>Outputs (documented in Elements report and described in the narrative). The faculty member does <u>not</u> demonstrate one of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A regular pattern of teaching assigned courses, as appropriate for EFT.</li> <li>2. A pattern of mentoring undergraduates, graduate students, and/or postdocs.</li> </ol> <p><b>Quality/impact/professional development (documented in course evaluations and described in narrative). There is evidence for <u>a</u> majority of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Course evaluations (assuming response rate of &gt;50%) or other student correspondence indicate a persistent and prevalent pattern of teaching/mentoring problems or issues (e.g., repeated teaching efforts with no indication of improvement).</li> <li>2. Self-reflection does not clearly indicate how the faculty member is making substantive and effortful attempts to improve teaching/mentoring (e.g., seeking relevant professional development, seeking feedback from peers on how to improve, mid-course evaluation, identifying specific room for improvement based on evidence from students or peers and a plan for change).</li> <li>3. Minor attempt to participate in Student Success Activities.</li> </ol>
3 = Meets expectations	<p><b>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A regular pattern of teaching assigned courses, as appropriate for EFT.</li> <li>2. A pattern of mentoring undergraduates, graduate students, and/or postdocs.</li> </ol> <p><b>Quality/impact/professional development (documented in narrative). The faculty member demonstrates at least <u>one</u> of the following:</b></p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Self-reflection that shows teaching/mentoring effectiveness via systematic analysis of one form of evidence (e.g., summary of student comments from course evaluations assuming response rate of &gt;50%, narrative description of peer evaluation of teaching, assessment of student learning or growth, mid-semester course evaluation).</li> <li>2. Self-reflection that identifies specific room for improvement based on evidence from students or peers and a plan for change.</li> <li>3. Involvement in Student Success Activities.</li> </ol>
4 = Exceeds expectations	<p><b>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A regular pattern of teaching assigned courses, as appropriate for EFT</li> <li>2. A pattern of mentoring undergraduates, graduate students, and/or postdocs.</li> </ol> <p><b>Quality/impact/professional development (documented in narrative). Faculty should demonstrate at least <u>two</u> of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pattern of investing in teaching/mentoring that requires additional workload, including large classes (75+ students), writing-intensive courses, greater than average # of undergraduate researchers (i.e., more than 1 undergraduate researcher per graduate researcher participating in research symposiums or data publication), or higher number of credit hours than expected</li> <li>2. Self-reflection that shows teaching / mentoring effectiveness via systematic analysis of one form of evidence (e.g., summary of student comments from course evaluations assuming response rate of &gt;50%; summary of teaching strengths and ideas for improvement from peer evaluation of teaching; assessment of student learning or growth; summary of findings of mid-semester course evaluation; assessment of research mentoring)</li> <li>3. Self-reflection that identifies specific room for improvement in teaching/mentoring based on evidence from students or peers and a plan for change</li> <li>4. Involvement in numerous Student Success Activities. One or more of the following (A) Funding for teaching innovation or impact activities; (B) Teaching leadership roles (e.g., mentoring others in teaching); (C) Local teaching awards or other recognition at a department, college, or institutional level.</li> <li>5. Participating in publication of <b>instruction focused</b> abstracts, peer-reviewed publications, and/ or conference presentations/proceedings.</li> </ol>
5 = Exemplary	<p><b>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A regular pattern of teaching assigned courses, as appropriate for EFT</li> <li>2. A pattern of mentoring undergraduates, graduate students, and/or postdocs.</li> </ol> <p><b>Quality/impact/professional development (documented in narrative). Faculty should demonstrate <u>three or more</u> of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pattern of investing in teaching that requires additional workload, including large classes (75+ students), writing-intensive courses,</li> </ol>

	<p>greater than average # of undergraduate researchers (i.e., more than 1 undergraduate researcher per graduate researcher participating in research symposiums or data publication), or higher number of credit hours than expected</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>2. Self-reflection that shows teaching effectiveness via systematic analysis of one form of evidence (e.g., summary of student comments from course evaluations, assuming response rate of &gt;50%; summary of teaching strengths and ideas for improvement from peer evaluation of teaching; assessment of student learning or growth; summary of findings of mid-semester course evaluation)</li><li>3. Self-reflection that identifies specific room for improvement based on evidence from students or peers and a plan for change</li><li>4. Involvement in a majority of Student Success Activities.</li><li>5. One or more of the following (A) Funding for teaching innovation or impact activities; (B) Teaching leadership roles (e.g., mentoring others in teaching); and (C) Local or national teaching awards or other recognition at an institutional or national level.</li><li>6. Participating in publication of instruction focused abstracts, peer-reviewed publications, and/ or conference presentations/proceedings.</li></ol>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## EXTENSION

Rating	Criteria: Evidence of development and implementation of high-quality extension activities that address emerging needs of Georgia’s animal and dairy science clientele with impacts commensurate with achieving or maintaining a local, regional or national reputation
1 = Does not meet expectations	<p><b>Outputs (documented in Elements report). Evidence from the faculty member indicates:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No attempt to develop and coordinate programming within the area of the candidate’s area of expertise (e.g., in-service training, seminars, workshops, webinars, county/regional meetings, field days, youth development events, clientele consultations, advisory meetings, radio/television interviews).</li> <li>2. No demonstration of leadership and technical ability in developing (Assistant Professors) and sustaining (Associate and Full Professors) a recognizable Extension and outreach programming (e.g. recognizable client programs, industry reputation, invited presentations, and awards).</li> <li>3. No attempt of extension publications (e.g, newsletters, trade journal articles, exhibits/posters, computer programs, interactive learning modules, multimedia educational programs, electronic products [e-books, websites, blogs, social media posts]).</li> <li>4. No attempt of scholarly work, which should include published research related to extension and/or applied research in refereed discipline-specific scientific journals or extension bulletins of local, national or international significance.</li> <li>5. No attempts to secure funding to support extension programs, publications or trainings.</li> </ol> <p><b>Professional development (documented in narrative):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The faculty member has not sought professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) or described how they have enacted what they learned.</li> </ol>
2 = Needs improvement	<p><b>Outputs (documented in Elements report). Evidence from the faculty member indicates:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minimal attempt to develop and coordinate programming within the area of the candidate’s area of expertise (e.g., in-service training, seminars, workshops, webinars, county/regional meetings, field days, youth development events, clientele consultations, advisory meetings, radio/television interviews).</li> <li>2. Minimal demonstration of leadership and technical ability in developing (Assistant Professors) and sustaining (Associate and Full Professors) a recognizable Extension and outreach programming (E.g. recognizable client programs, industry reputation, invited presentations, and awards).</li> <li>3. Minimal attempt to publish extension publications (e.g, newsletters,</li> </ol>

	<p>trade journal articles, exhibits/posters, computer programs, interactive learning modules, multimedia educational programs, electronic products [e-books, websites, blogs, social media posts]).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Minimal pattern of scholarly work, which should include published research related to extension and/or applied research in refereed discipline-specific scientific journals or extension bulletins of local, national or international significance.</li> <li>5. Insufficient funding to support the costs of extension programs, publications, and training <u>and</u> no submission of a grant for external funding.</li> </ol> <p><b>Quality/impact/professional development (described in narrative). Evidence from the faculty member indicates:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The reach or other impact of extension publications and presentations falls short of indicating a local, regional and/or national reputation in their field, as appropriate for rank.</li> </ol> <p><b>Professional development:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The faculty member has not sought professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) or described how they have enacted what they learned.</li> </ol>
3 = Meets expectations	<p><b>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sufficient attempt to develop and coordinate programming within the area of the candidate's area of expertise (e.g., in-service training, seminars, workshops, webinars, county/regional meetings, field days, youth development events, clientele consultations, advisory meetings, radio/television interviews).</li> <li>2. Sufficient demonstration of leadership and technical ability in developing (Assistant Professors) and sustaining (Associate and Full Professors) a recognizable Extension and outreach programming (E.g. recognizable client programs, industry reputation, invited presentations, and awards).</li> <li>3. Evident pattern of extension publications (e.g, newsletters, trade journal articles, exhibits/posters, computer programs, interactive learning modules, multimedia educational programs, electronic products [e-books, websites, blogs, social media posts]).</li> <li>4. Evident pattern of scholarly work, which should include published research related to extension and/or applied research in refereed discipline-specific scientific journals or extension bulletins of local, national or international significance.</li> <li>5. Sufficient funding to support the costs of extension programs, publications, and training <u>and</u> no submission of a grant for external funding</li> </ol> <p><b>Quality/impact/professional development (described in narrative):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The reach or other impact of extension publications, presentations, and/or scholarly efforts demonstrates a regional and/or national reputation in the field of study, as appropriate for rank.</li> <li>2. Innovations in their Extension programming, to include novel tools,</li> </ol>



	<p>approaches, and resources that have the potential to positively impact their field of work and advance the knowledge in their discipline and/or create interdisciplinary bridges.</p> <p><b>Professional development:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If needed to improve or maintain productivity, funding levels, quality, and dissemination of programs, etc., the faculty member has sought professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) and clearly described how they have enacted what they learned.</li> </ol>
<p>4 = Exceeds expectations</p>	<p><b>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Continuous pattern of development and coordination of programming within the area of the candidate’s area of expertise (e.g., in-service training, seminars, workshops, webinars, county/regional meetings, field days, youth development events, clientele consultations, advisory meetings, radio/television interviews).</li> <li>2. Multiple instances of leadership and technical ability in developing (Assistant Professors) and sustaining (Associate and Full Professors) a recognizable Extension and outreach programming (E.g. recognizable client programs, industry reputation, invited presentations, and awards).</li> <li>3. Continuous pattern of extension publications (e.g, newsletters, trade journal articles, exhibits/posters, computer programs, interactive learning modules, multimedia educational programs, electronic products [e-books, websites, blogs, social media posts]).</li> <li>4. Continuous pattern of scholarly work, which should include published research related to extension and/or applied research in refereed discipline-specific scientific journals or extension bulletins of local, national or international significance.</li> <li>5. Exceptional funding to support the costs of extension programs, publications, and training <u>and</u> submission of a grant for external funding</li> </ol> <p><b>Quality/impact/professional development (described in narrative):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The reach or other impact of extension publications, presentations, and/or scholarly efforts demonstrates a regional and/or national reputation in the field of study, as appropriate for rank.</li> <li>2. Innovations in their Extension programming, to include novel tools, approaches, and resources that have the potential to positively impact their field of work and advance the knowledge in their discipline and/or create interdisciplinary bridges.</li> <li>3. Established applied clientele-related research programs that contribute to relevant segments of Georgia’s animal industries and published this research in refereed journals</li> <li>4. Received state and regional recognition of emerging stature in extension programming and research application in the candidate’s area of expertise (e.g., awards from county faculty, industry, professional societies, etc.; invited presentations, manuscript review activities, recognitions within professional societies related to</li> </ol>

	outreach)
5 = Exemplary	<p><b>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Continuous pattern of development and coordination of programming within the area of the candidate’s area of expertise (e.g., in-service training, seminars, workshops, webinars, county/regional meetings, field days, youth development events, clientele consultations, advisory meetings, radio/television interviews).</li> <li>2. Multiple instances of leadership and technical ability in developing (Assistant Professors) and sustaining (Associate and Full Professors) a recognizable Extension and outreach programming (E.g. recognizable client programs, industry reputation, invited presentations, and awards).</li> <li>3. Continuous pattern of extension publications (e.g, newsletters, trade journal articles, exhibits/posters, computer programs, interactive learning modules, multimedia educational programs, electronic products [e-books, websites, blogs, social media posts]).</li> <li>4. Exceptional pattern of scholarly work, which should include published research related to extension and/or applied research in refereed discipline-specific scientific journals or extension bulletins of local, national or international significance.</li> <li>5. One or more of the following (A) Multiple sources of funding to support the costs of programming, publications, and training; (B) Extension leadership roles (committee chair, directorships, program officer/director); (C) National extension awards or other recognition at a national level.</li> </ol> <p><b>Quality/impact/professional development (described in narrative):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The reach or other impact of extension publications, presentations, and/or scholarly efforts demonstrates a regional and/or national reputation in the field of study, as appropriate for rank.</li> <li>2. Innovations in their Extension programming, to include novel tools, approaches, and resources that have the potential to positively impact their field of work and advance the knowledge in their discipline and/or create interdisciplinary bridges.</li> <li>3. Established applied clientele-related research programs in horticulture that contribute to relevant segments of Georgia’s horticulture clientele and published this research in refereed horticulture/biological science-related journals</li> <li>4. Received regional and national recognition of emerging stature in extension programming and research application in the candidate’s area of the horticulture discipline (e.g., awards from county faculty, industry, professional societies, etc.; invited presentations, manuscript review activities, recognitions within professional societies related to outreach)</li> </ol>

## SERVICE

Rating	Criteria: Evidence of departmental, college, campus, and university service as well as service to the discipline commensurate
1 = Does not meet expectations	<p><b>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member does <u>not</u> demonstrate any of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Membership in a departmental, college, campus, or university committee.</li> <li>2. Contribution to professional societies or industry groups (e.g., peer reviews of manuscripts, service on committees, etc.)</li> <li>3. <u>For associate/full professor level:</u> A professional service activity (e.g., multiple peer reviews of manuscripts, service on grant review panel/study section, professional society committee work and/or leadership, etc.).</li> </ol>
2 = Needs improvement	<p><b>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates only one of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Membership in a departmental, college, campus, or university committee.</li> <li>2. Contribution to professional societies or industry groups (e.g., peer reviews of manuscripts, service on committees, etc.)</li> <li>3. <u>For associate/full professor level:</u> A professional service activity (e.g., multiple peer reviews of manuscripts, service on grant review panel/study section, professional society committee work and/or leadership, etc.).</li> </ol>
3 = Meets expectations	<p><b>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Membership in a departmental, college, campus, or university committee.</li> <li>2. A pattern of at least one professional service activity (e.g., multiple peer reviews of manuscripts, service on grant review panel/study section, professional society committee work and/or leadership, etc.) at the <u>assistant professor level</u> and multiple professional service activities at the <u>associate/full professor level</u>.</li> </ol> <p><b>Quality/impact/professional development (documented in narrative). The faculty member demonstrates <u>one</u> of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Specific contributions (i.e., leadership roles) to committee work</li> <li>2. The quality/impact/prestige of the professional service activity.</li> <li>3. Effort to ensure preparedness/capacity to carry out committee work effectively, as needed (e.g., participating in professional development to improve committee work).</li> </ol>
4 = Exceeds expectations	<p><b>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Membership in multiple departmental, college, campus, or university committees.</li> <li>2. A pattern of one professional service activity at the <u>assistant professor</u></li> </ol>

	<p><u>level</u> and multiple professional service activities at the <u>associate/full professor level</u>.</p> <p><b>Quality/impact/professional development (documented in Elements report and/or narrative). The faculty member demonstrates <u>two or more</u> of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Specific contributions to committee work.</li> <li>2. The quality/impact/prestige of the professional service activity.</li> <li>3. Effort to ensure preparedness/capacity to carry out committee work effectively, as needed (e.g., participating in committee-related professional development, collecting evidence, and forming and enacting plans to improve committee work).</li> <li>4. Contributions or recognition in the form of local awards, internal funding, and/or leadership.</li> </ol>
5 = Exemplary	<p><b>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Membership in multiple departmental, college, campus, or university committees.</li> <li>2. A pattern of one professional service activity at the <u>assistant professor level</u> and multiple professional service activities at the <u>associate/full professor level</u>.</li> </ol> <p><b>Quality/impact/professional development (documented in Elements report and/or narrative). The faculty member demonstrates <u>three or more</u> of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Specific contributions to committee work.</li> <li>2. The quality/impact/prestige of the professional service activity.</li> <li>3. Effort to ensure preparedness/capacity to carry out committee work effectively, as needed (e.g., participating in committee-related professional development, collecting evidence and forming and enacting plans to improve committee work).</li> <li>4. Contributions or recognition in the form of national/international awards, external funding, and/or high-level leadership.</li> </ol>

## **Student Success Activities: *Check All that Apply to Your Teaching Program***

### **Teaching**

#### **In Class Examples**

Developing new courses

Develop new courses of distance learning sections of existing courses

Inclusion of career center modules in course materials

Coordinate group activities and review sessions for class

Incorporating peer mentors into the classroom

Incorporate teaching skills (e.g., data analysis, research design, writing-intensive projects)

Required conferencing with each student at the midterm point in the semester to discuss final paper topics and getting started

Hands on experience with equipment and instrumentation that is industrially relevant

Working with students as graders

Recording new videos and course materials for existing courses to assist with retention

Using evidence-based teaching strategies that are demonstrated to improve conceptual learning and retention

Small-group instruction during class, facilitated by a circulating instructor, which builds class community and creates learning opportunities

Writing-intensive best practices, as defined by WIP program

Using a learner-centered syllabus

#### **Using Active Learning and student engagement strategies in class**

##### **Examples of Active Learning (Check all that apply)**

Enhance student learning experiences through evidence-based learning

Coordinate group activities

Inclusive group discussions

Formative assessments

Group activities that teach working together

Case studies with class discussion

Using Transparency in Teaching and Learning methods

Scaffolding big assignments

Providing timely feedback using rubrics

Having students turn in draft essays, providing feedback, then grading the revised student essays

##### **Out of Class Examples**

Coordinate review sessions for class

Promote recruitment, mentoring and training, and professional development of undergraduate and graduate students.

Mentoring and training of students participating in undergraduate research

Advising student clubs, student groups, or organizations

Maintain office hours for mentoring students

One-on-one meetings with every student

Provide independent study opportunities

Provide internship opportunities

Supervising teaching assistants (graduate assistants or undergraduate learning assistants)

Oversee Internships (supervision of, making placements)

Lead study abroad

Guest lectures at UGA

Provide volunteer experiences

Provide field trips

Facilitating or participating in teaching workshops or fellowship programs  
Performing teaching observations or midsemester formative evaluations for other faculty  
Hosting and leading book discussions with the honors college  
Engage at-risk students (First Generation, vets, etc.) in "instructional coach" and "mentoring"  
Assisting with trouble shooting projects outside of regular class hours  
Faculty observation of graduate student teaching  
Faculty mentorship of graduate students  
Participate in professional development that directly improves teaching skills  
Provide practice sessions for students prior to conference presentations  
Co-author research manuscripts with undergraduate and graduate students  
Mentor graduate students on conference papers  
Publish with graduate students  
Preparing graduate students before they go on the job market to ensure they are prepared for the rigors and stress associated materials, practice job talks, discussing professional social norms/interviewing)

Check the box if  
you use what is  
described