

The Department of Entomology 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 Entomology 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.

Faculty in Entomology are required annually submit electronic copy of UGA Elements annual activity report and to fill in the information requested on our department's annual evaluation form which includes how they have contributed to student success activities and goals for the coming year. These evaluation documents are due to the Department Head by the second Friday in January. 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 annually during the second and third week of February. This meeting will also serve as an opportunity to review and if needed, adjust the Allocation of Effort of the faculty member based on the goals of the faculty member and the department for the current year. 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.

The attached annual evaluation letter template, including specific rubric components was adopted by the Entomology 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, documentation of contributions towards Student Success Activities, and goals appropriate for faculty type and rank ).

As per USG and UGA policy, Performance Remediation Plans (PRP) will be developed and implemented as needed. Failure to comply with a PRP will result in sanctions as appropriate and approved by the CAES. 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. In the Department of Entomology, the Department Head must develop the PRP for tenured faculty members, tenure track faculty members, and faculty members outside the tenure system that are not assigned to a particular laboratory. Each PRP must be developed in consultation with the faculty member. For faculty members that are assigned to a particular laboratory, the PRP must be developed by the individual who heads the laboratory in consultation with the Department Head and the faculty member. The PRP's goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable within a 1-year period, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member. The PRP must also include: 1) clearly defined goals and outcomes, 2) an outline of the activities that must be undertaken, 3) a timetable, 4) available resources and support, 5) expectation for improvement, and 6) a monitoring strategy. The PRP must be approved by the Dean of CAES and submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs. The PRP will become part of the official personnel record of the faculty member.

## **Department of Entomology Annual Evaluation Guidelines**

### **Preface**

The University of Georgia has long had a policy that each faculty member, regardless of rank or responsibilities, must receive a written annual evaluation of performance. Recent revisions in the Board of Regents (BOR) Policy Manual and procedures disseminated by the University System of Georgia (USG) have prompted each institution, including the University of Georgia, to revise annual evaluation policy to ensure adherence to Board Policy. University of Georgia Guidelines have not been finalized but current drafts indicate each College, School, and Department must develop an annual evaluation policy that: 1) assesses activities in proportion with the academic appointment of the faculty member and 2) provides a framework for continuous professional growth that is appropriate to the mission of the department. Evaluations must be based on discipline-specific assessment criteria that are proportional to appointment in the areas of: teaching, research, extension, scholarship, or other creative activities; and service to society, the University, and the profession, including student success activities, as appropriate. Evaluations must also use a 5-point scale that ranks the faculty member as: 1-Does Not Meet Expectations, 2-Needs Improvement, 3-Meets Expectations, 4-Exceeds Expectations, and 5-Exemplary. Department of Entomology annual evaluation guidelines presented below have been developed to be fully consistent with BOR, USG and University Guidelines as currently drafted.

### **I. Introduction**

The Department of Entomology resides in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CAES). Like most other CAES departments, academic rank faculty in Entomology who are in the tenure system have appointments in research, teaching and/or extension which is a form of service that is fully defined by Department guidelines for promotion and tenure. Faculty in Entomology outside of the tenure process have appointments that are affiliated with laboratories headed by a tenure track faculty member or have responsibilities in research, instruction, and/or extension with the direct supervisor being the Department Head.

Academic rank faculty in the Department of Entomology are extremely diverse in terms of what proportions of their appointments are in research, teaching or extension. Scholarly expertise, and responsibilities in meeting the Department's mission also highly varies among faculty. For these reasons, the Department of Entomology does not evaluate candidates for promotion and tenure or post-tenure review on the basis of meeting a specific benchmark for any one output used to document accomplishments in research, teaching, extension or other forms of service. Instead, evaluation is based on convincing documentation of outputs using multiple lines of evidence that include measures of quality and/or impact to provide an overall assessment of accomplishments that are commensurate with appointment.

The Department of Entomology views Annual Evaluations as a means to regularly assess whether activities and accomplishments are commensurate with expectations for the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor or titles outside of the tenure track system. Department of Entomology guidelines for conducting Annual Evaluations are thus designed to be fully consistent with University of Georgia policy for annual evaluations, departmental guidelines for promotion and tenure, and departmental guidelines for post-tenure review.

### **II. Annual Evaluation Procedures**

Each faculty member is responsible for submitting an annual activity report by the due date that is designated by the Department Head.

**Documentation materials.** All faculty must prepare and submit an Annual Activity Report which

is usually due in the middle of January for the previous calendar year being evaluated. UGA guidelines indicate that annual reports must be prepared from the UGA Elements System. UGA Elements generates an annual report that documents many but not all activities pertinent to annual evaluation. UGA Elements is additionally deficient in providing evidence that provides measures of quality and/or impact of activities in research, teaching, extension and other lines of service including student success activities. Department promotion and tenure guidelines list outputs and measures of quality that demonstrate research, teaching and extension accomplishments in Entomology along with expectations stated in University Guidelines for academic ranks. These outputs are listed in **Appendix 1** of this document. The Department of Entomology has further adopted a template for Annual Evaluations (**Appendix 2**) that the UGA Elements Annual report will be attached to. The Annual Evaluations template provides space for each faculty member to summarize activity and quality/impact metrics in research, teaching, extension and other service that the faculty member reports. The Annual Activity template will then be submitted to the Department Head together with the annual UGA Elements report.

**Annual activity report evaluation.** The Department Head conducts annual evaluations in the Department of Entomology. The Department Head is expected to evaluate each faculty member in accordance with their appointment. The Head must provide an overall assessment and also individually assess activities in research, teaching, extension and/or other service on the 1-5 scale mandated by BOR, USG and University policy: 1-Does Not Meet Expectations, 2-Needs Improvement, 3-Meets Expectations, 4-Exceeds Expectations, and 5-Exemplary. The Department Head is expected to evaluate each faculty member in accordance with their appointment. Consistent with departmental promotion and tenure guidelines, annual evaluations should also not evaluate individuals on the basis of meeting a specific benchmark for any one output used to document accomplishments in research, teaching and/or extension. Instead, evaluation should be based on multiple outputs and lines of evidence that include measures of quality and/or impact. Annual evaluations should additionally consider performance criteria expected for the rank of the person being evaluated and annual evaluations from preceding years, because research, teaching and extension activities in Entomology occur over timelines that make it inappropriate to assess accomplishments in a given year solely on metrics reported by UGA Elements for that year.

The Department Head will write overall and individual assessment scores in the space provided on the annual evaluation template the faculty member submits with the annual report generated by UGA Elements. Space is additionally provided in the annual evaluation template for the Head to concisely state the basis for the scores given. Noteworthy achievement as referenced by BOR policy is reflective of an overall or category evaluation score of 4 or 5 while deficient and unsatisfactory performance is reflective of an overall or category evaluation score of 1 or 2.

The Department Head must schedule a conference with each faculty member to discuss the content of the faculty member's annual written evaluation, and the evaluation scores given. The faculty member will sign a statement to acknowledge they have been apprised of the content of their annual written evaluation. A faculty member may respond to their annual evaluation in writing within 10 working days after that. The Department Head will acknowledge in writing receipt of the response within 10 working days and will note whether any changes in the annual evaluation were made because of the faculty member's written response. The faculty member's written response and the evaluator's reply will become part of the official personnel record. University policy though stipulates that annual reviews are not subject to discretionary review or appeal.

Faculty members outside the tenure track system must also submit annual evaluation reports at

the designated deadline date. Individuals with appointments linked to particular laboratories will be evaluated by the faculty member who heads the lab using the same evaluation document and procedure as described above, which will then be submitted to the Department Head for approval. The laboratory head will then meet with the faculty member to discuss their report and the evaluation scores given. Faculty outside the tenure track system who are not assigned to a particular laboratory will submit their annual evaluation report to the Department Head who will evaluate and meet with the faculty as described for faculty with academic appointments in the tenure system. Faculty outside the tenure system have the same option to respond to a faculty evaluation with responses and inclusion in the official personnel record as described above.

**Performance Remediation Plans (PRPs).** If a faculty member receives an overall evaluation score of 1 or 2, or an evaluation score in an assigned area of 1 or 2, BOR, USG and University policy requires that a PRP must be implemented to remediate performance during the next year. The only exception to this requirement is if the following year falls outside of the faculty members contract period as would be the case for an Assistant Professor in the 7<sup>th</sup> year of the probationary period. The purpose of PRPs is to improve performance of the faculty member in the given area(s) identified to be deficient in the annual evaluation report.

In the Department of Entomology, the Department Head must develop the PRP for tenured faculty members, tenure track faculty members, and faculty members outside the tenure system that are not assigned to a particular laboratory. Each PRP must be developed in consultation with the faculty member. For faculty members that are assigned to a particular laboratory, the PRP must be developed by the individual who heads the laboratory in consultation with the Department Head and the faculty member. The PRP's goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable within a 1-year period, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member. The PRP must also include: 1) clearly defined goals and outcomes, 2) an outline of the activities that must be undertaken, 3) a timetable, 4) available resources and support, 5) expectation for improvement, and 6) a monitoring strategy. The PRP must be approved by the Dean of CAES and submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs. The PRP will become part of the official personnel record of the faculty member.

The Department Head must schedule two meetings during each of the spring and fall semesters of the PRP to review progress, identify additional needs/resources and consider planned accomplishments. Consequences for failing to meet expectations of the PRP must also be stated in writing. The Department Head must summarize each meeting in writing and indicate if the faculty member is on track to complete the PRP, and consequences if the faculty is not on track.

A tenured faculty member who receives an overall score of 1 or 2 or a category score of 1 or 2 in an area for which they have a 10% or greater appointment for two consecutive years must participate in a corrective post-tenure review per BOR guidelines and University policy for Review of Tenured Faculty. The Department of Entomology Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review provide additional information on the process of corrective post-tenure review.

**Appendix 1:** Department of Entomology definitions of: 1) research, teaching, extension and other service activities, 2) outputs that measure accomplishments in these areas, 3) metrics that measure quality and/or impact, and 4) University-defined expectations for the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. \*From the Department of Entomology Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

## **I. Research**

Research is defined by the University as studious inquiry or examination, especially critical investigation or experimentation, that have as their purpose to improve the development, refinement, and application of knowledge. In the Department of Entomology, research activities are extremely diverse in terms of the discipline. Research activity also involves a range of interdisciplinary and collaborative activities.

**Documentation.** Outputs demonstrating research accomplishments include but are not limited to:

1. Authorship of research publications in peer-reviewed journals, reviews, and books.
2. Inventions, patents, or technology transfers including development of software or apps with research applications.
3. Submitted and funded research projects from grants, contracts and commissioned activities.
4. Student success activities in research through training of undergraduates, graduate students and post-doctoral associates.
5. Invited seminars or submitted research presentations to academic departments or institutions, professional societies, or other learned audiences including workshops.
6. Activities related to evaluation of publications and proposals including submitted manuscripts to peer-reviewed journals, appointments to editorial boards of peer-reviewed journals, editorships, and service to granting agencies as an ad hoc reviewer, panel member, or panel chair.
7. Election to offices or committees in learned societies or at the department, college or university levels that have functions in promoting the research mission.

**Evidence of quality and/or impact of research.** Documenting research activities should also include assessments of quality and/or impact where appropriate. For example, in addition to numerical measures of activity such as number of publications, grants or funding received for research activities, measures of quality and/or impact should also be evaluated. Examples of documenting quality and/or impact in research include but are not limited to:

1. Reporting the reputational standing of journals in which articles are published as measured by impact factor or other metrics for Entomology or other appropriate disciplines.
2. Total number of citations of published work as well as citations of particular papers provide measures of impact of published work on other investigators.
3. Sources of funding received for research activities vary in terms of competitiveness and professional impact. For example, grants from competitive sources such as the major federal agencies (NIH, NSF, USDA) that fund research in the life sciences are often more difficult to obtain than certain other sources of support. Impacts of competitive funding are also larger for the reputation of the awardee and University than several other types of funding. In the case of individuals with applied research or extension appointments, funding from commodity groups and related resources are also measures that provide evidence of impact on clientele groups that can also influence competitiveness for extramural funding from agencies such as USDA.
4. Honors and awards which vary in competitiveness and impact (national and international

versus regional, institutional or departmental).

5. Audience size or professional standing of meetings in which research presentations are given. Presentations that are invited versus submitted provide another measure of evidence of a candidate's reputation as a regional, national or international authority in a given area of study.

## **II. Teaching**

Teaching accomplishments are recognized by the University to include formal classroom instruction, advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students, and other activities that promote student success. The Department of Entomology recognizes the same criteria while additionally noting that mentorship of post-doctoral trainees and other early-stage professionals is another critically important component of the instructional mission of the Department. The Department also recognizes professional development as a line of evidence for improving instruction.

**Documentation.** Outputs demonstrating teaching accomplishments include but are not limited to:

1. Credit hours generated through classroom instruction, online instruction, seminars and study abroad courses.
2. Mentorship of undergraduate, graduate, post-doctoral, or other post-graduate advisees.
3. Membership of graduate or other advisory committees.
4. Supervision of teaching assistants and professional staff.
5. Placement of advisees, which is a key metric of student success.
6. Mentorship of at-risk students.
7. Service as a coordinator for the undergraduate or graduate programs in Entomology.
8. Submitted and funded grants, contracts and commissioned activities for instruction.
9. Creation of new course materials or revision of existing materials.
10. Instruction and outreach for non-traditional audiences such as returning education, primary and secondary school students associated with service learning or outreach, and professionals requiring certification or continuing education credits.
11. Awards or honors for instruction, mentorship or advising at the national, regional or institutional level.
12. Participation in instruction-related seminars, workshops conferences, or faculty development programs.

**Evidence of quality and/or impact.** Measures of quality and/or impact of teaching activities is wide ranging and also differs between classroom instruction, mentorship and functions that support the instructional mission of the department. Examples of documenting quality and/or impact in teaching include but are not limited to:

1. Positive student and/or peer evaluations including comments for classroom teaching.
2. Evidence of consistent or growing enrollment in a course.
3. Evidence of classroom activities to promote learning including review sessions, student engagement strategies, and active learning
4. Demonstrated progress of advisees toward graduation or successful scholarship.
5. Placement of graduate students and postdoctoral trainees in the workforce with emphasis on employment in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM)-related occupations.
6. Development of new instructional resources
7. Competitiveness of honors or awards.
8. Other measures of teaching effectiveness including self-reflection on how feedback received will be incorporated into future teaching activities.

### **III. Contributions in Extension**

Extension applies academic expertise to the benefit of citizens working in agriculture, natural resources and/or environmental stewardship. Extension programming further includes applied research, service-based instruction, and technical assistance for a range of other clientele groups. Most extension activities in the Department of Entomology provide evidence-based solutions to agricultural commodity groups in the state of Georgia. Some programming is directed toward other clientele groups in the state or problems that are regional or national in nature.

**Documentation.** Outputs demonstrating extension accomplishments include but are not limited to:

1. Authorship of publications in peer-reviewed journals, reviews, books, and bulletins and books.
2. Authorship of extension publications that are numbered and submitted through the CAES system including circulars and fact sheets.
3. Popular press publications and pest alerts that are disseminated to other extension personnel.
4. Electronic information including blog posts, website postings, and social media postings.
5. Providing information directly to individual citizens through phone calls, text messages, and email.
6. Attendance of meetings with clientele groups at the county, area or state level.
7. Submitted and funded projects from competitive grants, commodity groups, and industry.
8. Invited presentations and seminars at other institutions.
9. Participation and presentation in professional meetings, extension conferences, and workshops.
10. Mentorship of undergraduate, graduate, post-doctoral associates or other personnel in training that provide evidence of enhancing student success in extension-related activities.

**Evidence of quality and/or impact.** Measures of quality and/or impact of extension activities overlap with research and teaching but prioritize different constituency groups. Examples of documenting quality and/or impact in extension include but are not limited to:

1. Positive evaluations by district extension directors.
2. Measures of extension programming effectiveness such as increased profitability or production by growers after implementing recommendations.
3. Awards or honors for extension activities at the national, regional or institutional level.
4. Positive feedback from grower surveys after meetings
5. Frequency that written or online publications, information and other materials are accessed or cited.
6. Audience size or professional standing of meetings in which extension presentations are given. Invited seminars or presentations are also a metric of reputation and expertise in a given area of extension.

### **IV. Service to the University and Profession**

Faculty in the Department of Entomology also provide service to the University and their profession that constitute service and carrying out assigned work. Outputs that provide evidence of service to the University includes but is not limited to committee work at the department, college or university level, governance, and program development or implementation. Outputs that provide evidence of service to the profession of a faculty member includes but is not limited to committee assignments or elected office in professional societies, committee assignments that evaluate peer institutions or departments, and writing letters of evaluation for promotion and tenure, awards, or other functions at peer institutions.

## **V. Requirements for Academic Ranks in the Department of Entomology**

Expectations for the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor are defined by University Guidelines that the Department of Entomology fully follows.

**Assistant Professor.** The rank of Assistant Professor in Entomology has a terminal degree of PhD in Entomology or a related discipline. Candidates show promise of moving toward excellence in research, teaching and/or extension but are on probationary appointments (tenure-track) with the expectation of going forward for promotion to the rank of Associated Professor and tenure by the 6<sup>th</sup> year of creditable service.

**Associate Professor.** The rank of Associate Professor in Entomology denotes an early-stage, mid-career faculty member who is usually also tenured. Associate Professors are expected to be regional or national authorities in areas that are commensurate with their appointment in research, teaching and/or extension.

**Professor.** The rank of Professor in Entomology denotes a mid-career to senior faculty member who is also usually tenured. Professors are expected to be national and international authorities in areas that are commensurate with their appointment in research, teaching and/or extension.

Requirements for **Public Service and Outreach Faculty** ranks may be found here.  
<https://outreach.uga.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Guidelines-for-Appointments-and-Promotion-2021.pdf>

Requirements for **Academic Professional Faculty** ranks may be found here.  
[https://provost.uga.edu/resources/documents/Faculty\\_Affairs/faculty\\_hiring\\_and\\_appointments/guidelinesapptpromotionacademicprofessionals.pdf](https://provost.uga.edu/resources/documents/Faculty_Affairs/faculty_hiring_and_appointments/guidelinesapptpromotionacademicprofessionals.pdf)

Requirements for **Research Scientist Faculty** ranks may be found here.  
<https://research.uga.edu/docs/policies/research/Research-Scientist-Appointment-Promotion.pdf>



## Appendix 2. Faculty Annual Evaluation Template for the Department of Entomology

Name, rank:

Campus location:

Period:

Official ENTO FTE:    Research:            Instruction:            Extension:            Service (Public):            Administrative:

**Highlights and Context for Outputs and Accomplishments** (to be completed by person to be evaluated prior to meeting with Head of Department):

- To complete this form, please refer to Appendix I for potential indicators of quality and impact. In completing the form, faculty should include multiple lines of evidence for activities and quality/impact of activities in research, teaching, extension and other service including measures of student success as appropriate for appointment.
- Tables should be completed according to distribution of effort. You are only required to complete a table if you have over 5% effort within that category.

Research (Scholarship) Accomplishments 2023	
Outputs	Quality & Impact Indicators
X papers / manuscripts	Here, please provide context for these papers/manuscripts in terms of the rubric for expectations. Examples of what type of evidence might support quality and impact of papers/manuscripts include quality of journal, press attention, and your contribution to the manuscripts. Challenges to completing/publishing papers could also be discussed here to inform discussion with Department Head about how these challenges could be addressed and to set goals for next year.
X active grants	Here please provide context on these grants including the role you play (lead PI, co-I playing a supporting role, etc...) and summarize the impact of the work to be undertaken and your contributions to that work.
X grant proposals	Here please summarize goals for grants submitted, if any.
Professional development activities	Here please summarize any research related professional development activities undertaken in the year under review. These could include workshops, for research or writing, work with program officer to revise declined grant proposals. Other types of professional development activities can be found in Appendix 1.
Student success activities	Here please discuss any activities you engaged in to promote student success in research. These could include, for example, mentoring undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-graduate trainees, work with students to promote career development, mentoring workshops to improve your mentoring skills, or working with your group to improve science communication skills.
Other	Here highlight any other research related activities at the departmental, college, university, or professional level. This could include service on significant research related committees, service as an editor for a journal, research awards, or others (see Appendix 1).

Teaching & Mentoring (Instruction) Accomplishments 2023	
Output	Quality and Impact

<p><b>Courses taught</b></p> <p>I taught X undergraduate courses this year: one section of ABC course and half of a section of 123 course.</p> <p>I co-taught a graduate seminar course for XYZ students as part of so-and-so program.</p>	<p>Here please highlight any particular accomplishments or challenges in instruction this year. For example, significantly revising an existing course, developing a new course, or other (see Appendix 1).</p> <p>Student evaluation of teaching: Here please summarize your student evaluations of teaching. This should include both the response rate and results. Please provide a brief reflection on your student evaluations and how you responded (or plan to respond) to these (Self Evaluation).</p> <p>Peer evaluation of teaching: Here please summarize any peer-evaluation of your teaching that you engaged in this year. Please provide a brief reflection on your peer evaluations and how you responded (or plan to respond) to these (Self Evaluation).</p>
<p><b>Undergraduate researchers</b></p> <p>I mentored undergraduate researchers earning ENTO 4960, 4965, 4970 or BIOL 4960 or 4970 credit or pay (X number in Spring, Y number in Fall).</p>	<p>Here please provide any outputs from undergraduate research – including, for example, manuscripts in progress, research posters (including CURO, CAES, or meetings), CURO honors or assistantships, or CAES research awards.</p>
<p><b>Graduate students</b></p> <p>I served as dissertation advisor for X PhD students, and dissertation committee member for X PhD students.</p>	<p>Here please highlight any particular accomplishments of your graduate students (exams passed, research outputs, awards, etc...)</p>
<p><b>Postdoctoral supervision</b></p> <p>I served as research advisor for X postdoctoral associates</p>	<p>Here please highlight any particular accomplishments of your postdoctoral associates (research outputs, awards, career development etc...)</p>
<p><b>Professional development activities</b></p>	<p>Here please discuss any activities you engaged in to promote student success through instructional activities. These could include, for example, teaching workshops.</p>
<p><b>Other</b></p>	<p>Here highlight any other teaching related activities at the departmental, college, university, or professional level. This could include service on a significant teaching related committee, pedagogical publications, teaching awards, or others (see Appendix 1).</p>

Extension Accomplishments 2023	
Output	Quality and Impact
Papers and extension publications	Here please highlight any particular accomplishments and indicators of impact.
Popular press articles and pest alerts	Here please highlight any particular accomplishments and indicators of impact.
Presentations at professional meetings, extension conferences, and workshops	Here please highlight any particular accomplishments and indicators of impact.
Meetings with clientele groups	Here please highlight any particular accomplishments and indicators of impact.
Submitted and funded projects, including industry and commodity groups	Here please highlight any particular accomplishments and indicators of impact.
Contact with individual citizens	Here please highlight any particular accomplishments and indicators of impact.
Mentorship	Here please discuss any activities you engaged in to promote student success in extension. These could include, for example, mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate research students, work with students to promote career development, mentoring workshops to improve your mentoring skills, or working with your group to improve extension communication skills.
Professional development activities	Here please summarize any extension related professional development activities undertaken in the year under review. These could include workshops. Other types of professional development activities can be found in Appendix 1.
Other	Here highlight any other extension related activities at the departmental, college, university, or professional level. This could include service on a significant extension related committee, awards, or others (see Appendix 1).

Other Service	
Output	Quality and Impact
Institutional: Dept., College, University	Here please highlight any particular accomplishments and indicators of impact.
To the profession: for example, activities with professional societies, scientific agencies, review or oversight responsibilities with other institutions	Here please highlight any particular accomplishments and indicators of impact.

**Head's Narrative Statement** (to be completed by the Department Head prior to meeting with person being evaluated):

	1	2	3	4	5
	Does Not Meet Expectations	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Exemplary
Research					
Teaching					
Extension					
Service					
Administration					

**Overall Evaluation:**

Here the Department Head will summarize their thinking about how the information provided by the individual, as well as any information the Department Head has about the person being evaluated not provided by the Elements output and this form, was used in conjunction with the rubric to arrive at the score for each appropriate category.

**Goals for next year** (to be completed in conversation with the Department Head and person being evaluated):

Here the individual and Department Head will discuss the current year's performance. If the individual would like to improve their score in the next year, there should be a discussion about what goals they could set.

The Department Head must schedule two meetings during each of the spring and fall semesters of the PRP to review progress, identify additional needs/resources and consider planned accomplishments. Consequences for failing to meet expectations of the PRP must also be stated in writing. The Department Head must summarize each meeting in writing and indicate if the faculty member is on track to complete the PRP, and consequences if the faculty is not on track.