



Faculty Annual Evaluation Policy

Approved 5 December 2022

Introduction

The Department of Horticulture 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 complies with the [University of Georgia Academic Affairs Policy 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 Horticulture's 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.

Overview

Each faculty member in the Department of Horticulture, regardless of rank or responsibilities, must receive a written annual evaluation of their performance. Tenure-track faculty, tenured faculty, and faculty outside of the tenure process should be evaluated based upon clear, transparent, and department-specific assessment criteria and rubrics. Any changes to performance criteria must be made in advance of the next review cycle and allow time for faculty to incorporate those expectations into the preparation of their review documents.

Each evaluation must address research, teaching, Extension, and service in alignment with the faculty member's workload allocation. Performance in the relevant domains will be evaluated using a rubric. In alignment with UGA policy, the outputs, quality, impact, and effort to improve research, teaching, Extension, and service will be considered. In addition, every Horticulture faculty member is expected to engage in student success activities as part of their research, teaching, Extension and/or service and will list these activities as part of annual review and describe the quality of at least one student success activity.

Annual Review Materials

Each year, Horticulture faculty members are responsible for providing the material listed below to the Department Head by February 1 (or Monday thereafter if the date falls on a weekend).

1. An updated Elements report for the past calendar year
2. A performance report of no more than three pages that presents a summary of outputs accompanied by a narrative description of the quality and/or impact of those outputs for research, teaching, Extension, and service. The report should also include a summary of efforts to support the short- and long-term academic and professional achievements of students (Student Success Activities). An example of the performance report can be found in

Appendix A. In alignment with USG and UGA policy, evidence of involvement in professional development will be valued for faculty at all career stages. The report should present:

- a. Evidence of research productivity, including outputs and quality and/or impact. This may include the number of papers, proposals, and/or grants; the reputation and reach of journals, presentations, and other dissemination venues; impact on the discipline; and any other relevant evidence (e.g., research award scope, invitations for research leadership positions, etc.).
- b. Evidence of teaching effectiveness (for faculty with teaching appointment). This should include at least one form of evidence from students, peers, **or** the candidate (i.e., self-reflection). (Note: At least two forms of evidence of teaching effectiveness over time are required for promotion and tenure. See [UGA Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Academic Rank Faculty](#) for details.). Forms of evidence can include:
 - i. Critical self-reflection on course evaluation data
 - ii. Critical self-reflection on other evidence systematically collected from students
 - iii. Peer observation and narrative about the changes made in response to feedback
 - iv. Documentation of evidence-based instructional strategies or efforts to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion in the classroom
- c. Evidence of Extension effectiveness (for faculty with Extension appointment). This should include at least one form of evidence from growers, Extension Agents, peers, **or** the candidate (i.e., self-reflection). Forms of evidence can include:
 - i. Critical self-reflection on program dissemination, implementations, and impact.
 - ii. Critical self-reflection on other evidence systematically collected from stakeholders, community members, etc.
 - iii. Peer observation and narrative about the faculty's Extension program.
 - iv. Documentation of strategies or efforts to bring evidence-based science and modern technologies to farmers, consumers, and families.
- d. Evidence of scope and impact of service. This may include the scope of work undertaken in service roles; the impact of service roles on students, the department, the university, the stakeholders, and the discipline; efforts to evaluate and improve performance in service roles; and any other relevant evidence.
- e. Statement and brief description of at least three Student Success Activities (https://provost.uga.edu/faculty_working_group/SSA_CategorizedExamples_7Jan2022_DRAFT.pdf).
- f. A statement of goals for the forthcoming year and their progression toward achieving future milestones.

Annual Review Meetings

Between February and March of each year, the Department Head will review the material submitted by the faculty member and will schedule a meeting to discuss annual performance. The Head will also use this information to produce a written annual evaluation (template in *Appendix B*), using the departmental rubric (*Appendix C*) to assign a rating for each area of work that comprises 10% or more of the faculty member's EFT as well as an overall rating, according to the 5-point scale indicated below:

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

Deficient and unsatisfactory performance is reflective of a 1 or a 2 on the above 5-point scale. Failure to submit the required evaluation material indicated above (i.e., the Elements report and the performance report) will result in an evaluation rating of “1” for each area of responsibility lacking the required documentation.

In advance of the meeting, the Head will also prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member, which will serve as the basis for discussion. The annual review will focus on accomplishments in the preceding calendar year; however, the Department Head may comment on significant changes relative to accomplishments or deficiencies of previous years. 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) and for faculty members to share their goals for the current calendar year.

If the faculty member has a joint appointment in another department or Institute, has EFT assigned to a Center, Institute, or is located at the Griffin or Tifton campus, this meeting may be conducted jointly with the director of that entity.

Content of Written Annual Review

The written annual evaluation will include up to five sections, depending on faculty position responsibilities:

1. Teaching
2. Research
3. Extension
4. Service
5. Overall Evaluation

The written evaluation for each section will include a brief narrative description of the outputs, quality, impact, and efforts to improve reported by the faculty member. The evaluation will also note whether the faculty member indicates their involvement in student success activities as part of their research, teaching, and/or service work, and effort to implement at least one student success activity in ways that are consistent with its effectiveness. In addition, the written evaluation will provide a rating on a 5-point scale (see above) for research, teaching, Extension, service, and overall evaluation.

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 ≥5, round up). If a faculty member fails to report their involvement in student success activities as part of their research, teaching, Extension, and/or service work, and effort to implement at least one student success activity in ways that are consistent with its effectiveness, their overall evaluation rating will drop by one point.

Example calculation: Professor Smith earns a 5 rating for research, a 2 rating for teaching, and 5 for service, and they have a 65/30/5 split of research/teaching/service responsibilities. This amounts to a contribution of 3.25 for research (5×0.65), 0.60 for teaching (2×0.30), and 0.25 for service (5×0.05) for an overall evaluation rating of 4.10, which is rounded to a 4. Professor Johns has a 50/45/5 split and earns a rating of 4 for research, 4 for teaching, and 3 for service for an overall evaluation of 3.95 ($=4 \times 0.50 + 4 \times 0.45 + 3 \times 0.05$), which is rounded to a 4.

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. The written summary report of the annual evaluation will be given to and must be signed by the faculty member.

Developmental Response to 1 and 2 Ratings

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.

To provide an independent perspective in instances where the Department Head anticipates assigning a 1 or 2 rating in an area of work, he/she must inform the faculty member about the Head's assessment. If the faculty member believes this not to be an accurate evaluation of his/her performance, then a five-member Evaluation Committee composed of Horticulture faculty members (chosen by the faculty member being evaluated) will be established to provide an external review.

Notes:

- The faculty members proposed to serve on the Evaluation Committee must receive approval of the Department Head. Additionally, their rank must be the same or above the rank of the faculty member being evaluated.
- If the faculty member being evaluated is still being advised by a Mentoring Committee (mandatory for Assistant Professors and Research Scientists, optional for Associate Professors and Associate Research Scientists), the Chair of the Mentoring Committee can serve as an additional non-voting member of the Evaluation Committee to provide additional inputs.
- If the faculty member being evaluated has already received tenure and has gone through at least one Post-Tenure Review (PTR), the Evaluation Committee should be formed by the same faculty members who conducted the most recent PTR. If any of these members is not available to serve on the Evaluation Committee, then the faculty member being evaluated needs to provide the name(s) of other Horticulture faculty member(s) to replace them.

Once formed, the Evaluation Committee will review the faculty member's Department Head's evaluation, UGA Elements annual activity report, and Performance Report and provide their perspective on the fairness of the rating. If the consensus of the Evaluation Committee does not agree with the Department Head's evaluation, their rating of the faculty member's performance will supersede the rating assigned by the Department Head. If the Evaluation Committee agrees with the

Department Head that the faculty member's performance in any of the areas of work has not been satisfactory (i.e., <3), this will result in the development of a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP). This PRP must be developed jointly by Department Head and the Evaluation Committee in consultation with the faculty member within 30 days of the annual evaluation.

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 and will become part of the official personnel records.

Four quarterly meetings must be held to review progress, document additional needs/resources, and consider planned accomplishments for the upcoming semester. The first meeting must be held no later than May of the review year. After each meeting, the Department Head 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 evaluate 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.

If the faculty member fails to comply to the PRP or is 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 they will be required to participate in a corrective post tenure review, as described in the [USG 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.



Department of Horticulture
College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

[YEAR] FACULTY ANNUAL EVALUATION

To: [Faculty Member's Name]
From: Leo Lombardini
Date: [Between February 1 and March 31 of the calendar year]
Attachments: UGA Elements annual activity report
Performance Report (prepared by the faculty)

This constitutes your annual written evaluation required by Section 8.3.5.1 of the Board of Regents Policy Manual and Section 4.4, Faculty Evaluation Systems, of the University System of Georgia Academic and Student Affairs Handbook. Your assigned allocation of effort this year was [x%] scholarship, [y%] teaching, [z%] Extension, and 5% service.

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., 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 progress of the unit administered toward its strategic goals with measurable outcomes that document achievement of these objectives, and involvement in student success activities such as supporting curriculum development, advising, and scheduling; developing policies and student support initiatives.]

Rating for Extension = [1-5]

Service

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

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]

Leonardo Lombardini, Department Head

Name and Title of Evaluator

Signature of Evaluator

Signature of Evaluated Faculty Member, acknowledging receipt

Sources:

- [Board of Regents Policy Manual § 8.3.5.1](#) (Evaluation of Personnel/Faculty)
- [University System of Georgia Academic & Student Affairs Handbook 4.4](#) (Faculty Evaluation Systems)
- [UGA Academic Affairs Policy Manual 1.06-1](#) (Written Annual Evaluation)
- [UGA Academic Affairs Policy Manual 1.10-10](#) (to be added) (Student Success Activities)
- List of additional examples of Student Success Activities on OFA webpage



Appendix C

Faculty Annual Evaluation Rubric

For all areas of work, judgments will focus on the current year but will consider a two-year window of time to allow for year-to-year stochasticity.

RESEARCH

Rating	Criteria: Evidence of research activities and impacts commensurate with achieving or maintaining a regional and/or national reputation
1 = Does not meet expectations	<p>Outputs (documented in Elements report). Evidence from the faculty member indicates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> No attempt to publish research in refereed journals or generate other externally evaluated research products (i.e., no publications, patents, etc.). <input type="checkbox"/> No attempt to secure extramural funding (i.e., no proposals submitted, or grants received). <input type="checkbox"/> No involvement in mentoring undergraduate students or in graduate education (as chair and/or member of graduate committees). <p>Quality/impact/professional development (described in narrative):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty member has not sought professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) to improve or maintain research productivity, funding levels, research quality, etc., or described how they have enacted what they learned.
2 = Needs improvement	<p>Outputs (documented in Elements report). Evidence from the faculty member indicates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Absence of a regular pattern of publication in refereed journals or creation of other externally evaluated research products (e.g., patents) <u>or</u> the output falls short of clear effort toward this goal for those in their first 3 years (e.g., preprint). <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient funding to support the costs of research, publication, and training <u>and</u> no submission of a grant for external funding. <input type="checkbox"/> No dissemination of research findings and/or resources to the scholarly community, which could include research presentations at conferences; invited seminars, plenaries, or workshops; resource sharing, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Minimal involvement in mentoring undergraduate students or in graduate education (as chair and/or member of graduate committees).

	<p>Quality/impact/professional development (described in narrative). Evidence from the faculty member indicates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The reach or other impact of research publications and presentations falls short of indicating a regional and/or national reputation in the field of horticulture, as appropriate for rank. <input type="checkbox"/> The impact of the research products on the field is limited or not apparent. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty member has sought minimal professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) to improve or maintain research productivity, funding levels, research quality, etc., or has not described how they have enacted what they learned.
<p>3 = Meets expectations</p>	<p>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Pattern of publication in refereed journals or other externally evaluated research products with an expected average of one publication/product per year over a two-year period <u>or</u> clear effort toward this goal for those in their first 3 years (e.g., preprint). <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient funding to support the costs of research, publication, and training <u>or</u> submission of a grant for external funding. <input type="checkbox"/> Evident pattern of dissemination of research findings and/or resources to the scholarly community, which could include research presentations at conferences; invited seminars, plenaries, or workshops; resource sharing, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Regular involvement in mentoring undergraduate students or in graduate education (as chair and/or member of graduate committees). <p>Quality/impact/professional development (described in narrative):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The reach or other impact of research publications and presentations demonstrates a regional and/or national reputation in the field of study, if appropriate for rank. <input type="checkbox"/> Research products have the potential to have a positive impact on the field of horticulture, including novel discoveries, approaches, tools, resources innovations, etc. that advance or apply knowledge in the discipline and/or create interdisciplinary bridges. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty member has sought professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) to improve or maintain research productivity, funding levels, research quality, etc., and clearly described how they have enacted what they learned.
<p>4 = Exceeds expectations</p>	<p>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A continuous pattern of publication in refereed journals or other externally evaluated research products (e.g., patents), <u>or</u> clear effort toward this goal for those in their first 3 years (e.g., multiple pre-prints). <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate funding to support the costs of research, publication, and training. <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple instances of disseminating research findings and/or resources to the scholarly community, which could include research presentations at conferences; invited seminars, plenaries, or

	<p>workshops; resource sharing, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Involved in multiple graduate students' education as chair and/or member of graduate committees. <p>Quality/impact/professional development (described in narrative):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The reach or other impact of research publications and presentations demonstrates a regional and/or national reputation in their field of study. <input type="checkbox"/> Research products have a positive impact on the field of horticulture, including novel discoveries, approaches, tools, innovations, etc. that advance knowledge in the area and/or create interdisciplinary bridges. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty member has sought several opportunities for professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) to improve or maintain research productivity, funding levels, research quality, etc., and clearly described how they have enacted what they learned.
<p>5 = Exemplary</p>	<p>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A continuous pattern of publication in refereed journals or other externally evaluated research products (e.g., patents), with multiple publications per year <u>or</u> clear effort toward this goal for those in their first 3 years (e.g., multiple pre-prints). <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple instances of disseminating research findings and/or resources to the scholarly community, which could include research presentations at conferences; invited seminars, plenaries, or workshops; social media outreach; resource sharing, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> One or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Multiple sources of funding to support the costs of research, publication, and training. b. Research leadership roles (directorships, editor-in-chief/senior editor, program officer/director). c. National research awards or other recognition at a national level. <input type="checkbox"/> Chair of multiple graduate student committees. <p>Quality/impact/professional development (described in narrative):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The reach or other impact of research publications and presentations demonstrates a national or international reputation in their field of study. <input type="checkbox"/> Research products have a positive impact on the field of horticulture, including novel discoveries, approaches, tools, innovations, etc. that advance knowledge in the area and/or create interdisciplinary bridges. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty member has sought multiple opportunities for professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) to improve or maintain research productivity, funding levels, research quality, etc., and clearly described how they have enacted what they learned.

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>Outputs (documented in Elements report and described in the narrative). The faculty member does <u>not</u> do either of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Teach assigned courses, as appropriate for EFT. <input type="checkbox"/> Mentor undergraduates, graduate students, and/or postdocs in research, as appropriate for EFT. <p>Quality/impact/professional development (documented in course evaluations and described in narrative). There is evidence for <u>all</u> the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Course evaluations or other student correspondence indicate a persistent and prevalent pattern of teaching/mentoring problems or issues. <input type="checkbox"/> Self-reflection does not indicate any attempt to improve teaching/mentoring. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty member has not sought professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) on teaching or mentoring or described how they have enacted what they learned.
2 = Needs improvement	<p>Outputs (documented in Elements report and described in the narrative). The faculty member does <u>not</u> demonstrate one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A regular pattern of teaching assigned courses, as appropriate for EFT. <input type="checkbox"/> A pattern of mentoring undergraduates, graduate students, and/or postdocs in research, as appropriate for EFT. <p>Quality/impact/professional development (documented in course evaluations and described in narrative). There is evidence for <u>two</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Course evaluations 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). <input type="checkbox"/> 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). <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty member has sought minimal professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) to improve or maintain the quality of their teaching, students' learning, etc. or has not described how they have enacted what they learned.
3 = Meets expectations	<p>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A regular pattern of teaching assigned courses, as appropriate for EFT. <input type="checkbox"/> A pattern of mentoring undergraduates, graduate students, and/or

	<p>postdocs in research, as appropriate for EFT.</p> <p>Quality/impact/professional development (described in narrative). The faculty member demonstrates at least <u>one</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Self-reflection that shows teaching/mentoring effectiveness via systematic analysis of one form of evidence (e.g., summary of student comments from course evaluations, narrative description of peer evaluation of teaching, assessment of student learning or growth, mid-semester course evaluation). <input type="checkbox"/> Self-reflection that identifies specific room for improvement based on evidence from students or peers and a plan for change. <input type="checkbox"/> Description of specific implementation of inclusive and/or evidence-based teaching strategies or curriculum. <input type="checkbox"/> Substantive involvement in the implementation of active learning practices. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty member has sought professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) to improve or maintain the quality of their teaching, students' learning, etc., and clearly described how they have enacted what they learned.
<p>4 = Exceeds expectations</p>	<p>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A regular pattern of teaching assigned courses, as appropriate for EFT. <input type="checkbox"/> A pattern of mentoring undergraduates, graduate students, and/or postdocs in research, as appropriate for EFT. <p>Quality/impact/professional development (described in narrative). Faculty should demonstrate at least <u>two</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Pattern of investing in teaching/mentoring that requires additional workload, including large classes (75+ students), writing-intensive courses, higher than average number of undergraduate researchers (i.e., more than 1 undergraduate researcher per graduate researcher), or higher number of credit hours than expected. <input type="checkbox"/> 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 >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). <input type="checkbox"/> Self-reflection that identifies specific room for improvement in teaching/mentoring based on evidence from students or peers and a plan for change. <input type="checkbox"/> Description of specific implementation of inclusive and/or evidence-based teaching/mentoring strategies or curriculum. <input type="checkbox"/> Substantive involvement in the implementation of active learning practices. <input type="checkbox"/> One or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Funding for teaching innovation or impact activities.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Teaching leadership roles (e.g., mentoring others in teaching). c. Local teaching awards or other recognition at a department, college, or institutional level. <p><input type="checkbox"/> The faculty member has sought several opportunities for professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) to improve or maintain the quality of their teaching, students' learning, etc., and clearly described how they have enacted what they learned.</p>
<p>5 = Exemplary</p>	<p>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A regular pattern of teaching assigned courses, as appropriate for EFT. <input type="checkbox"/> A pattern of mentoring undergraduates, graduate students, and/or postdocs in research, as appropriate for EFT. <p>Quality/impact/professional development (described in narrative). Faculty should demonstrate <u>three or more</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Pattern of investing in teaching that requires additional workload, including large classes (75+ students), writing-intensive courses, higher than average # of undergraduate researchers (i.e., more than 1 undergraduate researcher per graduate researcher), or higher number of credit hours than expected. <input type="checkbox"/> 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 >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). <input type="checkbox"/> Self-reflection that identifies specific room for improvement based on evidence from students or peers and a plan for change. <input type="checkbox"/> Description of specific implementation of inclusive and/or evidence-based teaching strategies or curriculum. <input type="checkbox"/> Intensive involvement in the implementation of active learning practices. <input type="checkbox"/> One or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Funding for teaching innovation or impact activities b. Teaching leadership roles (e.g., mentoring others in teaching). c. Local or national teaching awards or other recognition at an institutional or national level. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty member has sought multiple opportunities for professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) to improve or maintain the quality of their teaching, students' learning, etc., and clearly described how they have enacted what they learned.

EXTENSION

Rating	Criteria: Evidence of development and implementation of a high-quality extension activities that address emerging needs of Georgia's horticulture clientele and impacts commensurate with achieving or maintaining a regional or national reputation
1 = Does not meet expectations	<p>Outputs (documented in Elements report). There is evidence from the faculty member indicates <u>all</u> of the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 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, clientele consultations, advisory meetings, radio/television interviews). <input type="checkbox"/> No attempt to publish Extension publications (e.g., Extension bulletins, circulars, factsheets, newsletters, trade journal articles, exhibits/posters, computer programs, interactive learning modules, multimedia educational programs, electronic products [e-books, websites, blogs, social media posts]) and/or applied research journals. <input type="checkbox"/> No demonstration of leadership and technical ability in developing innovative horticulture extension programs that are based on industry and societal clientele needs related to horticulture. <input type="checkbox"/> No attempt to secure extramural funding (i.e., no proposals submitted, or grants received). <p>Professional development (described in narrative):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty member has not sought professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) on communication strategies, novel/innovative outreach formats, research, leadership, etc. or described how they have enacted what they learned.
2 = Needs improvement	<p>Outputs (documented in Elements report). There is evidence from the faculty member indicates <u>all</u> of the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 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, clientele consultations, advisory meetings, radio/television interviews). <input type="checkbox"/> Little demonstration of leadership and technical ability in developing innovative horticulture extension programs that are based on industry and societal clientele needs related to horticulture. <input type="checkbox"/> Minimal attempt to publish extension publications (e.g., Extension bulletins, circulars, factsheets, newsletters, trade journal articles, exhibits/posters, computer programs, interactive learning modules, multimedia educational programs, electronic products [e-books, websites, blogs, social media posts]) and/or applied research journals. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient funding to support the costs of extension programs, publications, and training <u>and</u> no submission of a grant for external funding.

	<p>Quality/impact/professional development (described in narrative). Evidence from the faculty member indicates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The reach or other impact of extension publications and presentations falls short of indicating a regional and/or national reputation in the field of horticulture, as appropriate for rank. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty member has not sought professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) on communication strategies, novel/innovative outreach formats, research, leadership, etc. or described how they have enacted what they learned.
<p>3 = Meets expectations</p>	<p>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient attempt to develop and coordinate programming within the area of the candidate’s area of expertise (these may include but not be limited to providing in-service training, seminars, workshops, webinars, county/regional meetings, field days, clientele consultations, advisory meetings, radio/television interviews). <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient demonstration of leadership and technical ability in developing innovative horticulture extension programs that are based on industry and societal clientele needs related to horticulture. <p>Outputs (documented in Elements report) & Quality/impact professional development (narrative and/or Elements report). Faculty member demonstrates at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Evident pattern of Extension publications (e.g., Extension bulletins, circulars, factsheets, newsletters, trade journal articles, exhibits/posters, computer programs, interactive learning modules, multimedia educational programs, electronic products [e-books, websites, blogs, social media posts]) and/or applied research journals. <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient funding to support the costs of extension programs, publications, and training <u>and</u> no submission of a grant for external funding. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty member conducts a research project in support of their Extension program area <input type="checkbox"/> The reach or other impact of extension publications and presentations demonstrates a regional and/or national reputation in the field of study, if appropriate for rank. <input type="checkbox"/> Extension programs have the potential to have a positive impact on the field of horticulture, including novel discoveries, approaches, tools, resources, innovations, etc. that advance or apply knowledge in the discipline and/or create interdisciplinary bridges. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty member has sought professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) on communication strategies, novel/innovative outreach formats, research, leadership, etc. and clearly described how they have enacted what they learned.
<p>4 = Exceeds expectations</p>	<p>Outputs (documented in Elements report and/or narrative). The faculty member demonstrates:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ 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, clientele consultations, advisory meetings, radio/television interviews). ❑ Multiple instances of leadership and technical ability in developing innovative horticulture extension programs that are based on industry and societal clientele needs related to horticulture. <p>Outputs (documented in Elements report) & Quality/impact professional development (narrative and/or Elements report). Faculty member performs at least two of the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Continuous pattern of extension publications (e.g., Extension bulletins, circulars, factsheets, newsletters, trade journal articles, exhibits/posters, computer programs, interactive learning modules, multimedia educational programs, electronic products [e-books, websites, blogs, social media posts]) and/or applied research journals. ❑ Appropriate funding to support the costs of extension programs, publications, and training <u>and</u> submission of a grant for external funding. ❑ Continuous pattern of ongoing research projects in support of their Extension appointment ❑ The reach or other impact of research publications and presentations demonstrates a regional and/or national reputation in their field of study. ❑ 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. ❑ Received state and regional 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). ❑ The faculty member has sought several opportunities for professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) on communication strategies, novel/innovative outreach formats, research, leadership, etc., and clearly described how they have enacted what they learned.
5 = Exemplary	<p>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ 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, clientele consultations, advisory meetings, radio/television interviews).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Multiple instances of leadership and technical ability in developing innovative horticulture extension programs that are based on industry and societal clientele needs related to horticulture. □ Continuous pattern of extension publications (e.g., Extension bulletins, circulars, factsheets, newsletters, trade journal articles, exhibits/posters, computer programs, interactive learning modules, multimedia educational programs, electronic products [e-books, websites, blogs, social media posts]) and/or applied research journals. <p>Faculty member will demonstrate 3 or more of the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ One or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. □ and The reach or other impact of research publications and presentations demonstrates a regional and/or national reputation in their field of study. □ 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 □ Received state and regional 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) □ The faculty member has sought multiple opportunities for professional development (e.g., workshops, mentoring, feedback) , on communication strategies, novel/innovative outreach formats, research, leadership, etc. or, and clearly described how they have enacted what they learned.
--	---

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>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member does <u>not</u> demonstrate any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Membership in a departmental, college, campus, or university committee. <input type="checkbox"/> Contribution to professional societies or industry groups (e.g., peer reviews of manuscripts, service on committees, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> <u>For associate/full professor and associate/senior research scientist rank:</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.).
2 = Needs improvement	<p>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates only one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Membership in a departmental, college, campus, or university committee. <input type="checkbox"/> Contribution to professional societies or industry groups (e.g., peer reviews of manuscripts, service on committees, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> <u>For associate/full professor and associate/senior research scientist rank:</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.). <input type="checkbox"/> Participation in service to the community
3 = Meets expectations	<p>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Membership on a departmental, college, campus, or university committee. <input type="checkbox"/> 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 research scientist/assistant professor rank</u> and multiple professional service activities at the <u>associate research scientist/associate professor and senior research scientist/full professor rank</u>. <p>Quality/impact/professional development (described in narrative). The faculty member demonstrates <u>one</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Specific contributions (i.e., leadership roles) to committee work <input type="checkbox"/> The quality/impact/prestige of the professional service activity. <input type="checkbox"/> Effort to ensure preparedness/capacity to carry out committee work effectively, as needed (e.g., participating in professional development to improve committee work).
4 = Exceeds	<p>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</p>

<p>expectations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Membership in at least one departmental, college, campus, or university committee. <input type="checkbox"/> A pattern of one professional service activity at the <u>assistant research scientist/assistant professor rank</u> and multiple professional service activities at the <u>associate research scientist/associate professor and senior research scientist/full professor rank</u>. <p>Quality/impact/professional development (documented in Elements report and/or narrative). The faculty member demonstrates <u>two or more</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Specific contributions to committee work. <input type="checkbox"/> The quality/impact/prestige of the professional service activity. <input type="checkbox"/> 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). <input type="checkbox"/> Contributions or recognition in the form of local awards, internal funding, and/or leadership.
<p>5 = Exemplary</p>	<p>Outputs (documented in Elements report). The faculty member demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Membership in multiple departmental, college, campus, or university committees. <input type="checkbox"/> A pattern of one professional service activity at the <u>assistant research scientist/assistant professor rank</u> and multiple professional service activities at the <u>associate research scientist/associate professor and senior research scientist/full professor rank</u>. <p>Quality/impact/professional development (documented in Elements report and/or narrative). The faculty member demonstrates <u>three or more</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Specific contributions to committee work. <input type="checkbox"/> The quality/impact/prestige of the professional service activity. <input type="checkbox"/> 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). <input type="checkbox"/> Contributions or recognition in the form of national/international awards, external funding, and/or high-level leadership.