

Policy for Written Annual Evaluation
Department of Plant Pathology
5 December 2022

The Department of Plant Pathology developed and adopted the following Annual Evaluation Policy (AEP) to assure all faculty are evaluated based upon objective, transparent, and academic discipline-specific assessment criteria and rubrics, as required by 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 Plant Pathology 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.

Evaluation Policy

Faculty in the Department of Plant Pathology are required annually to submit an electronic copy of their UGA Elements annual activity report, which is due to the department head by January 15 each year. Failure to submit the required evaluation information will result in the department head pulling the Elements report manually, which may result in the use of incomplete data for evaluation. The department head will meet and discuss annual performance annually during February and March. 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 serve as an opportunity for faculty members to share their goals for the current calendar year. The department head will prepare a draft written evaluation of the faculty member in advance of the meeting and the written evaluation will serve as the basis for discussion. If there are factual errors in the draft evaluation document, those will be corrected following the evaluation meeting and a final version will be submitted to the faculty member. All faculty members will sign the final evaluation document acknowledging that they have been apprised of the content of their annual written evaluation; the signature only acknowledges its receipt and does not imply agreement. Failure to sign the written annual evaluation will not invalidate the evaluation.

Materials to be submitted for annual evaluation

- 1) Up-to-date electronic copy of the Elements faculty activity report for the previous calendar year.
- 2) End-of-semester student course evaluations from the previous calendar year (will be pulled by the department head)
- 3) Peer Review of Teaching summary (if conducted).
- 4) One or two optional documents may be added in situations where the faculty member feels that their Elements report does not adequately reflect their activities during the previous year:
 - A brief (half-page) narrative describing 3 to 5 examples of student success activities the faculty member engaged in over the previous year¹.
 - A statement of goals for the forthcoming year, including reflection on prior calendar year goals and on current calendar year goals.

¹ This may include but is not limited to: serving as major or co-major professor of graduate students; serving on graduate student committees; mentoring of undergraduate students or Young Scholars in formal research or Extension projects; publication of peer-reviewed manuscripts with your graduate students; formal scientific presentations given by your students at organized meetings; awards, distinctions, or recognitions that your students have received; and/or successful program completion by your graduate students. Additional examples of relevant activities include coordination of the departmental seminar series, colloquium, or a formal lab meeting course; teaching of a GradFIRST course; service on departmental, college, university, or professional society committee related to instruction; service as an academic program or internship coordinator; participation in mentoring or teaching workshops; and participation in K-12 outreach activities.

For faculty with joint appointments, the evaluation will be conducted jointly by the heads of the departments in which the faculty has appointments, utilizing the rubric of the department with the majority appointment. For faculty located at the Tifton or Griffin campuses or with appointments in UGA Centers and/or Institutes, input on a faculty member's performance will also be requested from the respective Director.

Response to written evaluation

A faculty member may respond to their final 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. Annual evaluations are not subject to discretionary review or appeal.

Developmental response to 1 and 2 ratings

As per USG and UGA policy, Performance Remediation Plans (PRP) will be developed and implemented in situations where the faculty member's 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. In cases where a PRP is required, it will be developed, implemented, and evaluated as described in UGA Academic Affairs Policy 1.06-1 "Written 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 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 support; 5) expectations for improvement; and 6) monitoring strategy.

Upon the faculty member's request, a Development Committee consisting of tenured faculty members of the Department of Plant Pathology may be involved in the development, implementation, and/or evaluation of the PRP. One committee member will be nominated by the faculty member, a second by the department head, and a third will be randomly selected among the remaining tenured faculty members in the department. In the case of a junior faculty member who has a Mentoring Committee, that committee may serve as the Development Committee. The Development Committee will select a chair among its members to facilitate interactions with the faculty candidate and department head during the process.

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

A tenured faculty member evaluated as a 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations or a 2 – Needs Improvement in any one of the assigned areas of effort exceeding 10% for two consecutive annual evaluations will participate in a corrective post-tenure review, as described in the UGA Policy for Review of Tenured Faculty and following the post-tenure review guidelines in the Department of Plant Pathology. 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. Refusal to comply with a PRP would result in a 1 or 2 rating in the affected Area of Effort in the subsequent year.

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-specific evaluation criteria

The attached annual evaluation letter template (Appendix A), including specific rubric components, will be used to assure compliance with USG and UGA policy in the annual evaluation components and process requirements. The criteria in the rubric will be assessed based on information included in the aforementioned annual evaluation documents. For criteria that may show cyclical patters (such as publications, grants, or graduate students), data from the last 3 years may be considered.

Given the wide diversity of appointments in the Department of Plant Pathology, it is understood that not all criteria will apply uniformly to all faculty members or faculty tracks. For example, faculty on Academic Professional, Public Service Faculty, or Research Scientist tracks may have duties and responsibilities that are insufficiently captured by the criteria below. In those cases, additional feedback will be provided in the "Evaluation Summary" section at the end of the evaluation letter. Likewise, new faculty members in their first 2 years will not have a complete 3-year record that can be used to compensate for a low in years 1 or 2; this will be taken into account in the evaluation.