Annual Review Evaluation Guidelines
Department of Marine Sciences
Adopted December 21, 2016

The purpose of the Annual Review Evaluation is to assess the scholarly achievement and professional productivity of faculty in accordance with procedures outlined in the University of Georgia Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure and the Department of Marine Sciences Promotion and Tenure Criteria. The Annual Review Evaluation will focus on research, teaching and service as prescribed by the faculty's job description or EFT assignment. Annual reviews may be used to make decisions regarding distribution of salary raises or selection for awards or other honors. The annual review will focus on accomplishments in the preceding calendar year; however the department head may comment on any significant changes relative to accomplishments of previous years.

All annual review evaluations of faculty performance will be supported by an Annual Activity Report consisting of the UGA Elements activity summary, any self assessment reports provided, and a summary of faculty productivity as outlined in the Faculty Performance Data Matrix (see Appendix A). All activities and accomplishments in the previous calendar year should be entered by faculty into UGA Elements and submitted to the Head by January 15 along with an updated CV. Faculty are evaluated in three areas – scholarly achievement, teaching effectiveness, and service contributions as described in the following sections, with performance measures defined as "exceeds, meets, or does not meet expectations" as a ranking. The evaluation framework will follow the outline shown in Appendix B.

The annual evaluation will be discussed with the faculty member who requests it, and in particular the Head will meet with all non-tenured faculty, and others where there has been difficulty meeting expectation standards. The faculty member may respond in writing to the evaluation within 10 days of the date of the evaluation; the response, if any, will be attached to the evaluation. Faculty may also return a signed copy of their evaluation to the department head to indicate their receipt of the evaluation. Where a faculty member receives an overall unsatisfactory evaluation, the head, in collaboration with the faculty member, will develop an improvement plan specifying corrective measures with time-lines for accomplishments. The improvement plan shall be a part of the written record. All annual review evaluations should be completed by March 31 and the Department Head will submit the evaluation (and response if there is one) to the College by the deadline set by the Dean.

Evaluation of the ranks:

Assistant Professor: It is mandatory for Assistant Professors to undergo Promotion and Tenure (P&T) review to Associate Professor with tenure. The underlying criteria for meeting expectations are that faculty are on track for P&T according to the University guidelines and the departmental criteria.

Associate Professor: It is not mandatory that Associate Professors undergo promotion to Full Professor, however it is highly encouraged that faculty work toward this goal. Thus, the underlying criteria for meeting expectations is that faculty are maintaining the level of productivity that was needed for promotion to Associate Professor.

Full Professor: The criteria for meeting expectations is that faculty maintain a level of productivity that is needed for promotion to Full Professor as outlined in the University guidelines and departmental criteria.

Research

Assistant/Associate rank: Peer reviewed activities are weighted higher than non peer reviewed activities; minimum requirements to meet expectations for a 50% research EFT (with requirements scaled proportionately for higher or lower research EFTs) are:

1) One presentation of research results at the national level, or two or more presentations at the state or regional level;
2) At least one active grant necessary to support the candidate's research or evidence of active pursuit of grant funding through proposal submissions; and
3) Submission of at least one paper in the year, with evidence that the faculty member has led the scholarly work and its dissemination (intellectual contributions on collaborative submissions shall be described or corroborated), or evidence of data collection or methods development that will lead to new publications and/or proposals.

Exceeding in research consists of a body of published work reflecting a quality and quantity of activity that is notable at the national level. In the event that one or more of the above criteria are not met, evaluation of the whole research portfolio, in light of accomplishment trajectory, will be made.

Full rank: Peer reviewed activities are weighted higher than non peer reviewed activities; minimum requirements to meet expectations for a 50% research EFT (with requirements scaled proportionately for higher or lower research EFTs) are:

1) At least one presentation of research results at the international level, or two or more presentations at the state, regional or national level;
2) At least one active grant necessary to support the candidate's research and training of lab members or documented evidence of active pursuit of grant funding through proposal submissions; and
3) Submission of at least two papers in the year, in journals that have an international reputation for quality or documented evidence of data collection or methods development that would lead to new publications and/or proposals.

Exceeding in research represents a body of published work reflecting a quality and quantity of activity that is notable at the national and international level. In the event that one or more of the above criteria are not met, evaluation of the whole research portfolio, in light of accomplishment trajectory, will be made.

Teaching

All ranks: Organized coursework and thus course/teacher evaluations are weighted higher than other activities; for a 25% teaching EFT (with requirements scaled proportionately for higher or lower teaching EFTs) the minimum requirements to meet expectations are:

1) Supervision of a student (1 graduate or at least one undergraduate) or exhibiting evidence of active recruiting efforts; documented evidence of assisting or mentoring graduate students;
2) Evidence of good teaching, considering the context of each course, or documented evidence of efforts to enhance or improve teaching effectiveness; and
3) Teaching units commensurate with an equitable contribution to the department's teaching load, or documented evidence of other pedagogy, (e.g., new course development or revision, providing experiential learning opportunities, or field trips that enhance learning outcomes).

Exceeding in Teaching is meeting the 3 minimum teaching requirements and exceeding in at least organized coursework reflecting a quality and quantity of activity that is notable. In the event that one or more of the above criteria are not met, evaluation of the whole teaching portfolio in light of accomplishment trajectory will be made.

For those who do not have a Teaching EFT, meeting expectations indicates that a faculty member is contributing to classroom instruction as a guest lecturer, advising students, mentoring students through internships, or serving on graduate student committees. Exceeding expectations requires a substantial contribution to one of these areas (e.g. organized coursework responsibilities).

Service:

All ranks: Marine Sciences faculty participate in one form or another in Service activities and so it is an important component in the evaluation process. Faculty are evaluated in terms of their level of service to the Profession and to the University. They may also provide service to the Community and Society. Service can be documented by the types of activities listed in the Faculty Performance Data Matrix weighted in order of impact (see Appendix A). Does not meet expectations shows minimal service, reflecting a lack of involvement in professional and University activities. Meeting expectations requires a demonstrable service to the profession and University. Exceeding expectation*s* reflects demonstrable leadership roles in professional, and institutional organizations and could include some contributions to society and community outreach programs.

Those with an EFT in Service are expected to demonstrate contributions to the Community and Society in proportion to their EFT allocation. This is over and above their service to the Profession and the University, as described above. For a 10% EFT allocation (this can be scaled proportionately to higher or lower EFTs), does not meet expectations shows minimal service to the Community and to Society, meets expectations shows a demonstrable service to the Community and to Society, and exceeds expectations requires additional service the Community and to Society.

Overall evaluation:

The Department Head is responsible for the annual evaluation of progress toward Promotion and Tenure and this should be incorporated into the overall evaluation of untenured faculty. The majority of the faculty member's assigned time will determine the overall evaluation and any significant changes compared to the prior review may be documented. The overall evaluation will be given according to:

1) Exceeds expectations – corresponds to a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for the institution, discipline, or unit.
2) Meets expectations – is a level of accomplishment normally expected and required for P&T.
3) Does not meet expectations – is beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance.

Appendix A: Faculty Performance Data Matrix

Statistical summaries of grants and teaching activities are obtained from information contained in the Elements basic reports and corrected by faculty where necessary; teaching evaluations, student advising, service summaries and publications are collected from the Annual Activity Report submitted by all faculty members. Those faculty with no teaching or Academic Professionals with no research are not included in the summaries related to teaching and research respectively.

Teaching:

Teaching Loads and Credit Hours are prorated by %-contribution to team-taught courses. "Graduate Seminars" include lab meeting- and research technique-type courses. Credit for these variable unit courses will not exceed 2 units per course. Multiple offerings of such courses by the same professor in the same semester are treated as a single course (with a 2 unit maximum). For undergraduate directed studies and graduate Master's and Ph.D. research, each student is counted as 1 teaching unit, irrespective of the number of hours for which they are enrolled. Credit Hour generation is calculated from the number of students enrolled in formal courses multiplied by credit hours per faculty.

Teaching evaluation scores are the median of the individual averages of questions 1-7 and 8 on the Department's evaluation form, for each respondent. Scale is 1-5, with 5 being Excellent and 1 Poor. These questions are: the instructor…
1) clearly articulated and met course objectives
2) was well-prepared
3) explained things clearly
4) used class time effectively
5) was available and willing to help students
6) was receptive to questions and independent thought
7) stimulated student interest
8) overall rating

Service:

Service is subdivided into *Service to the Profession* (e.g. review of manuscripts/proposals, service on editorial boards or in the governance of professional societies, etc.), *Service to the University* (e.g. service on departmental, institutional and University level committees, etc.), *Service to the Community* (e.g. visits to local schools, participation in community activities relevant to education, etc.), and *Service to Society* at the State and National Level (e.g. contributing to policy decisions, etc.). The score is on a scale from $1 - 5$, with 1 corresponding to no activity and 5 to exceptional contributions. The following table provides examples of service activities:

Service to the Profession
- Judging student presentations (e.g at conferences and science fairs)
- Paper and proposal reviews
- External tenure and promotion reviews

- Participation on review panels
- Service on editorial boards
- Organization of special sessions or professional meetings
- Leadership roles in professional societies
- Journal editor

Service to the University
- Representing Marine Sciences at events (i.e. recruitment fairs)
- Membership in departmental, institutional, college, or university-level committees
- Serving as seminar coordinator
- Serving on third year review, post tenure review committees
- Serving as Graduate or Undergraduate coordinator

Service to the Community
- Classroom visits
- Participation in public events (i.e. Skidaway Marine Science Day)
- Creation of websites for community education
- Preparation of fact sheets and other materials for community education
- Newspaper (and other media) interviews
- Presentations at events for the general public
- Teacher training workshops

Service to Society
- Presentations that involve environmental managers
- Providing materials for legislators and policy makers
- Organizing meetings and other events for resource managers
- Serving non-profit organizations
- Service on state or federal advisory boards (i.e. NRC panels; EPD Technical Advisory Group)

Research:

The number and dollar amounts of Proposals Submitted, New Awards and Active Grants are tabulated, with multi-investigator proposals prorated by the % Academic Contribution for each investigator, as indicated on the Transmittal Form or as stated by faculty. New Awards include grants started in the calendar year under evaluation. The entire amount of new multi-year awards is credited to the initial year and then in subsequent years the entire award will be credited as Active Grant funding.

Publication of scholarly work is identified as either peer-reviewed, book chapters or technical reports. The "peer-reviewed journals" category includes those publications with dates corresponding to the year under evaluation. Papers listed as submitted and in press are combined and reported in a separate category. "Presentations and seminars" includes all presentations on which you were a lead or co-author, regardless of who presented them, as reported in the Annual Activity Report.

Calendar Year 2015	Department Max	Department Median	Department Min	Faculty Name
Teaching Loads				
Undergrad units, classroom teaching	5.5	1.0	0.0	1.2
Undergrad units, directed studies	12.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Graduate units, classroom teaching	4.0	0.0	0.0	3.3
Graduate Seminars/Lab Meetings, Etc	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Graduate Research	22.0	4.0	0.0	9.0
Total Classroom Teaching	5.5	3.0	0.0	4.5
Total Teaching Units	32.5	11.0	1.0	13.5
Undergrad Credit-Hrs	684.0	7.0	0.0	8.2
Grad Credit-Hrs	191.0	40.0	0.0	119.7
Total Credit-Hrs	720.0	84.5	3.0	127.8
Teaching Evaluations (1-5)	5.00	4.14	3.07	3.79
Students Supervised				
B.S.	6	2	0	0
M.S.	4	0	0	2
Ph.D.	6	1	0	1
M.S and Ph.D. advisory committees	14	3	0	4
Undergrad Advising	Y: 5 Faculty	N: 21 Faculty		N
Service (Qualitative, 1-5)				
Community outreach	5	2	1	1
Institution	5	2	1	5
Profession	5	3	1	3
Society	5	2	1	2
Proposals Submitted				
Number	9	3	0	2
Number pending	2	1	0	0
New Awards				
Number of New Awards	3	1	0	2
New Funds awarded, $K	$13,173	$304	$0	$1,279
Active Grants				
Active Grant Funds, $K	$14,464	$893	$0	$2,703
Number of Active Grants	12	5	0	5
Publications				
Peer-reviewed journals	16	3	0	0
Books Chapts	2	0	0	0
Tech reports & non-peer-reviewed	3	0	0	0
Submitted or in press	15	2	0	0
Presentations & Seminars	24	5	0	4

Appendix B: Evaluation Framework

The written annual [evaluation framework](#), as posted on the Office of Faculty Affairs website is:

<p style="text-align:center">***[YEAR]*** **ANNUAL EVALUATION**</p>

To: *[Faculty Member's Name]*
From: *[Department Chair/Dean/VP/Center Director's Name; for those schools with departments, the dean should be cc'd]*
Date: *[Must be before March 31 of the calendar year; for those colleges/schools with departments, the dean should set an earlier deadline with sufficient opportunity to review and provide feedback on a draft.]*
Attachment(s): Annual Activity Report and Faculty Performance Data Matrix *[UGA Elements plus any self-assessments and other reports, as required by each academic unit]*

This constitutes your annual written evaluation required by Section 8.3.5.1 of the Board of Regents Policy Manual. Your assigned allocation of effort this year was **[x%]** scholarship, **[y%]** teaching, **[z%]** service, and **[zz%]** administration (or other _____).

[The faculty member should be evaluated in each category below. Tenure-track and tenured faculty should be evaluated based upon their Promotion and Tenure Unit's discipline-specific criteria. Where the rating is "does not meet expectations," the evaluation must provide a concrete course of action with measurable and documentable achievements expected, including a timeline for improving this rating. Faculty activity and productivity in each of the categories below may be briefly summarized as necessary by the evaluator. However, more extensive data or summaries or self-assessments by the faculty should be attached to the evaluation].

Scholarship/Research/Creative Work – [*EXCEEDS/MEETS/DOES NOT MEET*] EXPECTATIONS
[Evaluation should present quantitative data where applicable (e.g., impact of journals, numbers of publications, amounts of external grant funding and sources, original creative works judged/reviewed) and an assessment of the importance of the scholarship to the field]

Teaching – [*EXCEEDS/MEETS/DOES NOT MEET*] EXPECTATIONS
[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, enrollment, and development of innovative teaching approaches)]

Service – [*EXCEEDS/MEETS/DOES NOT MEET*] EXPECTATIONS]
[Evaluation should assess the impact of achievements in service (e.g., documented impact of service on audiences served)]

Administration or Other – [*EXCEEDS/MEETS/DOES NOT MEET*] EXPECTATIONS]

[Evaluation should assess the progress of the unit administered toward its strategic goals with measurable outcomes that document achievement of these objectives]

OVERALL EVALUATION – [*EXCEEDS/MEETS/DOES NOT MEET*] EXPECTATIONS

[This section should provide an overall assessment of performance in relation to the individual's assigned allocation of effort. If at least 50% of the faculty member's assigned time receives a rating of "Does Not Meet Expectations," then the overall evaluation should be "Does Not Meet Expectations."

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, tenure or post-tenure review 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, or will have a successful post-tenure review.]

You may respond to this report in writing. That response must be submitted within 10 days of the date on this evaluation. Although it is not required for the annual evaluation, you may be asked to sign the evaluation; your signature on this memo only acknowledges its receipt and does not imply agreement.

_____
Name and Title of Evaluator

_____
Signature of Evaluator

[If desired:]

_____
Signature of Faculty Member being evaluated