



University Council

To: President Jere W. Morehead

Re: Recommendations of the University Council from the April 20, 2022, Meeting
Document Number: 2022.04.20.19

Issue: A proposal from the Faculty Affairs Committee for revisions to 1.06-1 Written Annual Evaluation policy.

Discussion: There was an extensive discussion regarding the proposal in which a motion to amend the proposal was approved by the Council.

Action: The vote was called, and the proposal was approved with 116 in favor, 1 against, and 12 abstentions.

Submitted by: *Fiona Liken*
Fiona Liken, Secretary

4/22/22
Date


- ☒ Approved
☐ Reconsider
☐ Vetoed (see attached explanation)
☐ Received

Jere W. Morehead
Jere W. Morehead, President

5/13/22
Date

MEMORANDUM

To: University Council Secretary, Fiona Liken

From: University of Georgia President, Jere W. Morehead 

Re: Recommendations from University Council, September 28, 2022 Meeting

Date: November 14, 2022

The University Council approved the attached proposal, along with 10 other proposals related to faculty evaluation policies, on September 28, 2022. You submitted all 11 proposals to me on September 30, 2022. I marked them "Received" on October 18, 2022, allowing that they were subject to final review and approval by the University System of Georgia (USG), per USG Academic and Student Affairs Handbook Section 4.7 (see "Implementation Process and Timeline").

The 11 proposals, along with 2 additional proposals approved by University Council on April 20, 2022 (see full list below), were transmitted to USG on October 11, 2022. The USG provided feedback and final approval on October 19, 2022, indicating, "No revisions necessary." Accordingly, all 13 motions shall be considered full approved for implementation at the University of Georgia. This memorandum memorializes the proposals' dispositions as Approved.

Proposal for revisions to 1.06-1 Written Annual Evaluation policy

Proposal for a new policy on Student Success Activities

Proposal for revisions to Appointment and Promotion Guidelines: Academic Professionals

Proposal for revisions to Appointment and Promotion Guidelines: Clinical Faculty

Proposal for revisions to Appointment and Promotion Guidelines: Librarians and Archivists

Proposal for revisions to Appointment and Promotion Guidelines: Research Scientists

Proposal for revisions to Appointment and Promotion Guidelines: Lecturers

Proposed revisions to UGA Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Academic Rank Faculty

Proposed revisions to 1.06-4 Post Tenure Review Policy

Proposed policy on Due Process

Proposed revisions to UGA Academic Affairs Policy Manual, Section 1.16, Review of Administrators of Academic Units

Proposal to revise the bylaws of the Faculty Post-Tenure Review Appeals Committee

Proposal to revise the operating policy of the Faculty Post-Tenure Review Appeals Committee

Date: 17 March 2022
To: University Council Executive Committee
From: Janette R. Hill, Ph.D., Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee
Re: Proposed New Policy on Student Success Activities and Proposed Revisions to 1.06-1 Written Annual Evaluation Policy

On behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), I am sending a proposed new policy on Student Success Activities and the proposed revisions to 1.06-1 Written Annual Evaluation Policy for your consideration and hopefully to send to the University Council for consideration during the April meeting. I discuss the development of each policy below; both are included as attachments along with a third document which provides examples of Student Success Activities (to be posted on the Office of Academic Affairs' website).

Proposed New Policy on Student Success Activities

The FAC met throughout the fall and spring semesters to discuss the implications on current UGA policies of the USG revisions to policies for faculty reviews, including a new requirement to include "involvement in student success activities" as a component of reviews, in particular 1.06-1 Written Annual Evaluation. Student Success Activities is proposed to be included as a definition in the Academic Affairs Policy Manual for reference in other University and unit-specific faculty review guidelines and criteria, as appropriate. The FAC met on 7 January to discuss a draft of the Student Success Activities policy that was passed unanimously by the Working Group on Faculty Evaluation Policies and Practices (FEPP) to the FAC for consideration. Feedback on student success activities, gathered by a survey open to the entire university community, informed the creation of the proposed document shared with the FAC. After discussion of the proposed document, the FAC unanimously approved the Student Success Activities policy.

As the Student Success Activities is a new policy, there is not a marked-up document for comparison.

I have also included a list of examples of Student Success Activities that was reviewed by FAC on 7 January. This is not a document that need to be voted on. As noted, it is a list of additional examples. The list was developed based on examples provided by the university community. It is non-exhaustive and designed to be dynamic and updated. The list will be hosted on the Office of Faculty Affairs web site.

Proposed Revisions to 1.06-1 Written Annual Evaluation Policy

The FAC met throughout fall and spring semesters to discuss the implications of the USG updated policy on annual evaluation for UGA policy 1.06-1 Written Annual Evaluation. The committee met on 4 March to discuss a draft of the Written Annual Evaluation Policy that was passed unanimously by the Working Group on Faculty Evaluation Policies and Practices (FEPP) to the FAC for consideration. Feedback on the draft of 1.06-1 Written Annual Evaluation Policy, gathered by a survey open to the entire university community, was also shared with the FAC to inform the discussion.

Dr. Barbara Biesecker, lead of the FEPP subgroup on Due Process and Chair of the University Council Executive Committee, attended the 4 March FAC meeting. During that meeting, the FAC agreed to table its consideration of the FEPP's submitted draft and to hold a special meeting to consider suggested revisions that Dr. Biesecker indicated that she would provide the FAC before the special meeting. Dr. Biesecker subsequently submitted suggested revisions to the policy to the FAC for consideration that incorporated additional language from the University System of Georgia Academic Affairs Handbook,

which was finalized on 8 February 8 2022, into the FEPP's submitted draft. The FAC had a special meeting on 14 March to discuss the suggested revisions. After discussion, including additional revisions, the FAC unanimously approved the proposed revisions to 1.06-1 Written Annual Evaluation Policy.

I have provided a clean and marked up version of the proposed revisions to 1.06-1 Written Evaluation Policy. The following indicates the sources of the proposed revisions:

- Black text: the original text in the Written Annual Evaluation Policy
- Red text: Incorporation of new language into the proposed revisions to the Written Annual Evaluation Policy based on USG policy and guidelines.
- Blue text: Updates by the FEPP and FAC into the proposed revisions to the Written Annual Evaluation Policy to further clarify the revisions based on the updated USG policy and guidelines.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information.

University of Georgia Academic Affairs Policy Manual

1.06-1 Written Annual Evaluation

(note: black text=current UGA policy; red text=as prescribed by USG policy and guidelines; blue text=as amended and approved by FEPP and FAC)

Each faculty member at the University of Georgia, 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 academic discipline-specific assessment criteria and rubrics. All changes to performance criteria must be updated in UGA faculty policies in a timely fashion. These updates must be done in advance of the next review cycle and allow time for faculty to incorporate those expectations into the preparation of their review documents. Written Annual Evaluation policies, processes, and stated criteria must incorporate appropriate due process mechanisms and support the principles of academic freedom.**

Each evaluation must address the components outlined in the following framework **and encompass continuous professional growth appropriate to the institution's sector and mission, school or college, and department. Evaluators may use their own format and include additional components if they wish; however, the Office of Faculty Affairs must ensure that workload percentages for faculty roles and responsibilities are factored into the performance evaluation model in a consistent manner. Teaching, research, service, and administrative activities should be noted, including student success activities, as applicable and as further defined in discipline-specific criteria. The Office of Faculty Affairs is responsible for ensuring that academic administrators are properly trained for all levels of evaluation as outlined in the Board of Regents Policy Manual and procedures disseminated by the USG Chief Academic Officer. Each institution must develop a robust annual professional development plan for academic administrators and faculty to ensure adherence to Board Policy procedures outlined in UGA faculty policies. In addition, the institution is responsible to provide professional development to faculty who serve on tenure and post tenure review committees.**

The faculty member is responsible for providing an annual activity report from UGA Elements and any additional documentation and materials required or allowed by the discipline-specific annual evaluation criteria and process. The evaluator will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's annual written evaluation and their progression toward achieving future milestones. The faculty member will sign a statement to acknowledge that 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; 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.

All USG annual faculty evaluations must utilize the following 5-point scale:

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

Noteworthy achievement as referenced in BOR Policy 8.3.7.3 is reflective of a 4 or a 5 on the above 5-point scale. Deficient and unsatisfactory performance is reflective of a 1 or a 2 on the above 5-point scale.

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 remediate their performance during the next year; however, remediation cannot be required of a faculty member outside of the contract period.

The evaluator will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member. The PRP's goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable within the time frame, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member. The PRP must include the following components:

- 1. Clearly defined goals or outcomes
- 2. An outline of activities to be undertaken
- 3. A timetable
- 4. Available resources and supports
- 5. Expectations for improvement
- 6. Monitoring strategy

The PRP must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs. The PRP will become part of the official personnel records.

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

A tenured faculty member evaluated as a 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations or a 2 – Needs Improvement in any one of the assigned areas of effort, for which the assigned allocation of effort exceeds 10%, for two consecutive annual evaluations will participate in a corrective post-tenure review, as described in the Policy for Review of Tenured Faculty. Note that the deficiency does not have to be in the same area but could be in a different area from one year to the next.

University of Georgia Academic Affairs Policy Manual

1.06-1 Written Annual Evaluation

Each faculty member at the University of Georgia, 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 academic discipline-specific assessment criteria and rubrics. All changes to performance criteria must be updated in UGA faculty policies in a timely fashion. These updates must be done in advance of the next review cycle and allow time for faculty to incorporate those expectations into the preparation of their review documents. Written Annual Evaluation policies, processes, and stated criteria must incorporate appropriate due process mechanisms and support the principles of academic freedom.

Each evaluation must address the components outlined in the following framework and encompass continuous professional growth appropriate to the institution's sector and mission, school or college, and department. Evaluators may use their own format and include additional components if they wish; however, the Office of Faculty Affairs must ensure that workload percentages for faculty roles and responsibilities are factored into the performance evaluation model in a consistent manner. Teaching, research, service, and administrative activities should be noted, including student success activities, as applicable and as further defined in discipline-specific criteria. The Office of Faculty Affairs is responsible for ensuring that academic administrators are properly trained for all levels of evaluation as outlined in the Board of Regents Policy Manual and procedures disseminated by the USG Chief Academic Officer. Each institution must develop a robust annual professional development plan for academic administrators and faculty to ensure adherence to Board Policy procedures outlined in UGA faculty policies. In addition, the institution is responsible to provide professional development to faculty who serve on tenure and post tenure review committees.

The faculty member is responsible for providing an annual activity report from UGA Elements and any additional documentation and materials required or allowed by the discipline-specific annual evaluation criteria and process. The evaluator will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's annual written evaluation and their progression toward achieving future milestones. The faculty member will sign a statement to acknowledge that 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; 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.

All USG annual faculty evaluations must utilize the following 5-point scale:

- 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations
- 2 – Needs Improvement
- 3 – Meets Expectations

4 – Exceeds Expectations

5 – Exemplary

Noteworthy achievement as referenced in BOR Policy 8.3.7.3 is reflective of a 4 or a 5 on the above 5-point scale. Deficient and unsatisfactory performance is reflective of a 1 or a 2 on the above 5-point scale.

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 remediate their performance during the next year; however, remediation cannot be required of a faculty member outside of the contract period.

The evaluator will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member. The PRP's goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable within the time frame, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member. The PRP must include the following components:

1. Clearly defined goals or outcomes
2. An outline of activities to be undertaken
3. A timetable
4. Available resources and supports
5. Expectations for improvement
6. Monitoring strategy

The PRP must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs. The PRP will become part of the official personnel records.

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

A tenured faculty member evaluated as a 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations or a 2 – Needs Improvement in any one of the assigned areas of effort, for which the assigned allocation of effort exceeds 10%, for two consecutive annual evaluations will participate in a corrective post-tenure review, as described in the Policy for Review of Tenured Faculty. Note that the deficiency does not have to be in the same area but could be in a different area from one year to the next.