

CED Annual Review Policy

Overview and Purpose

The CED Annual Performance Review is a faculty development and unit enhancement mechanism. Its purpose is not merely to record an evaluation of a faculty member's performance for the year. The review should be carried out and utilized to promote open and productive dialog between each faculty member and the Dean.

The annual review process has two main components. The first is to review what the faculty member has accomplished over the previous year. The second is to discuss what the faculty member plans for the coming year. Completing these two tasks should lead to a meaningful faculty-driven career development process.

The Annual Review process is based on Academic Affairs Policy Manual section 1.06-1 Written Annual Evaluation. Pertinent documents also include: Board of Regents Policy Manual 8.3.5.1, UGA Academic Affairs University System of Georgia Academic & Student Affairs Handbook 4.4, and UGA Academic Affairs Policy Manual 1.10-10. In preparation for their annual review, all tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty must submit a fully updated Elements Activity Summary (EAS) for the evaluation year. In addition, faculty members are encouraged but not required to submit the additional CED form "Proposed Upcoming Year Activities." The documents are due to the Dean's office on or before January 31. All annual evaluations will take place before April 1.

After the documents have been submitted, the Dean's office will schedule a meeting to conduct the annual review. Following the review, the faculty member will sign a statement acknowledging that they have been apprised of the content of their yearly evaluation. Faculty must respond to their annual review within 10 working days. The Dean will acknowledge receipt of a faculty's written response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made as a result of the faculty written response, also within 10 working days.

Rating Scale and Criteria

Each faculty member will receive a separate evaluation in their designated areas (research/scholarship, teaching, service, and administration, if applicable) based on a 5-point scale.

5- Exemplary - The faculty member demonstrates exceptional performance, exceeds overall goals and expectations as described in the unit criteria for promotion and tenure, and significantly contributes to the College's success.

4- Exceeds Expectations - The faculty member demonstrates consistent performance in all areas of assignment, meets and exceeds some goals and expectations as described in the unit criteria for promotion and tenure, and contributes to the success of the College.

3- Meets Expectations - The faculty member demonstrates an acceptable level of performance as described in the unit criteria for promotion and tenure, meets overall goals and expectations, and has contributed to the success of the College.

2- Needs Improvement - The faculty member demonstrates inconsistent performance levels and may meet some goals and expectations, while not meeting other goals and expectations as described in the unit criteria for promotion and tenure. Overall, the faculty member demonstrates some willingness and ability to improve performance.

1- Does Not Meet Expectations - The faculty member is not meeting the job expectations and fails to meet goals as described in the unit criteria for promotion and tenure. The faculty member demonstrates unwillingness or inability to improve performance.