**Example Annual Evaluation Rubric - Generated by the UGA DeLTA Project** [**https://seercenter.uga.edu/delta-project/**](https://seercenter.uga.edu/delta-project/)

Annual evaluations that align with USG and UGA policy include the following forms of evidence:

* **Outputs:** Outputs are evidence that the faculty member is carrying out their work as assigned. Example outputs include explicit targets for activities related to each scope of work (e.g., number, type, or pattern of scholarly engagement or products consistent with discipline/subdiscipline, number of courses taught, expectations for committee membership, number of research mentees) along with indicators of the workload associated with each activity (e.g., whether a course has high enrollment or is writing intensive, whether the committee or committee role involves higher or lower workload such as serving as chair).
* **Quality and impact:** While outputs are important for providing evidence of workload, evidence of the quality and impact of the work provides insight into how well the work was done and what difference the work made. Indicators of quality and impact are important for demonstrating teaching, research, and service excellence for promotion and tenure. Example evidence of quality and impact of teaching can include indicators of ongoing efforts to make teaching decisions based on evidence as well as student performance on common assessments and peer observations using established approaches. Example evidence of quality and impact of research/scholarship/creative work can include the profile of where the work is presented or shared (e.g., reputation of the journal, conference, or other event), and reach of the venue where the work is presented or shared (e.g., audience number, audience diversity in terms of discipline, communities, geography, etc.).
* **Professional development:** USG and UGA policies emphasize the importance of professional development in all domains of faculty work. Evidence of professional development includes participating in learning opportunities that the faculty member strategically selects in order to improve their work as needed, as well as application of lessons learned as a result of professional development. Example evidence of teaching professional development can include participation in workshops accompanied by brief, narrative descriptions (e.g., teaching self-reflections) of how lessons learned were applied and what outcome(s) resulted. Example evidence of research professional development can include attending workshops on writing, grant development, and project development, engaging in networking events, and providing brief, narrative descriptions of sharing drafts of scholarly works in progress and how improvements were made based on feedback from colleagues. Example evidence of service professional development can include participation in relevant workshops and brief, narrative descriptions of feedback gathered from stakeholders for how to improve the operations or functions of the committee and how feedback was addressed.
* **Objectivity or bias mitigation:** To promote fairness and equity and reduce potential for bias, annual evaluations should rely on **multiple** pieces of evidence based on **established approaches** to evaluating quality and impact of the work **in the field or discipline**. For each domain of work (teaching, research, service), there should be more than one piece of evidence presented. For instance, publication expectations (*outputs*) could be accompanied by evidence of the *quality and impact* of each publication, such as narrative description of the journal’s reputation or reach and inclusion of altmetrics). Numbers of proposals submitted could be accompanied by a brief, narrative description of steps taken to improve fundability, such as how advice was sought on drafts and what steps were taken to revise based on feedback. Regarding teaching, student experience survey results (i.e., end-of-course surveys) should be accompanied by at least one other form of evidence, such as self-reflection that describes the collection and analysis of data (e.g., exam or assignment scores, recurrent themes in student survey responses, peer observation results), teaching decisions made based on the data, or steps for evaluating the effects of the change(s). Indicators of the quality and impact of work should align with what is expected in the field. For instance, the number of research and teaching activities and indicators of quality and impact should be evaluated with respect to standards for the faculty member’s position, rank, and discipline/sub-discipline.

Although annual evaluations occur on a yearly basis, evaluation results may be best considered on a longer timeframe, such as a three-year window. A longer evaluation timeframe accommodates teaching responsibilities that may vary year to year and the dynamicity from year to year of research, creative, and scholarly activities.

The following pages provide a template for an annual evaluation rubric. Explicit expectations for outputs should be defined by the unit based on standards in the discipline or subdisciplines (this may vary within the unit) and for the rank, position type, and workload allocation. Blue font is used throughout to indicate the items that should be discussed and defined by the unit.

Example Rubric Template

\*Targets may refer to quantitative (e.g., # of works published) or qualitative expectations (e.g., regular pattern of publishing).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Research | Teaching | Service |
| 1 = Does not meet expectations | * Outputs fall short of targets by some defined amount
* No indicators of quality/impact are included
 | * Courses/student-hours taught, students advised falls short of targets
* No evidence of quality/impact is provided
* No evidence of effort to improve teaching
 | * Information provided is insufficient to evaluate service efforts
* Service responsibilities are listed, without information about contributions, quality, or impact
 |
| 2 = Needs improvement | * Outputs meet targets but do not include indicators of quality/impact
* Outputs and indicators of their quality/impact are included but fall short of targets by some defined amount
 | * Courses/student-hours taught, students advised meet targets but do not include indicators of quality/impact or descriptions of improvement efforts
* Indicators of quality/impact rely on only one source of evidence
* Narrative describes minimal effort made to improve teaching
 | * Service responsibilities fall short of targets by some defined amount / in defined ways (e.g., insufficient national service, insufficient contributions to local committee work)
* No evidence of effort to improve service
 |
| 3 = Meets expectations | * **Outputs** meet targets regarding publications, proposals/grants and/or presentations or other forms of research / scholarship / creative work such as projects, collaborations, or other forms of research/creative/scholarly engagement
* **Quality/impact:** narrative describes the reputation, reach, or other impact of the research / scholarly / creative product/progress that aligns with desired level of quality and impact
* **Professional development:** narrative describes good effort to improve research/scholarly progress/products as needed
 | * **Outputs** meet targets regarding courses / student-hours taught, students advised, with some accounting for workload (e.g., based on enrollment, intro vs. upper division, writing intensity, etc.)
* **Quality/impact:** at least two forms of evidence for quality/impact are included (e.g., summary of student experience survey results, narrative description of peer evaluation of teaching, assessment of student learning or growth) (see for examples: <https://seercenter.uga.edu/delta-project/resources-for-departments/>)
* **Professional development:** narrative describes good effort to improve teaching based on peer evaluation, student evaluation, or other evidence from students as needed
 | * **Outputs** meet targets of service responsibilities at the local (unit, institution) and national/international level, with some accounting for workload (e.g., based on role-associated workload)
* **Quality/impact/professional development:** narrative describes good effort to evaluate service efforts and make improvements as needed (e.g., participating in professional development to improve committee work)
 |
| 4 = Exceeds expectations | * Outputs exceed targets at some level
* Indicators of quality/impact exceed targets by a defined amount / in a defined way(s) such as grants received, local awards or recognition, taking on leadership or mentorship roles
* Narrative describes ambitious effort to improve research/scholarly progress/products, as needed
 | * Outputs exceed targets at some level
* Indicators of quality/impact exceed target by a defined amount / in a defined way(s), such as local awards, evidence of teaching effectiveness and inclusiveness, taking on leadership and/or mentorship roles
* Narrative describes ambitious effort to improve effectiveness and inclusiveness of teaching, including using multiple forms of evidence to make teaching decisions, enactment and evaluation of teaching changes, **and/or** seeking relevant professional development to improve as needed
 | * Outputs exceed targets at some level
* Narrative describes ambitious effort to improve committee functioning, effectiveness, and/or impact and making improvements based on results (e.g., collecting and analyzing data on committee functioning, effectiveness, and/or impact, making improvements based on results)
* Indicators of quality/impact are included, such as local awards, recognition, internal funding, and/or leadership
 |
| 5 = Exemplary | * Outputs exceed targets at some level
* Indicators of quality/impact exceed target by a defined amount / in a defined way(s) such as grants received, national/international awards or recognition, taking on high-level leadership roles
* Ambitious effort to improve the quality and impact of research/scholarly progress/products, as needed
 | * Outputs exceed targets at some level
* Indicators of quality/impact exceed targets by a defined amount / in a defined way(s), such as scholarship of teaching, teaching grants received, extensive application of evidence-based teaching, national/ international awards, recognition, and/or high-level leadership
* Ambitious effort has been made to improve effectiveness and inclusiveness of teaching as needed, including **all** of the following: using multiple forms of evidence to make teaching decisions, enactment and evaluation of teaching changes, and professional development to improve
 | * Outputs exceed targets at some level
* Narrative describes ambitious effort to improve committee functioning, effectiveness, or impact and making improvements based on results
* Indicators of quality/impact are included, such as national / international service awards, recognition, external funding, and/or high-level leadership
 |

**Student Success Activities**

* Submitted materials document involvement in Student Success Activities as appropriate to the discipline, assigned effort, and area of effort (teaching, research, service, and/or administration):

<https://provost.uga.edu/faculty_working_group/SSA_CategorizedExamples_7Jan2022_DRAFT.pdf>

* + yes \_\_\_ no \_\_\_\_\_
* Narrative describes good effort to implement at least 1 student success activity in ways that are consistent with its effectiveness:
	+ yes \_\_\_ no \_\_\_\_\_

**Overall Evaluation:**

1 - Does not meet expectations

2 - Needs improvement

3 - Meets expectations

4 - Exceeds expectations

5 - Exemplary

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 student success activities have not been documented as described above, the overall rating drops by one level.

**Example calculation:** Professor ABC earns a 5 rating for research and a 2 rating for teaching, and they have a 67/33 split of research and teaching responsibilities. This amounts to a contribution of 3.35 for research (5 x 0.66) and a 0.66 for teaching (2 x 0.33), for an overall evaluation rating of 4.01, which is rounded to a 4. Professor XYZ earns a rating of 3 for research (3 x 0.5) and 4 for teaching (4 x 0.5) and has a 50/50 split, for an overall evaluation of 3.50, which is rounded to a 4.