

DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS

The following process will be followed in the Department of Kinesiology for the annual review of faculty. The annual evaluation will cover activities that occurred in the previous calendar year (January 1- December 31) in the areas of assigned time.

Materials to be Submitted

The following materials will be submitted in electronic format (single pdf file) to the Department office manager by January 20.

- Narrative statement (2 page maximum):
 - Summarize your research, teaching and service activities during the last year and their impact;
 - Describe how these activities contributed to the strategic goals of the Department, College and University;
 - Describe the progress you have made relative to your short-term and long-term goals during the last year;
 - Identify your goals for the next year in research, teaching and service and how they relate to your long-term goals.
- Annual Faculty Activity Report (FAR)
- Updated vita
- Syllabus for each course taught
- Complete student course evaluation report for each course taught

Evaluation by Department Head (completed by April 1)

- Based on the materials submitted, the Department Head will evaluate performance in each of the areas of assigned time. Each area is rated on a 5-point scale: 1=needs improvement, 2=satisfactory, 3=good, 4=very good, 5=exceptional. In addition, a narrative summary is written. Expectations are based on the Department's criteria for promotion and tenure, and the individual's rank and assigned time. The evaluation is given to the faculty member before the scheduled meeting between the faculty member and Department Head.
- The faculty member and Department Head meet to discuss the evaluation and development recommendations. Any revisions to the evaluation agreed to during the meeting are made by the Department Head. After any revisions are made, the faculty member and Department Head sign the review. The signed reviews are submitted to the Dean's office by April 1 and an electronic copy is saved in the Department faculty member's personnel file.

Criteria and Standards Used for Annual Review

The annual review of faculty instruction, research, service and administrative activities is based on data across all faculty in the Department.

Instruction

“Teaching communicates knowledge to students and develops in them the desire and skills necessary to continue learning. The University distinguishes between routine classroom performance and contributions to teaching that draw upon the teacher’s depth and breadth of scholarship. Teaching includes not only formal classroom instruction, but also advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students.” [From *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure*, 2004, p. 14]

Criteria	Student and Peer Evaluations	Course and Curriculum Development; scholarship of instruction	Student Advisement and Mentoring
1	Unsatisfactory ratings in all courses	Syllabi not up to date and not complete. No innovations of course content/delivery. No scholarship of instruction.	Below average advisement load and completion rate, and quality of mentorship. No evidence of achievement of advisees.
2	Satisfactory ratings across all courses	Syllabi complete but minimally developed. Some innovations of content/delivery. Some scholarly materials to aid instruction.	Average advisement load, and completion rate, and quality of mentorship. Some evidence of advisees’ success in careers.
3	Good ratings across all courses. Nominated for internal or external award.	Good course syllabi. Significant innovations of content/ delivery or new course/ curriculum development. Good scholarly materials to aid instruction.	Good advisement load and completion rate, and quality mentorship. Evidence advisees successful in competing for good positions in field.
4	Very good ratings for all courses; internal instructional award	Very good course syllabi; challenging course/behavioral objectives. Significant innovations of content/delivery and course/ curriculum development. Instructional articles, chapters, texts submitted.	Very good advisement load, completion rate, and quality mentorship. Evidence advisees are competitive for very good positions in field and are successful.
5	Exceptional ratings for all classes; University or external instructional award	Exceptional innovations of content/delivery and course/curriculum development. Instructional articles, chapters and/or texts published.	Exceptional advisement (load and graduation) and mentorship. Advisees obtaining best positions in field and exceptionally successful.

Research

“Inquiry and originality are central functions of the University. Faculty are to discover new ideas, to fashion new interpretations of enduring ideas, and to participate in the application of these ideas. Consequently, faculty should conduct research or engage in other creative activities appropriate to their disciplines and to the missions of their appointment units, and they should disseminate the results of their work through media appropriate to their disciplines. Interdisciplinary and collaborative works are valid forms of scholarly activity and will be judged as such as long as each candidate gives clear evidence of his/her participation in each instance. Faculty whose work assignments include research or other creative activities should clearly demonstrate high quality in these endeavors. The University distinguishes between the routine and the outstanding as judged by the candidate’s peers at the University of Georgia and elsewhere. The principal standard should always be quality rather than quantity.” [From *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure*, 2004, p. 17]

Criteria	Professional Articles, Chapters, Books	Presentations	Contracts and Grants
1	No published/in press articles, chapters, or books	No peer reviewed presentations	No proposal submissions or work on funded projects
2	Publications/in press and manuscripts under review	Peer reviewed state/ regional or national/ international presentations	Submitted an internal proposal or worked on a funded project
3	Refereed publications and other publications/in press	Peer reviewed national/international presentations; invited symposium participant	PI on internal funding or submitted an external proposal
4	Same as 3 but number, contribution and/or impact (journal quality/citations) is high and/or internal or external research award	Same as 3 and invited presentations to important audiences or activities important (e.g., keynote); symposium organizer	PI on non-federal external contract or grant; co-PI on federal external grant or subcontract
5	Same as 3 but number, contribution and impact is exceptional and/or highly prestigious internal or external research award	Same as 4, and invited to give named lecture	PI on large, multi-year federal grant

Service

“*Service to the University* includes, but is not limited to, participating in departmental, school/college and/or University committee work and/or governance; contributing to administrative support work (such as serving as a college representative on a major University committee or task force); and developing, implementing or managing academic programs or projects. *Service to the profession* includes, but is not limited to, offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies; development and organization of professional conferences; editorships and the review of manuscripts in professional association and learned societies publications; and review of grants applications. *Service to society* refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of unit and University missions. It can include applied research, service-based instruction, program and project management, and technical assistance.” [From *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure*, 2004, p. 19-20]

Criteria	University (at all levels)	Profession	Society
1	Does not attend Department or College meetings. No committee work.	No editorial work or association leadership	No community work or professional consultation
2	Usually attends but contributes little to Department or College meetings. Some committee work.	Some editorial work or association leadership	Some community work or professional consultation
3	Conscientiously attends and actively participates in Department and College meetings. Committee leadership or effective academic program management.	Some editorial work and association leadership and/or service on grant review/advisory boards	Substantial community work or professional consultation
4	Same as 3 but number or importance of committees/ programs is high/program accomplishments high/ or College service award	Same as 3 but number or importance (e.g., editorship/federal advisory boards and review panels) is high or external regional service award	Same as 3 but number or importance of activities is high or external community/State/regional service award
5	Exceptional impact of committee work or program management or University service award	Exceptional impact of national/international service activities or national professional association service award	Exceptional impact of national/international service activities or national international service award

Computation of Overall Performance Rating

A weighted average of the performance ratings in each area (instruction, research, service) is determined by summing the products of the fraction of assigned time for each area and the rating for each area. The overall rating is used for salary determination based on the z-score distribution of individual faculty ratings.

Interpretation of Ratings

- Needs improvement (1): Average rating is below 1.6
- Satisfactory (2): Average ratings from 1.6 to 2.5
- Good (3): Average rating is from 2.6 to 3.5
- Very good (4): Average rating is from 3.6 to 4.5
- Exceptional (5): Average rating is above 4.5.

Annual Evaluation Conference

Each faculty member will meet with the Department Head to review accomplishments for year, progress toward promotion and/or tenure, goals for the upcoming year, challenges and needs, and professional development.

Raises

If funds are available for faculty raises, the raise will be based on the annual average performance rating and on other considerations, including directives from the College of Education and University, salary equity, salary compression, and exceptional contribution to Department, College and University goals.