

## Recommendations from the Review Team

***The Review Team strongly feels that the most pressing issue facing the CRSS department is the rather urgent need to attain departmental consensus on future direction and management of undergraduate and graduate degree programs that are multi-locational and interdisciplinary in nature. We recommend that the Department Head convene a faculty workshop/retreat on this matter and invite the Dean of CAES, the Associate Dean for Instruction, and Heads of other departments engaged in interdisciplinary majors to participate.***

**RESPONSE (Implemented):** The department held a state-wide teaching workshop on August 6, 2007. The following issues were discussed (see Attachment A)

1. Status of state-wide teaching program
2. Institutional versus local needs and responsibilities.
3. Peer evaluation of teaching at all three locations – Department has changed process to accommodate location specific issues such as peer review and committee membership (see Attachment B)
4. Management of courses and curriculum
  - A. Department has a state-wide curriculum committee. Each major has a standing member on the committee. Curriculum issues are discussed and, if appropriate, voted on by faculty.
  - B. All courses are archived on the web
  - C. Curricula changes discussed by locational (Athens, Tifton and Griffin) and departmental committees.
  - D. Instructor of record regulations for Teaching Assistants have been developed.
5. Distance education
  - A. Use of technology is at the discretion of faculty and is discussed by the Curriculum Committee. Faculty are using video conferencing to support teaching (e.g., Graduate Seminar, Graduate Student committee meetings and several other courses are being discussed).
  - B. All Distance Education courses must have an “E” prefix.
6. Assessment – The department holds a teaching workshop each year following our Fall faculty meeting. In addition, teaching issues are discussed as part of our Spring and Fall faculty meetings. College administrators are invited and attend on an annual basis.

***The Review Team believes that CAES administration needs to be more proactive in providing leadership and day-to-day management of multi-locational and interdisciplinary majors. In particular, the administration need to: (i) clarify the current and future roles of Assistant Deans and REIs at the Griffin and Tifton campus; (ii) develop a governance structure that sustains the viability of interdisciplinary majors rather than have them degenerate into programs administered by a single department; and (iii) become more engaged in efforts to use the new majors as a means to attract new undergraduate and graduate students to various departments within the College.***

**RESPONSE (Implemented):** Faculty, staff and administration are working to enhance the governance and management of our multi-locational programs. The previous response outlines many of the mechanisms. The CRSS state-wide curriculum committee, based in Athens, has a member from the Griffin and Tifton curriculum committees. This has tremendously enhanced communication. The Assistant Deans and REIs interact on a continuous basis with colleagues and department heads to deal with teaching programs. Athens, Tifton and Griffin are working collectively to recruit undergraduate and graduate students into our new programs. A college curriculum committee has been established and has met to more effectively administer the Applied Biotechnology major.

***There is clearly a need for significant improvement, and CAES investment is needed in technology resources and IT staff to support distance education for the Athens, Griffin, and Tifton campuses. As newly created undergraduate majors expand and research and graduate programs grow at Tifton and Griffin, it is critical to provide and support a rapid means to link faculty and students at the campuses together for teaching, graduate student advisement, and in the planning of multi-location research and extension programs.***

**RESPONSE (Implemented):**

1. The Department has invested in technology to allow faculty/staff/students to conveniently communicate via video or teleconference. Departmental committees, graduate student committees, faculty interviews and routine meetings are now conducted using these technologies.
2. The Department is continuously updating web based resources and will continue to work with CAES to ensure adequate funding to support this essential resource.

***Extension faculty need to develop a strategic plan and identify resources that will facilitate “mass deliver” of basic extension education programs while allowing faculty to devote their personal interactions to high priority and emerging issues. As with teaching, support for technology and IT staff is a key need int his area.***

**RESPONSE (Implemented):**

The extension faculty in CRSS met (see Attachment C) to discuss the department's strategic plan and its relevance to extension programs. Extension faculty determined that the present strategic plan remains relevant at present and into the foreseeable

future. They voted to continue using the existing Strategic Plan. Extension faculty and administration met each year to discuss strategic and tactical issues.

***The CAES Dean and CRSS Department Head should increase efforts to personally engage departmental faculty at all three campuses in long-range planning and in the development of any new visions or strategic plans now being conceived by administration for CAES and CRSS.***

**RESPONSE (Implemented):**

The Executive Committee and faculty recommended that the department review the existing strategic plan. This occurred at the 2008 Spring Faculty meeting. Following extensive discussion by the Executive Committee, Extension Faculty and all departmental faculty, a vote was taken which resulted in a unanimous agreement to retain the current strategic plan.

***The Review Team encourages the initiation of a systematic process to provide college, UGA, or external funding for core equipment and facilities that can be shared by scientists in various CAES departments.***

**RESPONSE (Implemented):**

The department continuously discusses core versus extramurally funded equipment and facilities. The Department has a policy of “sharing” 25% of departmental IDC with faculty. This helps to create an incentive to obtain additional extramural funding. Departmental royalty funds are used to leverage plant breeding and genetics faculty resources. Many departmental programs and administrative and operational costs (eg., greenhouse and farm operations) are subsidized with extramural funds. We believe the department has a reasonable funding balance; however, we know there is a need to continue to encourage leveraging state resources with grant funding. The department recognizes that state resources will continue to diminish and the need for extramural funding will increase in the future.

***Increased efforts are necessary to attract and recruit minority students and faculty to enhance the diversity in the traditionally white/male dominated Department. This could be achieved through the establishment of and/or increased participation in existing recruitment programs, such as the Young Scholars program.***

**RESPONSE (Implemented):**

The department does everything possible to recruit under represented students, staff and faculty:

- 1) active participation in Young Scholars program
- 2) broad recruitment efforts - local, state, national
- 3) broadly advertise student scholarships and departmental majors
- 4) discuss the importance of diversity
- 5) establish Search and Screen committees that embrace the need to enhance diversity

The Department has an aggressive recruitment plan in place.

1. Updated brochures
2. Numerous recruiting/marketing items
3. Department display is used at various events:
  - a) professional meetings
  - b) state events
  - c) campus events
  - d) display and brochures will be available for download
4. North campus general interest courses
  - a) Water resources
  - b) Agro Security
  - c) Turfgrass
  - d) new courses - "The Environment and You"
5. A department faculty member is PI on an Agro Security national grant to develop and offer a certificate in Agro security.

## Attachment A

### FALL TEACHING WORKSHOP CROP & SOIL SCIENCES

#### AGENDA

Opening Statement  
Status-Statewide Teaching Program  
Peer Evaluation of Teaching  
Management of Courses  
Management of Curricula  
Distance Education  
Assessment

---

#### Statistics on Majors

MAJOR	Spring 2006	Spring 2007
Turfgrass Management	34	28
Water & Soil Resources and Env. Soil Science	13	24 (BSFR #??)
Environmental	3	10
Agriscience & Environmental Systems	28	40 (6 Athens)
Environmental Resource Science	10	10
TOTAL	88	112

---

#### Program Review Comments

ERS & TRF major need required internship  
Greater study abroad participation  
Course with service learning component  
Semester by semester guide to majors  
Lack of CAES and CRSS oversight to multidisciplinary majors and multi-locational majors  
Redundancy in course offerings among three campuses  
Lack of CRSS ownership of BTEC major  
Low % of faculty involved in teaching

---

## Attachment B

### Policy and Procedures for Peer Review of Instruction, Department of Crop and Soil Sciences

1. The Department of Crop and Soil Sciences instituted a system for peer review of instruction in 1994. To date, most of these reviews have been made for faculty members applying for promotion and have been made on a sporadic basis. The policy of the University of Georgia, however, is that all faculty activities be peer reviewed. Thus, the department intends to formalize the instructional review process and institute a system to ensure that all faculty members with an instructional appointment undergo regular peer review of their classroom instruction activities.

#### Instructional Review Schedule

The Department Head will determine which of the faculty should have a peer instructional review during the upcoming semester or academic year. Only those faculty members who have an instructional appointment and teach formal classes should be evaluated. The following schedule is suggested for each faculty rank to ensure that all faculty members involved in the instructional program are regularly evaluated.

**Assistant Professors and other non-tenured tenure-track faculty:** The evaluation should be made during the fourth or fifth year after the initial appointment to UGA and/or at least one year prior to application for promotion and/or tenure.

**Associate Professors:** The evaluation should be made during the third or fourth year after promotion to the present rank and at least one year prior to application for promotion to Professor.

**Professors:** The peer evaluation of instruction should be in the year prior to or during the year the faculty member is scheduled for post-tenure review.

At current staffing numbers, four faculty members should be evaluated each year assuming a five-year rotation.

#### Instructional Review Process

There are two separate and equal components of the review process. The first is the course content and materials presented to students, and the second is the instructor's teaching methods and effectiveness in the classroom.

At least one month prior to the beginning of the semester during which the class/instructor will be reviewed, the instructor will provide the Department Head with names of five potential committee members. The Department Head will select three members to form the instructional review committee, and will designate one as committee chair. All committee members should be actively teaching and at least one must be from a campus other than that of the faculty member being reviewed. Membership on this committee is open to all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the University regardless of location, departmental affiliation, or instructional appointment. The faculty member can choose which class will be evaluated if he/she will be teaching multiple courses during the semester or year during which the review is scheduled.

The committee chair will request that the faculty member being reviewed submit a copy of 1)

the class syllabus, 2) the topical outline of the class if separate from the syllabus, 3) materials made available to students (class handouts, etc.), 4) homework assignments, and 5) all exams from the most recent semester during which the class was taught. An electronic copy, a link to the class Web page, or a mixture of formats is acceptable. These materials will be the basis for the review of course content and materials presented to students. They will be made available to the other two committee members for their evaluation. Because the subject matter may be outside the expertise of the review committee, these materials will also be sent to three external faculty members who teach a similar course at other universities. The external reviewers of course materials will be asked to provide a blind evaluation of 1) the subject matter included in the course, i.e. are all important topics being addressed and are all topics covered needed 2) the appropriateness of the text if a text is required, 3) adequacy, need, and clarity of materials made available to students, 4) adequacy and level of difficulty of homework assignments and required readings, 5) level of difficulty and completeness of exams. Members of the review committee will be expected to provide a similar critique if they feel qualified to do so.

Each of the three committee members will be expected to attend a minimum of one class lecture to provide the basis for evaluation of the instructor's teaching methods and effectiveness in the classroom. These classroom observations should be coordinated with the instructor to ensure the visit will be during an appropriate class meeting, i.e. an exam or other atypical activity is not scheduled. At the discretion of the committee chair, committee members may review "in-class" instruction using videotape, video conferencing or teleconferencing; however, at least one committee member must attend a classroom lecture.

Within one month after the end of the semester during which the evaluation was done, the committee chair should transmit a written report of the evaluation to the Department Head. The method used to solicit committee input and to summarize committee and external reviewer comments will be at the discretion of the committee chair. In most cases, a one- to two-page report should be sufficient to summarize the findings and recommendations of the committee. The Department Head should provide a copy of this report to the faculty member who was evaluated and subsequently meet with the faculty member (with or without the review committee) to discuss the committee report. At his or her discretion, the Department Head may wish to meet with the review committee chair to discuss findings and recommendations of the committee prior to meeting with the faculty member being reviewed.

*Last Updated: 6/4/2008*

---

## **Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

1. Schedule of peer evaluation through 2011  
Fall 2007 – Harris, Hook, Radcliffe  
Spring 2008 – Hendrix, West, Hartel  
Fall 2008 – Chee, Miller  
Spring 2009 – Cabrera, Karnok  
Fall 2009 – Hill, Vencill, Huang  
Spring 2010 – Brown  
Fall 2010 – Grey, Waltz, Beasley
  2. How should committees be comprised to reflect the statewide nature of our teaching program?
- 

## **Management of Courses**

---

1. Communication of course inventory (web page, etc.)
  2. Coordination of course content for same course taught in multiple locations
- 

## **Management of Curricula**

Better coordination of CRSS and various interdisciplinary and multi-locational majors  
CRSS & Tifton Curriculum Committee  
CRSS & Griffin Curriculum Committee  
CRSS and Applied Biotechnology  
Decision making process  
Scholarships

---

## **Scholarships**

Awarding of scholarships  
Archiving of all scholarships

---

## **Distance Education**

1. Should we develop a list of courses that would be suitable for distance education at Athens, Tifton and Griffin?
  2. What infrastructure requirements do we need?
  3. Are there any additional personnel requirements (i.e. TA's to run equipment during lecture)?
  4. Faculty attendance at downlink site
-

## Major Assessment

### Learning Outcomes

WSR – Students will be able to understand and solve environmental problems.....

TRF – Students will have a broad understanding of disciplines related to turfgrass management.....

### Expected Results

WSR – Graduates will be expected to develop broad understanding of the sciences related to soils, environmental conditions.....

TRF – Graduates will develop broad understanding of disciplines related to turf management and strong communication skills

### Faculty Involvement

Undergraduate Teaching Committee will formulate assessment techniques; compile assessment results, and communicate back to the faculty at large

---

## Assessment Methods

### Faculty

Course evaluations

Peer review evaluations

### Majors

Senior exit interviews

Internship evaluations

Alumni survey

Employer survey

---

## Alumni Survey – Usefulness of Courses

	1998	2006
Plant Sciences	1.7	2.56
Soil Sciences	1.3	1.33
Chemistry & Math	2.7	3.33
Communication	1.4	1.5

1 = very valuable; 5 = no value

---

## Alumni Survey – Summary

	1998	2006
Advisement	1.82	2.17
Faculty Interest	1.58	1.61
Classroom	1.58	1.61
Laboratory	2.3	1.6
Job Placement	2.5	1.95

1 = very valuable; 5 = no value

## **Alumni Survey**

Since the survey was started in 1995, > 90% of survey respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with their experience at the University of Georgia

---

### **Assessment Impact**

Improve professional develop of students (resume prep, job interview skills, etc.)

Changes in curriculum such as addition of business courses and changes in some science requirements

Addition of communication requirements

## **Attachment C**

Crop and Soil Sciences- UGA  
Extension Faculty Departmental Meeting  
Oct. 30, 2007 Minutes  
Horticulture Bldg  
Tifton GA

Faculty attending: Donn Shilling, Dewey Lee, Tim Murphy, Eric Prostko, Scott Tubbs, Dennis Hancock, John Woodruff, Clint Waltz and John Beasley.

Faculty not present: Glen Harris, Steve Brown, Stanley Culpepper, J.M. Moore

Agenda and handouts provided.

The Department Head opened the meeting with a statement of appreciation for faculty making the annual extension departmental meeting. He made several general statements regarding the follow-up of the departmental review. The review team suggested a strategic plan for Extension should be developed. The faculty discussed reviewing the existing strategic plan to determine its relevance. Copies of the strategic and operational plans were provided for the discussion.

The strategic plan was discussed to determine the relevance to the extension faculty's current and future needs. Only two concerns were identified: Issue 2: should we consider the addition of an energy or bio-fuel program; and Issue 4: should additional consideration of new technology in soil remediation be considered. No other comments were made for Issues 1, 3, 5 and 6.

The faculty determined there were not enough major issues to seek changes to the existing strategic plan or the development of a new plan. It is broad enough to guide Extension. A motion was made to accept the existing plan and it was seconded. A vote to accept the present strategic plan was unanimously affirmative.

The existing operational plan was discussed. A formal mentoring program was discussed. The faculty generally agreed that by default an informal mentoring program existed (arising from the commodity team approach to issue programming). A possible problem could occur when there are few faculty at a location. For example Dennis Hancock is the only Extension faculty member in Athens with no other full time Extension faculty member.

Several issues regarding tactical problems, positions, resource allocation between research and extension were discussed. The group discussed how we should confront issues such as water and natural resource management within the traditional extension delivery system. The question of how to address some of the broad environmental issues was discussed. More and more research faculty are involved in translating research into environmental outreach programs (water, on-site waste water management, waste management, etc). Strategically do we need to convert and extend this information via the traditional extension role? Mr. Rad Yager is beginning to provide an Extension component to water issues at the Stripling Irrigation Park and believes there is an opportunity for specialist to be more involved. There

was discussion to consider hiring someone with responsibilities for water resources.

The Associate Dean of Extension discussed the banner programs (one being water). In-house resources such as contingency funds and grants through EPD will be used to support those already involved in water-related issues particularly the larger more visible team efforts.

A description of how the Green industry is an example of a private/public coalitions (business coalition interacting with government officials) focused on determining the economic impacts of water loss.

Split appointments were discussed. Tim Murphy's replacement may be a three-way split: extension, research and teaching. Teaching is taking more time because several extension faculty members are involved in the teaching programs at Tifton and Griffin. Further discussion took place on ABAC/UGA interactions in teaching.

The Associate Dean addressed questions about providing resources to Extension faculty such as technical assistance, startup packages, etc. We discussed how many of the solutions to departmental problems help other departments and should be considered institutional. The Associate Dean discussed problems associated with "regional coordinators or area agents." This point was made because of the current make up of the Extension Forage Team (ie., Ag. Agents serve on the team and provide regional support). The Associate Dean stated that over the next five years there will be a loss of 90+ county faculty due to retirements and they are trying to plan accordingly. This does not include state faculty. In addition to some final comments, a question was raised about publication editing. She commented that outsourcing some of the work has been successful.

The Department Head discussed some faculty priorities and how resourcing will be dealt with on an individual basis. The Associate Dean discussed contingency funds.

The area agronomist at Statesboro and the Assistant Dean of extension positions were discussed.

Tim Murphy was thanked for his service. The meeting was adjourned.