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Armstrong Campus, Georgia Southern University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Agenda for March 19, 2018
Student Union, Ballroom A, 3:00 p.m.

I. Pre-Senate Working Session (3:00–3:30 p.m.)
II. Call to Order
III. Senate Action
   A. Approval of Minutes from February 19, 2018 Faculty Senate Meeting
   B. Brief Remarks from Dr. Jaimie Hebert, President
   C. Brief Remarks from Dr. Chris Curtis, Interim Provost and Vice-President of Academic Affairs (Armstrong Campus)
   D. Old Business
      1. Consolidation Updates
         a. Tenure and Promotion
            i. Faculty Welfare OWG: Faculty Evaluation Recommendations
               i. Original GSU Faculty Handbook (Appendix A)
               ii. Proposed GSU Faculty Handbook (Appendix B)
               iii. OWG Proposal Face Sheet (Appendix C)
               iv. T and P Transition Documents (Appendix D)
         ii. Salary Study
         iii. Advising
         iv. Website Migration
      2. Administrative Position Updates
      3. Administrative Appraisals
      4. Faculty Senate Bill on Class Scheduling (Appendix F)
      5. Formation of Committee on Class Scheduling
      6. Old Business from the Floor
   E. New Business
      1. Joint Faculty Senate Resolution on Student Protests (Appendix G)
      2. General Education Committee Core Area A Grades of C Requirement
      3. Need Faculty to Serve Consolidation Review Committee and Statutes Review Committee
      4. Committee Membership and Reports
         i. University Curriculum Committee
         ii. Governance Committee
         iii. Academic Standards
         iv. Education Technology
         v. Faculty Welfare
         vi. Planning, Budget, and Facilities
vii. Student Success
5. New Business from the Floor
F. Senate Information and Announcements
   1. Send Committee Meeting Dates and Minutes to faculty.senate@armstrong.edu
   2. Send Changes in Committee Membership, Chairs and Senate Liaisons to governance.senate@armstrong.edu and faculty.senate@armstrong.edu
   3. Announcements (from the floor)
Adjournment
Appendix A

Desired Attributes of Georgia Southern Faculty

All Georgia Southern faculty should exhibit the following characteristics. In addition to specific criteria set for each discipline, the University will seek to recruit new faculty with these attributes in mind:

- Commitment to excellence in teaching and learning (as evidenced by seminar/presentation during campus visit with students present)
- Promise of productive scholarship consistent with the teacher-scholar model, including grant/proposal-writing
- Commitment to professional service within the University and beyond
- Technological literacy and a commitment to using technology in teaching and scholarship
- Experience with, or interest in, working in diverse academic and professional communities
- Ability to contribute to a positive work environment in the department, college, and University
- Commitment to recruiting, advising, retaining, and mentoring qualified students
- Understanding of, and commitment to, the strategic goals of the department, college, and University
- Terminal degree in the discipline

Georgia Southern University seeks a competent and diverse group of individuals. To assist in this goal, it is expected that all searches include a “telephone screening” or videoconference prior to any recommendations for interviews. The deans and Provost pledge to take an active interest in each search.

Adapted by Faculty Senate, October 25, 2001.

Faculty Evaluation

Criteria for All Types of Faculty Evaluation

The criteria described below, along with the Desired Attributes in Section 204, apply to all types of faculty evaluation described in Section 205.04 of the Faculty Handbook. Evaluators of faculty at all levels shall seek evidence of sustained effort, involvement, and record of achievement. Accomplishments which have enriched the student learning experience are valued most. The entire body of work submitted by candidates shall be considered, though the most recent work shall be afforded greater consideration by the deliberating bodies at each level of evaluation. At Georgia Southern, the four Board of Regents’ criteria of superior teaching, outstanding service to the institution, academic achievement, and professional growth and development are expressed as the three criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service, with professional growth and development considered among these three. The following standards, articulated by Charles E. Glassick, Mary Taylor Huber, and Gene I. Maeroff in Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1997, p. 36) shall be applied where appropriate to each area of evaluation: clarity of goals, adequacy of preparation, appropriateness of methods, significance of results, effectiveness of presentation, and evidence of reflective critique. While the manifestations of faculty achievement may vary across disciplines, the qualities represented in these criteria and in the Desired Attributes shall be the predominant basis for evaluation and shall be reflected in college and departmental governance documents.

Teaching

A demonstrated record of superior, effective teaching is the first and most important area of evaluation. Superior teaching is reflective, student-centered, respectful of the diversity of students, multimodal, and focused on student learning outcomes. Teaching represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and the development of
critical thinking skills. Such activity typically involves teaching in the classroom, laboratory, or studio, and direction of research, fulfillment of professional librarian responsibilities, mentoring, and the like. Teaching evaluation procedures should include both formative and summative elements. All teaching evaluation procedures should include a narrative or self-evaluation and student ratings of instruction. The narrative should include a description of teaching methods used to achieve or maintain excellence in teaching, description of new course development or course revisions, conferences attended on teaching and learning, college level teaching and learning projects, pedagogy scholarship, contributions toward special teaching initiatives, mentoring of student research and student writing, examples of course syllabi, and other class materials. Further evidence of excellence in teaching can be found in classroom evaluations by peers and/or the department chair, peer assessment, and examination of student work. A teaching evaluation might include any of these kinds of evaluations as well as other evaluation methods not listed here.

Student ratings of instruction shall not be the sole measure of teaching effectiveness for any review, nor shall instructors be ranked according to student ratings for evaluation; rather, a complete picture should be obtained through multiple sources. Documentation of teaching effectiveness is the responsibility of the faculty member.

Scholarship

The significance of scholarly accomplishments shall be judged rigorously within the context of the discipline. Candidates must provide evidence of work which has been selected for dissemination through normally accepted peer-reviewed venues such as publications, conference presentations, exhibitions, performances, or other professional accomplishments. Scholarship includes the discovery, integration, development, application, and extension of knowledge as well as aesthetic creation and is often demonstrated by publications and presentations designed for professional audiences. Scholarship is manifested in articles, scholarly books and texts, reports of research, creative works, textbooks, scholarly presentations, research grants, demonstration grants, papers read, panel participation, exhibits, performances, professional honors and awards, additional professional training or certification, degrees earned, postdoctoral work, and academic honors and awards.

Service

Faculty are expected to make service contributions to their professions and to the institution. Service at the department/school, college, and university levels is essential to the well-being of the University. Service includes the application of one’s expertise in the discipline for the benefit of a professional organization, the community, or the institution. Service also includes the academic advisement of Georgia Southern University students. Additionally, service may include work in schools, businesses, museums, social agencies, government, or the like, as well as activities undertaken on behalf
of the University that do not entail systematic instruction, such as manuscript reviewing and the design and development of professional conferences. Consulting shall be designated as paid or unpaid.

*Approved as amended by Faculty Senate, April 21, 2015; approved by President, April 23, 2015.*

**205.02 Evaluation of Faculty**

Under the policies of the Board of Regents, the maximum probationary period for a newly employed non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member is seven years. At the end of the fifth or sixth year, a decision is made as to whether the employee will be tenured. Each year of the probationary period, non-tenured, tenure-track faculty are evaluated. Following the evaluation in the first year, the faculty member is notified by February 1 if a contract will not be offered for the following year. The notification date during the second year is November 1 if a contract will not be offered for the following year. In subsequent years, the faculty member is notified by August 1 if a contract will not be offered for the following year. This notification schedule is identical for non-tenure track faculty (in the ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor) who are also evaluated annually, but not subject to a probationary period of seven years. It does not apply to regular, limited-term (formerly full-time, temporary/visiting) faculty. Regular, limited-term faculty and part-time faculty are appointed for a specified length of time (either one academic year or one semester); therefore, they do not receive a letter of intent not to renew. Nonetheless, regular, limited-term faculty are evaluated annually (or at the end of the semester if appointed full-time for one semester), and part-time faculty are evaluated at the end of the semester of appointment (or term of appointment if appointed for a full-year). Similarly, teaching adjunct faculty are evaluated at the conclusion of the semester of appointment (or term of appointment if teaching for an academic year).

For lecturers with less than three years of full-time, continuous service in that position, written notice of intent not to renew should be sent as early as possible, but no specific notice is required. For lecturers with three or more years but less than six years of full-time, continuous service in that position, written notice of intent not to renew should be sent a least 30 calendar days prior to the first day of classes in the semester. For senior lecturers with six or more years of full-time, continuous service in that position, written notice of intent not to renew is sent at least 180 calendar days prior to the first day of classes in the semester (*Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.4.3*).

Reappointment of Academic Professionals is made annually. Notice of reappointment and non-reappointment must be made consistent with the three month, six month, and nine month notification schedule, depending upon the length of service (*Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.4.2*).

Faculty contracts in the University System of Georgia cannot exceed one year. An evaluation of the work of every non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member and every non-tenure track faculty member is made annually with the department chair responsible for recommending renewal or non-renewal of contract for the succeeding year. The section on promotion and salary increases in the *Faculty Handbook* indicates the general criteria used in faculty evaluations.

In addition to the annual review of a non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member, the University’s colleges conduct an extra and especially thorough evaluation in the third year as a basis for recommending renewal or nonrenewal of the contract beyond the following year (pre-tenure review). Each department is free to develop its particular system for evaluating faculty members under the general criteria established by the Board of Regents. The procedures should be described to faculty by the department chair and provided to faculty in a written set of departmental procedures (*Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.5*).

**205.03 Faculty Evaluation Guidelines**

(*The following guidelines for faculty evaluations were approved by Faculty Senate, June 1, 1981.*)

The Board of Regents at its September 1979 meeting added the following statement to its policies: “Each institution shall establish definite and stated criteria, consistent with
Regents’ policies and the statutes of the institution, against which the performance of each faculty member will be evaluated. The evaluation shall occur at least annually and shall follow stated procedures as prescribed by each institution” (Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.5).

Subsequently, a tentative set of guidelines was developed by the Chancellor’s office. It reads, in part: “The purpose of the new faculty evaluation policy is twofold. The primary purpose is to aid the faculty member in improving and developing his or her performance as a member of the academic community and to ensure the faculty member’s understanding of the relationship between his or her performance and the expectations of the institution. Secondly, the faculty evaluation should assist the institution in its review of the faculty member for continued employment, promotion, tenure, and merit salary increases. The institution may wish to develop different procedures for each category of review. However, the faculty member must clearly understand the criteria and the procedures to be used in the evaluation process for continued employment, promotion, tenure, and merit salary increases.”

The following information concerning faculty evaluation provides an overview of the kinds of faculty evaluations that are currently made, lists the various types of evaluations, and suggests a schedule of dates for the completion of each. The actual development of procedures for each kind of evaluation is the responsibility of the faculty and academic administration. In all university evaluation procedures, Regents policy requires that the criteria and procedures be put in writing. Emphasis is placed upon:

- doing necessary tasks positively and constructively;
- clarifying procedures, results, and recommendations;
- determining specific procedures for each type at the most reasonable level, i.e., department/school or college; and
- attempting to foster a climate of professional collegiality rather than one of employer/employee or management/labor.

### Types of Evaluations

**205.04**

A. Each full-time, continuing faculty member is evaluated annually to ensure effective performance and facilitate improvement. Annual evaluations also serve as the basis for recommending merit salary increases and determining continuation of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty and non-tenure track faculty.

B. Regular, limited-term faculty are evaluated annually (or at the end of the semester if appointed full-time for one semester).

C. Part-time faculty are evaluated at the end of the semester of appointment (or term of appointment if appointed for a full-year).

D. Teaching adjunct (honorary, uncompensated) faculty are evaluated at the conclusion of the semester of appointment (or term of appointment if teaching for an academic year).

E. Special evaluations are made for the following specific decisions, relevant for full-time, continuing faculty:

- pre-tenure review
- tenure
- promotion
- post-tenure review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Annual Review | A review of the performance and achievements of each faculty member as related to the faculty member’s stated objectives and goals for the year. | - Faculty submit a report of their professional activities to the department chair by early January.  
- Department chairs conduct annual faculty reviews January through March; however, evaluations of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty and non-tenure track facu... |
faculty for purposes of determining continuation for the next academic year must occur prior to the notification dates required by the Board of Regents.

- First year probationary faculty receive notification by February 1st if a contract will not be offered for the following year.
- Second year probationary faculty receive notification by November 1st if a contract will not be offered for the following year.
- All other faculty receive notification by August 1st if a contract will not be offered for the following year.
- Salary increase recommendations—based on the annual reviews—are made in April.

\( \text{Note: Regular, limited-term faculty are evaluated annually (or at the end of the semester if appointed full-time for one semester). Part-time faculty are evaluated at the end of the semester of appointment (or term of appointment if appointed for a full-year). Teaching adjunct (honorary, uncompensated) faculty are evaluated at the conclusion of the semester of appointment (or term of appointment if teaching for an academic year).} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Tenure Review</td>
<td>A comprehensive review of the performance and achievements of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty members conducted in the third year of the probationary period.</td>
<td>Faculty receive notification of the review in mid-September and are asked to prepare their materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department submits pre-tenure reviews to the dean’s office in early February.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean’s office submits summary memorandum to the Provost’s Office in mid-April.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>A comprehensive review of the performance and achievements of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty members conducted in the fifth or sixth year of the probationary period for consideration of the award of tenure.</td>
<td>Dean’s subcommittee tenures reviews to the Provost’s Office in early December.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure review at the university level completed by the end of January.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If approved, tenure is effective August 1st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If review is unfavorable, a nonrenewal letter is issued to the faculty member no later than August 1st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>A comprehensive review of the performance and achievements of non-tenured and tenured faculty members for consideration for promotion to the next higher rank.</td>
<td>Dean’s subcommittee promotion reviews to the Provost’s Office in early December.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion review at the university level completed by the end of January.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If approved, promotion is effective August 1st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Tenure Review</td>
<td>A systematic, periodic, cumulative review of all tenured faculty members which focuses on identifying faculty development opportunities which are mutually beneficial for the faculty member and the institution.</td>
<td>Faculty receive notification of the review in mid-September and are asked to prepare their materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Departments submit post-tenure reviews to the dean’s office in early February.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean’s office submits summary memorandum to the Provost’s Office by mid-March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth-Year Lecturer Review</td>
<td>A comprehensive review of the performance and achievements of lecturer faculty members conducted in the fifth or sixth year of service for consideration of continuing appointment and/or promotion to senior lecturer.</td>
<td>Deans submit lecturer reviews to the Provost’s Office in early December.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer review at the university level completed by the end of January.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If recommended and approved, promotion to senior lecturer is effective August 1st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If review is unfavorable, a nonrenewal letter is issued to the faculty member no later than August 1st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up Lecturer/Senior Lecturer Review</td>
<td>A systematic, periodic, cumulative review of all lecturers and senior lecturers who have previously and successfully navigated the sixth year review.</td>
<td>Faculty receive notification of the review in mid-September and are asked to prepare their materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Departments submit follow-up reviews to the dean’s office in early February.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean’s office submits summary memorandum to the Provost’s Office by mid-March.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( 205.05 \)  

\( \text{Schedule for Completion of Evaluations} \)

A. Annual Evaluations

1. Faculty evaluations for full-time, continuing faculty
   a. Faculty submit materials to the department chair in early January.
   b. The department chair meets with each faculty member between January and March.

2. Salary recommendations submitted to the Provost’s Office in early April.

3. Evaluations of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty and non-tenure track faculty for purposes of determining continuation for the next academic year must occur prior to the notification dates required by the Board of Regents:
205.06 Procedures for Faculty Evaluations

The following guidelines relate to different aspects of faculty evaluation.

A. Criteria in all evaluations

The major criteria to be considered in both qualitative and quantitative terms are those specified for promotion by the Regents: teaching, service to the institution, academic achievement, and professional growth and development (Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.6.1). At Georgia Southern, these four are combined as the three criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service (see § 205.01 of the Faculty Handbook). Regents’ policy also states “effective advisement shall be credited toward retention, tenure, and promotion. It shall be a specific topic of faculty evaluation” (Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 3.9).

B. Faculty input and initiative

1. Each faculty member is encouraged to provide any information he or she wishes to facilitate the evaluation.

2. Either the faculty member or department chair may initiate an evaluation for promotion, but in either case, the faculty member provides the supporting material.

3. To facilitate the evaluation process, faculty whose scholarship is published in another language will provide English translations of articles, conference papers, and works of similar length. The department will seek third-party reviews in English of longer works such as books and monographs. This requirement may be waived in units where sufficient numbers of faculty who read the foreign language proficiently are eligible for service on evaluation committees. Such waivers require the appropriate dean’s approval on an annual basis.

4. Each tenured or tenure-track faculty member undergoing either a promotion or tenure review shall submit to his/her chair or unit head the names and contact information of at least three qualified individuals not directly involved in the faculty member’s work (i.e., have not been involved as a mentor or close collaborator) who can objectively review the
faculty member’s portfolio. The individuals should be experts in the faculty member’s field and hold an academic appointment at an institution at least similar to Georgia Southern with rank at or above the rank to which the candidate is aspiring. The department chair or chair of the department’s Tenure and Promotion Committee shall solicit letters from two of the individuals that address the quality of work performed and readiness of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure. In addition to submitting names for individuals who may be contacted for external review, the faculty member may submit up to three names (and contact information) of individuals who may NOT be contacted by anyone involved in the tenure and/or promotion review. The department chair in association with the Tenure and Promotion Committee chair may also solicit up to two additional letters from any individual not on the forbidden list that he or she may think has the background
commensurate with carefully evaluating the candidate’s portfolio and contributions to the profession. (#4 approved by Faculty Senate, June 2, 2015.)

C. Feedback

The department/school chair will discuss the evaluations and the recommendations based upon them, except in cases of nonrenewal, with the faculty member involved. The discussion should be constructive, candid, and future-oriented. In the case of the annual evaluation, the primary purpose is to provide information for the faculty member’s professional development, to advise the faculty member of any recommendations made and the basis for the recommendations, and to set professional goals for the faculty member for the coming year. A narrative summary of the evaluation, including recommendations, will be written by the department chair. The faculty member may append his or her written comments to this summary. A copy of the evaluation and comments will be given to the faculty member.

D. Locus and responsibility

The process of faculty evaluation is carried out primarily in the department. The chair directs the evaluation and provides summaries and recommendations to the dean.

E. Departmental determination of criteria and procedures

1. Members of each department shall approve all criteria for evaluation of instruction, scholarship and creativity, and service and all procedures for evaluation.

2. Each department shall describe in writing its criteria and procedures for evaluation. A copy shall be submitted to the dean for approval.

3. Regents policy requires that a written system of student ratings of instruction be utilized in the annual evaluation of each faculty member (Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.5). Completed rating forms are kept on file in the department chair’s office and are the property of the University.

4. The special evaluations (for promotion, tenure, pre-tenure review, and post-tenure review) should also include some type of systematic evaluation by peers and others who have knowledge of the work of the faculty member.

F. College determination of procedures

Each college shall determine and describe in writing its procedures for evaluating the promotion recommendations submitted by the department chairs. A copy of the procedures shall be submitted to the Provost for approval.

205.07 Student Ratings of Instruction

Georgia Southern requires and conducts written or online student ratings of instruction each academic term (excluding summer) to provide information to faculty for their use in the improvement of teaching. Results are also used in faculty evaluation as mandated by Regents policy as a portion of an evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Department chairs return a summary of numerical results and students’ written comments to faculty each academic term; original responses are the property of the University. Courses shall be evaluated by students in the same manner as the course is conducted. Partially online courses whose content is offered 50% or more online are evaluated through CoursEval. As with any evaluation, faculty shall have the right to respond to student ratings regarding factors that might have influenced student ratings of instruction scores.

Approved as amended by Faculty Senate, March 12, 2015.

206 Annual Reports

Faculty report their professional activities in early January for the previous calendar year. These reports form the basis for the annual performance evaluation and for department,
Salary Increases

The Board of Regents receives an annual appropriation from the General Assembly for all phases of its operations. Expenditures for operation of the University System are therefore necessarily contingent upon legislative appropriations, including salaries. While compensation could be reduced as a consequence of actions of the Governor or the General Assembly, it is the stated intent of the Board “to maintain current salary commitments as far as possible to every employee, and the Board will exert its composite influence and best efforts to that end” (Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.12.1).

Salary increases for full-time teaching faculty are awarded on the basis of merit. Merit ratings are determined by evaluation procedures established in accordance with university policies and represent a consensus arrived at by the department chair, the dean, and the Provost.

Criteria for the determination of merit increases shall include teaching ability, completion of significant professional development activities (including the attainment of additional academic degrees), promotion in rank, seniority, research productivity, academic achievements and publications, academic honors and recognitions, academic advisement, relevant professional achievements and recognitions, and non-teaching services to the institution (Academic and Student Affairs Handbook, § 2.07 and § 4.1402).

Promotion Guidelines

Georgia Southern approves faculty for promotion based upon Regents policies (Academic and Student Affairs Handbook, § 4.5). Promotions in rank are based on merit and are not automatic. Promotion applications are considered and recommendations made at the department/school, college, and Provost’s levels, culminating in an institutional decision at the President’s level. The Board of Regents has fixed certain minimum criteria for promotion. Promotion at Georgia Southern requires satisfactory performance in all areas of evaluation, with noteworthy accomplishment in teaching and one of the other two areas. Regents policies state that there should be appropriate involvement of faculty in making recommendations for promotion. Each unit shall have written procedures for making recommendations, and these procedures shall be available to all faculty members. Unit and college procedures must be approved by the Provost.

The difference between successive faculty ranks is primarily one of achievement and professional growth and development. Aspirants to higher ranks are expected to demonstrate progressively more advanced levels of professional maturity, accomplishment, and recognition beyond the boundaries of the University as they are considered for promotion.

At Georgia Southern the terminal degree or its equivalent is required for promotion to associate or full professor. Strong justification should be provided in support of any recommendation for promotion to the ranks of associate or full professor without the terminal degree in the discipline.

Length of service is taken into consideration. Faculty are eligible for and may be reviewed for promotion in rank during their fifth year of service in their current rank. If recommended for promotion, the new rank will go into effect at the beginning of their next contract period. Recommendations for promotion are not normally considered for individuals who are currently on leaves of absence. Under special circumstances, faculty who are performing significantly above the expectations for their current rank may be considered for “early” promotion. At research and comprehensive universities, faculty may be considered for “early” promotion with less than the required minimum years of service in rank listed below; however, these cases require strong justification and approval by the President.

- For early promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, faculty must have served a minimum of three years as Lecturer.
- For early promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor, faculty must have served
Tenure Guidelines

The institution approves faculty for tenure in accordance with Section 8.3.7.2, Board of Regents Policy Manual, which includes a comprehensive statement of tenure policies in the University System. Tenure ensures academic freedom for faculty and protection against improper restrictions of the freedom of inquiry in teaching, scholarship, and service. It protects the right to publish or otherwise present scholarly work publicly without the threat of political or other confining orthodoxies. Academic freedom and tenure sustain and support the transmission and advancement of knowledge and understanding, which are central to the mission of the University. Tenured faculty have the responsibility to engage in continuous professional growth; to remain vital and contributing members of the faculty; to present accurate information in teaching; and to facilitate, support, defend, and preserve an environment of academic integrity.

Tenure applications are considered and recommendations made at the department/school, college, and Provost’s levels, culminating in an institutional decision at the President’s level. Tenure at Georgia Southern University may be awarded after five years of full-time service at the institution at the rank of assistant professor or higher. Probationary credit, which must be granted at the time of initial appointment, may be used to reduce this time requirement. Meeting the minimum time requirement does not guarantee the award of tenure. A faculty member initially appointed at the rank of lecturer at a University System of Georgia institution may be awarded tenure after five years, provided that the individual has served at least three years at the rank of assistant professor at Georgia Southern University. A tenure timeline must be completed for each non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member in the department and placed in the faculty member’s personnel file.

Recommendations for probationary credit will typically be initiated at the departmental level subject to approval by the dean and Provost at the time of appointment and will be subject to the following guidelines.

- Persons who have previously earned tenure at a regionally accredited institution may be granted up to three years of probationary credit.
- Persons who served in tenure-track positions may be granted up to two years based upon evaluation of years of prior service and professional
The following schedule: Intention not to renew a non-tenured faculty member shall be furnished in writing according to the following schedule:

- at least three months before the date of termination of an initial one-year
contract (February 1);

- at least six months before the date of termination of a second one-year contract (November 1);
- at least nine months before the date of termination of a contract after two or more years of service at the institution (August 1).

This schedule of notification does not apply to faculty holding regular, limited-term or part-time positions.

Tenure resides at the institutional level. Only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors are eligible for tenure. Faculty members with part-time appointments shall not acquire tenure, nor does tenure apply to honorary (adjunct) appointments.

The tenure guidelines were revised by the Provost’s Office to align with BOR policy, March 5, 2013.

Approved as amended by Faculty Senate, April 21, 2015; approved by President, April 26, 2015.

210 Procedure for Appeals

Appeals of post-tenure, tenure, and promotion review recommendations made by department or college committees or department/unit chairs must first be carried out according to college procedures, but may culminate in an appeal for reconsideration of the recommendation to the dean. Colleges should structure their timetables to allow for appeals to be acted upon in advance of the due date of the college recommendations to the Provost. Recommendations made by a dean may be appealed to the Provost within 14 calendar days of notification of the decision.

Final decisions are made by the President. In accordance with the Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 8.6, any appeal of the President’s decision must be made to the University System of Georgia Board’s Office of Legal Affairs.

Approved by Faculty Senate, April 21, 2015; approved by President, April 23, 2015.

211 Renewal/Nonrenewal of Faculty

211.01 Renewal/Nonrenewal of Probationary Faculty

Department chairs will seek the advice of the tenured faculty on decisions of renewal or nonrenewal of probationary (non-tenured, tenure-track) faculty. Chairs may seek additional advice as they deem appropriate. Before written notice is given to the faculty member, the department chair will discuss with the dean and then the dean will discuss with the Provost.

211.02 Grounds for Removal: Regents Policy

A tenured or non-tenured faculty member may be dismissed before the end of his/her contract term for any of the following reasons, provided that the institution has complied with procedural due process requirements:

1. Conviction or admission of guilt of a felony or of a crime involving moral turpitude during the period of employment—or prior thereto if the conviction or admission of guilt was willfully concealed.
2. Professional incompetency, neglect of duty, or default of academic integrity in teaching, in research, or in scholarship.
3. Unlawful manufacture, distribution, sale, use or possession of marijuana, a controlled substance, or other illegal or dangerous drugs as defined by Georgia laws; teaching or working under the influence of alcohol which interferes with the faculty member’s performance of duty or his/her responsibilities to the institution or to his/her profession.
4. Conviction or admission of guilt in a court proceeding of any criminal drug offense.
5. Physical or mental incompetency as determined by law or by a medical board of three or more licensed physicians and reviewed by a committee of the faculty.
6. False swearing with respect to official documents filed with the institution.
7. Disruption of any teaching, research, administrative, disciplinary, public service, or other authorized activity.
8. Violation of, among other policies, Board Policy 8.2.1 (non-discrimination), Board Policy 8.2.16 (sexual harassment), or Board Policy 8.2.23 (amorous relationships).
9. Such other grounds for dismissal as may be specified in the Statutes of the institution.

Each institution, as part of its Statutes, may supplement Regents’ policies governing causes for dismissal and procedures for dismissal. Each institution should provide for standards governing faculty conduct, including sanctions short of dismissal, and procedures for the implementation of such sanctions. In the imposition of sanctions, the burden of proof lies with the institution (Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.9.1).

211.03 Procedures for Dismissal: Regents Policy

These procedures shall apply only to the dismissal of a faculty member with tenure, or a non-tenured faculty member before the end of the term specified in his/her contract. It is intended that the procedures set forth below shall be considered as minimum standards of due process and shall not be construed as a limitation upon individual standards or procedures, consistent with the Policy Manual and Bylaws of the Board, which a University System of Georgia institution may elect to adopt for its own improvement or to make adjustment to its own particular circumstances. Such additional standards or procedures shall be incorporated into the Statutes of the institution.

The president may at any time remove any faculty member for cause. Cause or grounds for dismissal are set forth in the Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 8.3.9.1 and in the approved Statutes or Bylaws of an institution. Whenever the words “president” or “administration” are used in these procedures, they shall be construed to include the designated representative of the president.

Preliminary Procedures
The dismissal of a tenured faculty member, or a non-tenured faculty member during his/her contract term should be preceded by:

1. Discussion between the faculty member and appropriate administrative officers looking toward a mutual settlement.
2. Informal inquiry by an appropriate faculty committee which may, upon failing to effect an adjustment, advise the president whether dismissal proceedings should be undertaken; its advisory opinion shall not be binding upon the president.
3. A letter to the faculty member forewarning that he/she is about to be terminated for cause and informing him/her that a statement of charges will be forwarded to him/her upon request. The faculty member may also request a formal hearing on the charges before a faculty committee. Failure to request charges or a hearing within a reasonable time shall constitute a waiver of the right to a hearing.
4. A statement of charges, if requested by the faculty member, framed with reasonable particularity by the president or his or her designated representative. Along with the charges, the faculty member shall be advised of the names of the witnesses to be used against him or her together with the nature of their expected testimony.

Provision for Hearing Committee

A dismissal as defined above shall be preceded by a statement of charges or causes (grounds for dismissal) if so requested, including a statement that the faculty member concerned shall have the right to be heard by a faculty hearing committee.

The Hearing Committee shall consist of not fewer than three or more than five impartial faculty members appointed by the executive committee (or its equivalent) of the
highest legislative body of the faculty, from among the members of the entire faculty, as defined in Section 8.1.1 of the Board of Regents Policy Manual, of the institution. Members of the Hearing Committee may serve concurrently on other committees of the faculty. The Hearing Committee will meet as a body when it is called into session by the chair of the body that selected them either at his/her discretion, or upon the request of the president or the faculty member who is subject to dismissal.

When the Hearing Committee is called into session, it shall elect a chair from among its membership. A member should remove himself/herself from the case, either at the request of a party or on his/her own initiative if he/she deems himself/herself disqualified for bias or interest. Each party shall have a maximum of two challenges without stated cause, provided, however, that all challenges whether with or without cause shall be made in writing and filed with the chair of the Hearing Committee at least five days in advance of the date set for the hearing. The chair shall have the authority to decide whether a member of the committee is disqualified for cause. If the chair determines that a member is so disqualified or if a committee member removes himself/herself from a case, the replacement shall be made in the same manner as the original committee was selected. If the chair is thus removed, the committee shall elect a new chair after committee replacements have been appointed. A minimum of three members is required for any action to be taken.

**Dismissal Procedures**

In all instances where a hearing is requested, the following hearing procedures shall apply:

1. Service of notice of the hearing with specific reasons or charges against the faculty member together with the names of the members of the Hearing Committee shall be made in writing at least 20 days prior to the hearing. The faculty member may waive a hearing or he/she may respond to the charges in writing at least five days in advance of the date set for the hearing. If a faculty member waives a hearing, but denies the charges or asserts that the charges do not support a finding of adequate cause, the Hearing Committee shall evaluate all available evidence and rest its recommendation upon the evidence in the record.

2. The Hearing Committee, in consultation with the president and the faculty member, may exercise its judgment as to whether the hearing should be public or private.

3. During the proceedings the faculty member and the administration shall be permitted to have an academic advisor and/or counsel of his/her choice. The Hearing Committee will be permitted to have advisory counsel.

4. At the request of either party or the chair of the Hearing Committee, a representative of a responsible education association shall be permitted to attend as an observer.

5. A tape recording or transcript of the proceedings shall be kept and made available to the faculty member and the administration in the event an appeal is filed.

6. An oath or affirmation shall be administered to all witnesses by any person authorized by law to administer oaths in the state of Georgia.

7. The Hearing Committee may grant adjournments to enable either party to investigate evidence as to which a valid claim of surprise is made.

8. The faculty member and the administration shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity to obtain necessary witnesses and documentary or other evidence.

9. The faculty member and the administration will have the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses. Where the witness cannot or will not appear but the Committee determines that the interests of justice require the admission of his/her statement, the Committee will identify the witness, disclose his statement and if possible provide for interrogatories.

10. The Hearing Committee will not be bound by strict rules of legal evidence and may admit any evidence which is of probative value in determining the issues
Policy on Pre-Tenure Review

In addition to the annual review of faculty, the University conducts a comprehensive review of achievements and performance in the third year of the probationary period as a basis for recommending renewal or nonrenewal of the contract beyond the following year. Each department or unit must develop procedures and criteria within the parameters established by Regents policy and the university policy outlined below. The procedures and criteria shall be described to faculty by the department chair/unit head and provided to each incoming faculty member in a written set of departmental/unit procedures. The written procedures shall make clear that a positive pre-tenure review is not a guarantee of promotion and/or tenure.

Because the pre-tenure review looks ahead to tenure and, in many cases, promotion, criteria at the unit level must mirror the unit’s tenure and promotion criteria, emphasizing excellence in teaching. The pre-tenure review must assess progress toward tenure and promotion and provide written feedback to the faculty member with specific suggestions for continued progress. The pre-tenure review may lead to a decision of nonrenewal in those cases where tenure is not possible.

The pre-tenure review is carried out in the third year of the probationary period or, in those cases where the faculty member has prior years of service toward tenure, at the midpoint of the remaining probationary period. By September 15 of each year, candidates for pre-tenure review are notified of their review and asked to prepare materials specified in the unit’s procedures for submission by February 1. Submissions should include copies of annual reviews and materials related to achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service. Unit procedures must outline how and by whom the materials will be evaluated; how input will be sought from peers, students, unit heads, and others; and the specific criteria for the review. All
input will be considered by a committee of tenured faculty which must include at least three members. Committees which function as part of the pre-tenure review should be diverse in their composition. Units are not required to substitute the pre-tenure review for the annual review but may do so.

The review committee shall deliver its written report to the unit head who is responsible for making a recommendation to the next level of administrative oversight. Unit heads who are department chairs will discuss the content of the review committee’s report and their own recommendations with their dean. Unit heads shall then give the faculty member a written summary of their recommendation, a copy of the committee’s report, and any suggestions for continued progress; discuss all materials with the faculty member, and give the faculty member an opportunity to provide a written response which will be appended to the written report. Feedback from the pre-tenure review should be candid and future-oriented. Unit heads are responsible for assisting faculty with implementing plans for continued progress. Such plans should be integrated with campus resources such as the Centers for Teaching and Technology; internal and external grant programs; and formal and informal mentoring systems. In cases where tenure is not possible, the unit head will deliver a letter of nonrenewal consistent with timetables in Regents and university policies.

Both parties sign the report to indicate that they have discussed it. The unit head should remind the faculty member that a positive pre-tenure review is not a guarantee of promotion and/or tenure. The unit head apprises the line officer one level above the unit of the results of the pre-tenure review conference and provides that officer with a copy of the signed report. A copy shall be placed in the faculty member’s file at the unit level, along with materials submitted for the review. Subsequent annual reviews should assess continued achievement and provide feedback regarding acceptable progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The dean’s office submits a memorandum summarizing the pre-tenure reviews conducted in the college for that year to the Provost’s Office no later than mid-April.

213 Policy on Post-Tenure Review

1. Introduction

Post-tenure review, the systematic, periodic, cumulative review of all tenured faculty, is an extension of the evaluation system currently in place. Coupled with any evaluation process is the obligation to provide faculty development opportunities that allow all faculty to realize their full potential. Post-tenure review focuses on identifying faculty development opportunities for tenured faculty that mutually benefit the individual and the institution. The ultimate purpose of post-tenure review is to recognize, reward, and enhance the performance of tenured faculty.
II. Purpose and Criteria

The post-tenure review process and the process for deciding promotion and tenure share the same evaluation criteria; however, their purposes and evaluation standards are different. The purposes of post-tenure review are:

- to recognize and reward tenured faculty who have made and continue to make significant contributions to the missions of their departments, colleges, and the University;
- to provide faculty development opportunities for tenured faculty for the primary purpose of enhancing teaching, but also scholarship and/or service, in a way that is mutually beneficial to the individual and the University; and
- to provide a systematic faculty development plan to remedy instances where a tenured faculty member’s contributions in teaching, scholarship, and/or service are found to be deficient with respect to the missions of the department, college, or University.

Post-tenure review not only concentrates on the period under review, but also considers the cumulative contributions of faculty. For this reason, and because it focuses on continuing a mutually beneficial relationship between the institution and the individual, judgments regarding post-tenure review should be based on contributions over one’s career as well as those since the last review and not only on the contributions which are applied to promotion. A satisfactory post-tenure review indicates that the individual continues to make contributions which benefit the University, its students, and its other constituents.

In an institution devoted to “teaching first,” teaching and contributions to the learning environment are of paramount importance in the post-tenure review process. Evidence of contributions in the areas of scholarship and service is also required. The three criteria, teaching, scholarship, and service, are described in Section 205.01 of the Faculty Handbook. Each unit should define the exact criteria and how they will be assessed (see Roles and Responsibilities at IV), taking into consideration the uniqueness of the individual, the variations within disciplines, and the differing expectations and assignments that influence faculty contributions. Individual differences are reflected in varying combinations of emphasis in teaching, scholarship, and service; however, teaching and contributions to the learning environment are the primary focus of post-tenure review.

III. Schedule

Board of Regents policy stipulates that each tenured faculty member is to be reviewed five years after the most recent promotion or personnel action, as defined below, and at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a promotion, a written declaration to retire within five years (submitted through the appropriate dean’s office to the Provost’s Office), or a leave of absence. In the latter case, the faculty member will be reviewed upon returning to active employment. At Georgia Southern, “five years after” is interpreted as requiring review in the faculty member’s sixth year to allow for five full years of activity. Tenured faculty whose primary responsibilities are in administration, including interim appointments, will be reviewed five years after returning to a full-time faculty position. Faculty members undergoing post-tenure review will submit their materials for evaluation to the department chair or unit head by mid-January.

IV. Roles and Responsibilities

Each department, school, college, and the library will develop written procedures and specific criteria for post-tenure review as outlined below and will provide a copy of the procedures to each tenured and tenure-track faculty member. Reviews may be carried out at the department, school, or college level as agreed upon and described in the units’ written procedures. The phrases “department chair” and “unit head” as used in this document refer to the line officer who is the immediate supervisor of the faculty member undergoing post-tenure review.

Faculty are responsible for providing documentation of their performance as follows:

- an up-to-date curriculum vitae and copies of the annual performance
review for each of the five years under consideration:

- measures of effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service (including but not limited to a combination of written (or online) student ratings of instruction and peer evaluations);
- a self-evaluation narrative of accomplishments for the period under review and projected goals for the next five-year period; and
- other documentation as specified by the college or department/unit.

Faculty may submit other materials which may enhance the review committee’s understanding of their performance. It is recognized that materials submitted by non-teaching faculty will differ substantially from those submitted by teaching faculty. The faculty member and the department chair or unit head will develop the documentation and provide it to the review committee.

The post-tenure review process will be conducted by a committee of at least three faculty peers with tenure, with the committee composition and selection process to be determined at the department, school, or college level in consultation with the appropriate dean. Units should strive to ensure diversity of membership in post-tenure review committees. After reviewing documentation of performance as outlined in the unit’s post-tenure review document, the committee will be expected to provide informed and candid feedback in a written report on the quality of the faculty member’s performance, accomplishments, and contributions in teaching, scholarship, and/or service. Meritorious accomplishments should be noted by the committee in any review. Likewise, major, chronic, or ongoing deficiencies should be identified and supporting documentation provided.

The committee will provide a written summary of its findings and any recommendations for faculty reward or development to the department chair or unit head who will transmit the written summary to the faculty member and discuss it with him or her. The unit head should append his/her comments, and both the faculty member and the unit head should sign the document to indicate that they have discussed the committee’s report and the unit head’s comments. The faculty member may append a written response. A copy of the committee’s report, the unit head’s comments, and any written response by the faculty member will then be sent to the administrative officer at least one level above the faculty member’s administrative unit where they will be reviewed and commented on by the dean/administrative director. All written comments will also be forwarded to the faculty member. These comments, along with all other documents that played a substantive part in the review not readily available elsewhere, will then be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file at the department/unit level. The dean composes a memorandum to the Provost, summarizing the findings at each level of review for each candidate and including a final assessment on whether the candidate meets, exceeds, or falls below expectations. This memorandum is submitted electronically to the Provost’s Office by mid-March.

In response to post-tenure review, the unit head will be responsible, in consultation with the faculty member, for deciding whether the faculty member should be rewarded for meritorious accomplishments (see “Relationships to Other Campus Processes” below) and/or engage in faculty development activities that would be helpful to the faculty member and in the best interest of the institution. Funding for any required development plan will be arranged by the unit head and the administrative officer at least one level above. In most cases, the results of the post-tenure review are likely to reveal that the faculty member is performing well, and any development plan would focus on further enhancing the faculty member’s performance (e.g., enhancing knowledge and skills in the use of current technologies in teaching or scholarship). Faculty development is an important opportunity for all faculty members as they seek to reach their full potential and perform at their full capacity.

In cases where a faculty member is identified in the post-tenure review as having deficiencies, the administrative unit head, in consultation with the faculty member, must establish a formal plan of development. A formal plan includes identifying appropriate resources for faculty development on campus, on other campuses of the University System, at the System level, or in other locations. The plan for faculty development should (a) define specific goals or outcomes that the plan is designed to achieve; (b) outline the activities that
will be undertaken to achieve the goals or outcomes; (c) set appropriate times within which the goals or outcomes should be accomplished; and (d) indicate appropriate criteria by which the faculty member will monitor progress. The faculty member’s unit head will be responsible for forwarding the formal faculty development plan resulting from a post-tenure review to the appropriate administrative office at least one level above the faculty member’s unit. The unit head and the administrative officer at least one level above are jointly responsible for arranging for appropriate funding for the development plan, if required.

At the time of the annual evaluation, the administrative unit head will meet with each faculty member who is working on a development plan because of deficiencies to review progress toward achieving the goals of the formal faculty development plan. A progress report, which will be included in the annual review, will be forwarded each year to the appropriate administrative officer at least one unit above the faculty member’s unit. It will be the responsibility of the unit head and the current post-tenure review committee to determine if, after a specified period of three years, the faculty member has been successful in completing the formal faculty development plan; they will report that finding to the appropriate administrative officer at least one level above the faculty member’s unit. An individual who successfully completes a development plan will be reviewed five years from the date of the original post-tenure review. If the faculty member has not been successful in completing the formal faculty development plan, the University may move for dismissal for cause under existing Board of Regents policy, Section 8.3.5.4, provided that the deficiencies meet the strict requirements of that policy.

A faculty member who disagrees with the results of a post-tenure review, including the need for a development plan, shall have the right to appeal as defined by the unit in implementing this policy. Each unit will develop an appeal procedure. The unit will provide the Provost as well as all tenured and tenure-track faculty with a copy of this procedure.

V. Relationships to Other Campus Processes

Academic Freedom This policy is written in the spirit of upholding the University’s commitment to academic freedom, and committees and individuals who act under this policy must ensure the academic freedom of faculty under review. The policy is not designed to abridge academic freedom, hinder the tenure or annual review process, or facilitate the dismissal of faculty (see the Academic Freedom Policy, approved by the Faculty Senate in June 1998, in § 201 of the Faculty Handbook).

Termination for Cause Nothing in the post-tenure review policy alters current Regents policy on dismissal for cause or its due process requirements. While dismissal for cause as the result of the post-tenure review process will be rare, it may be justified in certain instances as defined in Regents policy, Section 8.3.9.

(Revised March 2016 (per Provost) to reduce the amount of documentation colleges are required to submit to the Provost’s Office on each candidate.)

214 Non-Tenure Track Appointments

Institutions of the University System are authorized to establish professional positions designated as non-tenure track positions. Such positions may be established for full-time professional personnel employed in administrative positions or to staff research, technical, special, career, and public service programs or programs that are anticipated to have a limited life span or that are funded, fully or partially, through non-System sources. There shall be no maximum time limitation for service in positions of this category.

Positions originally designated as non-tenure track positions or as tenure-track positions may be converted to the other type only with approval by the institution’s president. Individuals employed in non-tenure track positions may apply, on an equal basis with other candidates, for tenure-track positions which may become available. The transfer of individuals from tenure-track to non-tenure track positions shall be effected on a voluntary basis only. Probationary credit toward tenure shall not be awarded for service in non-tenure track positions, except for lecturers and senior lecturers (§ 8.3.8, Board of Regents Policy Manual).

Notice of intention not to renew contracts of non-tenure track personnel who have
been awarded academic rank shall follow the schedule required for tenure-track personnel. There is no maximum time limit for non-tenure track faculty at the rank of instructor. Non-tenure track faculty are eligible for promotion and all other faculty rights except that they shall not be eligible for consideration for the award of tenure.

214.01 Lecturers

The appointment and promotion of lecturers at Georgia Southern University are based upon the experience and academic background of the candidate as well as the instructional needs in the position. The designation applies to non-tenure track positions that carry out special instructional functions. The position is governed by all provisions of Board of Regents’ policy 8.3.8.1, including being capped at no more than 20% of the FTE corps of primarily undergraduate instruction. The administration shall facilitate a reasonable distribution among departments and schools in usage of these positions across the University.

As described in the Board of Regents Policy Manual 3.2.1.1, lecturers are part of the corps of instruction and members of the faculty. As such, lecturers have access to grievance procedures which are defined in the Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook, Section 220.01, as available to “all members of the faculty.”

An initial appointment to a lecturer position is for a one-year period. Subsequently, renewal is on an annual basis. In no case will the service as lecturer or senior lecturer imply any claim upon tenure. However, as stated in the Board of Regents Policy Manual 8.3.4.3: “Lecturers and senior lecturers who have served full-time for the entire previous academic year have the presumption of reappointment for the subsequent academic year unless notified in writing to the contrary.” Notification of non-reappointment will be provided as early as possible, preferably following the schedule for notification of tenure-track faculty, as stated in the Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook, Section 205.02, but no later than the following (Board of Regents’ policy 8.3.4.3):

For lecturers with less than six years of full-time, continuous service in that position, institutions must provide non-reappointment notice at least 30 calendar days prior to the institution’s first day of classes in the semester.
For senior lecturers or lecturers with six years or more of full-time, continuous service in that position, institutions must provide non-reappointment notice at least 180 calendar days prior to the institution’s first day of classes in the semester.

As stated in the Board of Regents Policy Manual 8.3.4.3, “Lecturers or senior lecturers who have served for six or more years of full-time service at an institution and who have received timely notice of non-reappointment shall be entitled to a review of the decision in accordance with published procedures” of Georgia Southern University.

214.0101 Evaluations

Every lecturer and senior lecturer shall have an annual review conducted along the same schedule as individuals in the professorial ranks. Any additional requirements for departmental input or constitution of the review committee may be adopted by the individual department and/or college in which they are appointed. For lecturers, annual performance reviews should show achievement in teaching and achievement in at least one of the following areas: (1) service; (2) professional growth and development. The faculty in each unit and college should establish its own formal review process (mechanisms and policies) for lecturers and senior lecturers, including definitions of “exceptional teaching ability,” “extraordinary value to the institution,” and “noteworthy achievement.”

As stated in the Board of Regents Policy Manual 8.3.8.1, reappointment of a lecturer who has completed six consecutive years of service to an institution will be permitted only if the reviews of the lecturer demonstrate “exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution.” After the sixth year or promotion, a further major review will take place every five years. The intent of this review is to focus on continuing a mutually beneficial relationship between the institution and individual, to provide development opportunities, and to recognize, reward, and enhance faculty performance. Input for evaluating lecturers and senior lecturers at these points of major review will follow established unit and college
policies as specified in the required policy documents. The departmental review committee shall be composed of at least three members, including both tenured faculty and senior lecturers, if any exist in the unit.

214.0102  Promotion to Senior Lecturer

To be promoted to senior lecturer, a lecturer must have served in rank for a minimum of five years and demonstrate through annual performance reviews and other credible evidence noteworthy achievement in teaching and achievement in at least one of the following areas: (1) service; (2) professional growth and development. Recommendations for promotion to senior lecturer are made utilizing the process and documentation described in Section 208, Promotion Guidelines, of the Faculty Handbook.

In keeping with Board of Regents’ policy, promotion to senior lecturer requires approval by the President. Reappointment procedures for senior lecturers follow the same reappointment procedures as those for lecturers.

214.0103  Appeals

The candidate for promotion or retention beyond the sixth year may appeal a negative decision, except in the case of programmatic changes or financial exigency. The appeal must be based on the perception of significant omissions or commissions in the review process, impermissible bias in the review, or procedural errors that precluded an objective, fair review. The appeal must be to the next level of review. The responsible administrator at the appeal level shall review the appeal and make a recommendation. If the decision on appeal is to support the promotion or retention, the review process shall continue through the remaining review levels as if the decision from which the appeal was filed had been positive. If the decision on appeal is against the applicant, a further appeal may be filed. The process of appeals may continue until a final decision by the President.

Adopted by Faculty Senate, April 15, 2010; revised by the Provost’s Office, October 6, 2014, to conform with the Board of Regents’ updated promotion policy.
Appendix B

204 Desired Attributes of Georgia Southern Faculty

All Georgia Southern faculty should exhibit the following characteristics. In addition to specific criteria set for each discipline, the University will seek to recruit new faculty with these attributes in mind:

- Commitment to excellence in teaching and learning (evidenced by seminar/presentation during campus visit with students present)
- Promise of productive scholarship consistent with the teacher-scholar model, including grant/proposal writing
- Commitment to professional service within the University and beyond
- Technological literacy and a commitment to using technology in teaching and scholarship
- Experience with, or interest in, working in diverse academic and professional communities
- Ability to contribute to a positive work environment in the department, college, and University
- Commitment to recruiting, advising, retaining, and mentoring qualified students
- Understanding of, and commitment to, the strategic goals of the department, college, and University
- Terminal degree in the discipline

Georgia Southern University seeks a competent and diverse group of individuals. To assist in this goal, it is expected that all searches include a “telephone screening” or videoconference prior to any recommendations for interviews. The deans and Provost pledge to take an active interest in each search.

Faculty Evaluation

Criteria for All Types of Faculty Evaluation

The criteria described below apply to all types of faculty evaluation. Evaluators of faculty at all levels shall seek evidence of sustained effort, involvement, and record of achievement. Accomplishments which have enriched the student learning experience are valued most. The entire body of work submitted by candidates shall be considered, though the most recent work shall be afforded greater consideration by the deliberating bodies at each level of evaluation. The four Board of Regents’ criteria of superior teaching, outstanding service to the institution, academic achievement, and professional growth and development are to be applied where appropriate. While the manifestations of faculty achievement may vary across disciplines, the qualities represented in these criteria shall be the predominant basis for evaluation and shall be reflected in college and departmental governance documents.

Teaching

A demonstrated record of superior, effective teaching is the first and most important area of evaluation. Superior teaching is reflective, student-centered, respectful of the diversity of students, multimodal, and focused on student learning outcomes. Teaching represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and the development of critical thinking skills. Such activity typically involves teaching in the classroom, laboratory, or studio, and direction of research, fulfillment of professional librarian responsibilities, mentoring, and the like. Teaching evaluation procedures should include both formative and summative elements. All teaching evaluation procedures should include student ratings of instruction and a narrative or self-evaluation that includes reflections of how professional pedagogical development (e.g., conferences/workshops on teaching and learning, course development) is applied. Further evidence of excellence in teaching can be found in classroom evaluations by peers and/or the department chair, examination of student work, as well as other evaluation methods not listed here.

Adopted by Faculty Senate, October 25, 2001.
Student ratings of instruction shall not be the sole measure of teaching effectiveness for any review, nor shall instructors be ranked according to student ratings for evaluation; rather, a complete picture should be obtained through multiple sources. Documentation of teaching effectiveness is the responsibility of the faculty member.

**Scholarship**

The significance of scholarly accomplishments shall be judged rigorously within the context of the discipline. Candidates must provide evidence of work that has been selected for dissemination through peer-reviewed venues. Scholarship includes the discovery, integration, development, application, and extension of knowledge as well as aesthetic creation and is often demonstrated by publications and presentations designed for professional audiences. Scholarship is manifested in articles, scholarly books and texts, reports of research, creative works, textbooks, scholarly presentations, research grants, demonstration grants, papers read, panel participation, exhibits, performances, professional and academic honors and awards, additional professional training or certification, degrees earned, and postdoctoral work.

**Service**

Faculty are expected to make service contributions to their professions and to the institution. Service at the department/school, college, and university levels is essential to the well-being of the University. Service includes the application of one’s expertise in the discipline for the benefit of a professional organization, the community, or the institution. Service also includes the academic advisement of Georgia Southern University students. Additionally, service may include work in schools, businesses, museums, social agencies, government, etc., as well as activities undertaken on behalf of the University. Consulting shall be designated as paid or unpaid.

**Evaluation of Faculty**

Under the policies of the Board of Regents, the maximum probationary period for a newly employed non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member is seven years. At the end of the fifth or sixth year, a decision is made as to whether the employee will be tenured. Each year of the probationary period, non-tenured, tenure-track faculty are evaluated. Following the evaluation in the first year, the faculty member is notified by February 1 if a contract will not be offered for the following year. The notification date during the second year is November 1 if a contract will not be offered for the following year. In subsequent years, the faculty member is notified by August 1 if a contract will not be offered for the following year. This notification schedule is identical for non-tenure track faculty (in the ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor) who are also evaluated annually, but not subject to a probationary period of seven years. It does not apply to limited-term (i.e., full-time temporary or visiting) faculty. Limited-term and part-time faculty are appointed for a specified length of time (either one academic year or one semester); therefore, they do not receive a letter of intent not to renew. Nonetheless, limited-term faculty are evaluated annually (or at the end of the semester if appointed full-time for one semester), and part-time faculty are evaluated at the end of the semester of appointment (or term of appointment if appointed for a full-year). Similarly, teaching adjunct faculty (i.e., honorary, uncompensated appointments) are evaluated at the conclusion of the semester of appointment (or term of appointment if teaching for an academic year).

For lecturers with less than three years of full-time, continuous service in that position, written notice of intent not to renew should be sent as early as possible, but no specific notice is required. For lecturers with three or more years but less than six years of full-time, continuous service in that position, written notice of intent not to renew should be sent at least 30 calendar days prior to the first day of classes in the semester. For senior lecturers with six or more years of full-time, continuous service in that position, written notice of intent not to renew is sent at least 180 calendar days prior to the first day of classes in the semester (Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.4.3). Unlike tenure-track faculty who either obtain tenure after six years or must accept a terminal contract, lecturers may be judged at their sixth-year review as either promoted, not promoted but continuing, or not promoted and not continuing.
Reappointment of Academic Professionals is made annually. Notice of reappointment and non-reappointment must be made consistent with the three month, six month, and nine month notification schedule, depending upon the length of service (Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.4.2).

Faculty contracts in the University System of Georgia cannot exceed one year. An evaluation of the work of every non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member and every non-tenure track faculty member is made annually with the department chair responsible for recommending renewal or non-renewal of contract for the succeeding year. The section on promotion and salary increases in the Faculty Handbook indicates the general criteria used in faculty evaluations.

In addition to the annual review of a non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member and for lecturers, the University’s colleges conduct an extra and especially thorough evaluation in the third year as a basis for recommending renewal or nonrenewal of the contract beyond the following year (pre-tenure review/third year review). Each department is free to develop its particular system for evaluating faculty members under the general criteria established by the Board of Regents. The procedures are to be described to faculty by the department chair and provided to faculty in a written set of departmental procedures.

Faculty Evaluation Guidelines
The Board of Regents has established that: “Each institution shall establish definite and stated criteria, consistent with Regents’ policies and the statutes of the institution, against which the performance of each faculty member will be evaluated. The evaluation shall occur at least annually and shall follow stated procedures as prescribed by each institution” (Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.5.1).

The Chancellor’s office has added the following guidelines: “The purpose of the new faculty evaluation policy is twofold. The primary purpose is to aid the faculty member in improving and developing his or her performance as a member of the academic community and to ensure the faculty member’s understanding of the relationship between his or her performance and the expectations of the institution. Secondly, the faculty evaluation should assist the institution in its review of the faculty member for continued employment, promotion, tenure, and merit salary increases. The institution may wish to develop different procedures for each category of review. However, the faculty member must clearly understand the criteria and the procedures to be used in the evaluation process for continued employment, promotion, tenure, and merit salary increases.”

The following information concerning faculty evaluation provides an overview of the kinds of faculty evaluations that are currently made, lists the various types of evaluations, and suggests a schedule of dates for the completion of each. The actual development of procedures for each kind of evaluation is the responsibility of the faculty and academic administration. In all university evaluation procedures, Regents policy requires that the criteria and procedures be put in writing. Emphasis is placed upon:

- doing necessary tasks positively and constructively;
- clarifying procedures, results, and recommendations;
- determining specific procedures for each type at the most reasonable level, i.e., department/school or college; and
- attempting to foster a climate of professional collegiality.

Types of Evaluations
A. Each full-time, continuing faculty member is evaluated annually to ensure effective performance and facilitate improvement. Annual evaluations also serve as the basis for recommending merit salary increases and determining continuation of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty, and non-tenure track faculty.

B. Limited-term faculty are evaluated annually (or at the end of the semester if appointed full-time for one semester).
C. Part-time faculty are evaluated at the end of the semester of appointment (or term of appointment if appointed for a full-year).

D. Teaching adjunct (honorary, uncompensated) faculty are evaluated at the conclusion of the semester of appointment (or term of appointment if teaching for an academic year).

E. Special evaluations are made for the following specific decisions, relevant for full-time, continuing faculty:
   - pre-tenure review
   - tenure
   - promotion
   - post-tenure review
   - third-year, sixth-year, and fifth-year follow-up lecturer reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Faculty Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Annual Review | A review of the performance and achievements of each faculty member as related to the faculty member’s stated objectives and goals for the year. | Faculty submit a report of their professional activities to the department chair by early January.  
   - Department chairs conduct annual faculty reviews January through March; however, evaluations of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty and non-tenure track faculty for purposes of determining continuation for the next academic year must occur prior to the notification dates required by the Board of Regents.  
   - First year probationary faculty receive notification by February 1st if a contract will not be offered for the following year.  
   - Second year probationary faculty receive notification by November 1st if a contract will not be offered for the following year.  
   - All other faculty receive notification by August 1st if a contract will not be offered for the following year.  
   - Salary increase recommendations (based on the annual reviews) are made in April.  

Note: Limited-term faculty are evaluated annually (or at the end of the semester if appointed full-time for one semester). Part-time faculty are evaluated at the end of the semester of appointment (or term of appointment if appointed for a full-year). Teaching adjunct (honorary, uncompensated) faculty are evaluated at the conclusion of the semester of appointment (or term of appointment if teaching for an academic year).
| **Pre-Tenure Review** | A comprehensive review of the performance and achievements of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty members conducted in the third year of the probationary period. | Faculty receive notification of the review in mid-September and are asked to prepare their materials.  
- Departments submit pre-tenure reviews to the dean’s office in early February.  
- Dean’s office submits a summary memorandum to the Provost’s Office in mid-April. |
| **Tenure Review** | A comprehensive review of the performance and achievements of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty members conducted in the fifth or sixth year of the probationary period for consideration of the award of tenure. | Faculty receive notification of the review in mid-September and are asked to prepare their materials.  
- Deans submit tenure reviews to the Provost’s Office in early December.  
- Tenure review at the university level completed by the end of January.  
- If approved, tenure is effective August 1st.  
- If review is unfavorable, a nonrenewal letter is issued to the faculty member no later than August 1st. |
| **Promotion** | A comprehensive review of the performance and achievements of non-tenured and tenured faculty members for consideration for promotion to the next higher rank. | Faculty receive notification of the review in mid-September and are asked to prepare their materials  
- Deans submit promotion reviews to the Provost’s Office in early December.  
- Promotion review at the university level completed by the end of January.  
- If approved, promotion is effective August 1st. |
| **Post-Tenure Review** | A systematic, periodic, cumulative review of all tenured faculty members which focuses on identifying faculty development opportunities which are mutually beneficial for the faculty member and the institution. | Faculty receive notification of the review in mid-September and are asked to prepare their materials.  
- Departments submit post-tenure reviews to the dean’s office in early February.  
- Dean’s office submits a summary memorandum to the Provost’s Office by mid-March. |
| **Sixth-Year Lecturer Review** | A comprehensive review of the performance and achievements of lecturer faculty members is conducted in the fifth or sixth year of service. | Faculty receive notification of the review in mid-September and are asked to prepare their materials.  
- Deans submit lecturer reviews to the Provost’s Office in early December.  
- Lecturer review at the university level completed by the end of January.  
- If the lecturer applied for senior lecturer and was approved, promotion to senior lecturer is effective August 1st.  
- If the sixth-year review results in nonrenewal, a nonrenewal letter is issued to the faculty member no later than August 1st. |
| Follow-up Fifth-Year Lecturer/Senior Lecturer Review | A systematic, periodic, cumulative review of all lecturers and senior lecturers who have previously and successfully navigated the sixth-year review. | Faculty receive notification of the review in mid-September and are asked to prepare their materials.  
• Departments submit follow-up fifth-year lecturer/senior lecturer reviews to the dean's office in early February.  
• Dean's office submits summary memorandum to the Provost's Office by mid-March. |

**Schedule for Completion of Evaluations**

**A. Annual Evaluations**

1. Faculty evaluations for full-time, continuing faculty
   a. Faculty submit materials to the department chair in early January.
   b. The department chair meets with each faculty member between January and March.

2. Salary recommendations submitted to the Provost's Office in early April.

3. Evaluations of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty and non-tenure track faculty for purposes of determining continuation for the next academic year must occur prior to the notification dates required by the Board of Regents:
   a. at least three months before the date of termination of an initial one-year contract (February 1);
   b. at least six months before the date of termination of a second one-year contract (November 1);
   c. at least nine months before the date of termination of a contract after two or more years of service at the institution (August 1).

4. Limited-term faculty are evaluated annually (or at the end of the semester if appointed full-time for one semester).

5. Part-time faculty are evaluated at the end of the semester of appointment (or term of appointment if appointed for a full-year).

6. Teaching adjunct (honorary, uncompensated) faculty are evaluated at the conclusion of the semester of appointment (or term of appointment if teaching for an academic year).

**B. Special Evaluations**

1. Promotion: due to Provost’s Office in early December.

2. Tenure: due to Provost’s Office in early December.

3. Pre-tenure review of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty: due in the Provost’s Office mid-April of the third probationary year or at the mid-point if using probationary credit.


5. Lecturer sixth-year review: due to Provost’s Office in early December.

6. Lecturer/senior lecturer follow-up review: due in Provost’s Office by mid-March.
Procedures for Faculty Evaluations

The following guidelines relate to different aspects of faculty evaluation.

A. Criteria in all evaluations
   The major criteria to be considered in both qualitative and quantitative terms are those specified for promotion by the Regents: teaching, service to the institution, academic achievement, and professional growth and development (Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.6.1).

B. Faculty input and initiative
   1. Each faculty member is encouraged to provide any information he or she wishes to facilitate the evaluation.
   2. Either the faculty member or department chair may initiate an evaluation for promotion, but in either case, the faculty member provides the supporting material.
   3. To facilitate the evaluation process, faculty whose scholarship is published in another language will provide English translations of articles, conference papers, and works of similar length. The department will seek third-party reviews in English of longer works such as books and monographs. This requirement may be waived in units where sufficient numbers of faculty who read the foreign language proficiently are eligible for service on evaluation committees. Such waivers require the appropriate dean’s approval on an annual basis.
   4. Each tenured or tenure-track faculty member undergoing either a promotion or tenure review shall submit to his/her chair or unit head the names and contact information of at least three qualified individuals not directly involved in the faculty member’s work (i.e., have not been involved as a mentor or close collaborator) who can objectively review the faculty member’s portfolio. The individuals should be experts in the faculty member’s field and hold an academic appointment at an institution at least similar to Georgia Southern with rank at or above the rank to which the candidate is aspiring. The department chair or chair of the department’s Tenure and Promotion Committee shall solicit letters from two of the individuals that address the quality of work performed and readiness of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure. In addition to submitting names for individuals who may be contacted for external review, the faculty member may submit up to three names (and contact information) of individuals who may NOT be contacted by anyone involved in the tenure and/or promotion review. The department chair in association with the Tenure and Promotion Committee chair may also solicit up to two additional letters from any individual not on the forbidden list that he or she may think has the background commensurate with carefully evaluating the candidate’s portfolio and contributions to the profession.

C. Feedback
   The department/school chair will discuss the evaluations and the recommendations based upon them, except in cases of nonrenewal, with the faculty member involved. The discussion should be constructive, candid, and future-oriented. In the case of the annual evaluation, the primary purpose is to provide information for the faculty member’s professional development, to advise the faculty member of any recommendations made and the basis for the recommendations, and to set professional goals with the faculty member for the coming year. A narrative summary of the evaluation, including recommendations, will be written by the department chair. The faculty member may append his or her written comments to this summary. A copy of the evaluation and comments will be given to the faculty member.

D. Locus and responsibility
   The process of faculty evaluation is carried out primarily in the department. The chair directs the evaluation and provides summaries and recommendations to the dean.

E. Departmental determination of criteria and procedures
1. Members of each department shall approve all criteria for evaluation of instruction, scholarship and creativity, and service and all procedures for evaluation.

2. Each department shall describe in writing its criteria and procedures for evaluation. A copy shall be submitted to the dean for approval.

3. Regents policy requires that a written system of student ratings of instruction be utilized in the annual evaluation of each faculty member (Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.5). Completed rating forms are kept on file in the department chair’s office and are the property of the University.

4. The special evaluations (i.e., promotion, tenure, sixth-year lecturer review, pre- and post-tenure, and the follow-up fifth-year lecturer/senior lecturer reviews) should also include some type of systematic evaluation by peers, but may also include evaluations by others who have knowledge of the work of the faculty member.

F. College determination of procedures
Each college shall submit in writing to the Provost’s approval its procedures for all special evaluations.

Student Ratings of Instruction
Georgia Southern requires and conducts written or online student ratings of instruction each academic term (excluding summer) to provide information to faculty for their use in the improvement of teaching. Results are also used in faculty evaluation as mandated by Regents policy as a portion of an evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Department chairs return a summary of numerical results and students’ written comments to faculty each academic term; original responses are the property of the University. Courses shall be evaluated by students in the same manner as the course is conducted.

Partially online courses whose content is offered 50% or more online are evaluated through CoursEval. As with any evaluation, faculty shall have the right to respond to student ratings regarding factors that might have influenced student ratings of instruction scores.

Faculty Annual Reports
Faculty report their professional activities in early January for the previous calendar year. These reports form the basis for the annual performance evaluation and for department, school, college, and university reports.

Salary Increases
The Board of Regents receives an annual appropriation from the General Assembly for all phases of its operations. Expenditures for operation of the University System are therefore necessarily contingent upon legislative appropriations, including salaries. While compensation could be reduced as a consequence of actions of the Governor or the General Assembly, it is the stated intent of the Board “to maintain current salary commitments insofar as possible to every employee, and the Board will exert its composite influence and best efforts to that end” (Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.12.1).

Salary increases for full-time teaching faculty are awarded on the basis of merit. Merit ratings are determined by evaluation procedures established in accordance with university policies and represent a consensus arrived at by the department chair, the dean, and the Provost.

Criteria for the determination of merit increases shall include teaching ability, completion of significant professional development activities (including the attainment of additional academic degrees), promotion in rank, seniority, research productivity, academic achievements and publications, academic honors and recognitions, academic advisement, relevant professional achievements and recognitions, and non-teaching services to the institution (Academic and Student Affairs Handbook, § 2.07 and § 4.1402).
Promotion Guidelines

Georgia Southern approves faculty for promotion based upon Regents’ policies (Academic and Student Affairs Handbook, § 4.5). Promotions in rank are based on merit and are not automatic. Promotion applications are considered and recommendations made at the department/school, college, and Provost’s levels, culminating in an institutional decision at the President’s level. The Board of Regents has fixed certain minimum criteria for promotion. Promotion at Georgia Southern requires an ongoing record of satisfactory performance in all areas of evaluation, with more than satisfactory performance in teaching and one other area. Regents’ policies state that there should be appropriate involvement of faculty in making recommendations for promotion. Each unit shall have written procedures for making recommendations, and these procedures shall be available to all faculty members. Specific guidelines for promotion should be found in the departmental and collegiate policies and procedures. Unit and college procedures must be approved by the Provost.

The difference between successive faculty ranks is primarily one of achievement and professional growth and development. Aspirants to higher ranks are expected to demonstrate progressively more advanced levels of professional maturity, accomplishment, and recognition beyond the boundaries of the University as they are considered for promotion.

At Georgia Southern the terminal degree or its equivalent is required for promotion to associate or full professor. Strong justification should be provided in support of any recommendation for promotion to the ranks of associate or full professor without the terminal degree in the discipline.

Length of service is taken into consideration. Faculty are eligible for and may be reviewed for promotion in rank during their fifth year of service in their current rank. If recommended for promotion, the new rank will go into effect at the beginning of their next contract period. Recommendations for promotion are not normally considered for individuals who are currently on leaves of absence. Under special circumstances, faculty who are performing significantly above the expectations for their current rank may be considered for “early” promotion. At research and comprehensive universities, faculty may be considered for “early” promotion with less than the required minimum years of service in rank listed below; however, these cases require strong justification and approval by the President.

- For early promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, faculty must have served a minimum of three years as Lecturer.
- For early promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor, faculty must have served a minimum of three years as Instructor.
- For early promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, faculty must have served a minimum of four years as an Assistant Professor.
- For early promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, faculty must have served a minimum of four years as an Associate Professor.

At the time of an individual’s initial appointment, a maximum of three years of probationary credit towards promotion may be awarded for service at other institutions or service in a faculty rank within the institution. In extraordinary cases, research and comprehensive universities may award more than three years of probationary credit at initial faculty appointments. Such awards require approval by the President and written notification to the University System of Georgia Chief Academic Officer. Faculty given probationary credit towards promotion may not use their probationary credit towards consideration for “early” promotion without the approval of the President.

In considering the promotion of an academic administrator (vice president, dean, department chair), the immediate supervisor must obtain the appropriate input from the academic department involved. Decisions regarding promotion of an academic administrator will be based upon the faculty evaluation criteria and will be independent of administrative performance.
The composition of the departmental and college promotion committees shall follow the guidelines as set forth in each college’s Bylaws or procedural manual.

**Extension of the Tenure Clock/Review Process (FMLA, Sickness, etc.)**

Due to any number of circumstances, faculty members may request an extension of the timeline for tenure, pre- and post-tenure reviews, sixth-year lecturer review, or lecturer/senior lecturer fifth-year follow-up review. These requests may include, but are not limited to, reasons approved by the Board of Regents in Section 8.2.7, Board of Regents Policy Manual (except § 8.2.7.1, Board of Regents Policy Manual). Each faculty member may be granted up to 12 months per occurrence and may reapply. Under extreme circumstances, faculty may request a continuance.

In the event of medical or non-medical circumstances beyond the faculty member’s control (including but not limited to adoption of a child, care for a family member with a serious health condition, or death of a family member), or as a result of a compelling professional opportunity or other circumstance that significantly interferes with the faculty member’s progress toward tenure (including, but not limited to, off-campus post-doctoral appointments, significant delays in the provision of start-up funds or facilities, the effects of natural disasters, or other off-campus duties that prevent or impede progress in teaching, service, or scholarship), a candidate for tenure may request to extend the tenure clock. Application should be made in writing to the department chair or unit head; approved requests are then submitted to the college dean, the college Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the University’s Provost. Requests for extensions must be made before the final pre-tenure year, except in the case of emergencies. An applicant may apply for an extension of the tenure clock more than once, but ordinarily will not be granted more than two years total. If such an extension is approved, the faculty member will enter into a written agreement to establish a new time table for the mandatory tenure review. During the tenure year, this document must be made available to all external reviewers and must be included in the tenure dossier.

Dossiers for candidates who have extended their tenure clock are based on the time dedicated to full-time service. A faculty member may utilize the full, extended probationary period to meet tenure expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service without any penalty regarding what should or should not be considered during candidate evaluation. As acceptance of submissions for publication and opportunities for leadership in service can occur at any time, documentation of evidence for the full probationary period must be considered for tenure decisions.

**Tenure Guidelines**

The institution approves faculty for tenure in accordance with Section 8.3.7.2, Board of Regents Policy Manual, which includes a comprehensive statement of tenure policies in the University System. Tenure ensures academic freedom for faculty and protection against improper restrictions of the freedom of inquiry in teaching, scholarship, and service. It protects the right to publish or otherwise present scholarly work publicly without the threat of political or other confining or arbitrary orthodoxies. Academic freedom and tenure sustain and support the transmission and advancement of knowledge and understanding, which are central to the mission of the University. Tenured faculty have the responsibility to engage in continuous professional growth; to remain vital and contributing members of the faculty; to present accurate information in teaching; and to facilitate, support, defend, and preserve an environment of academic integrity.

Tenure applications are considered and recommendations made at the department/school, college, and Provost’s levels, culminating in an institutional decision at the President’s level. Tenure at Georgia Southern University may be awarded after five years of full-time service at the institution at the rank of assistant professor or higher. Probationary credit, which must be granted at the time of initial appointment, may be used to reduce this time requirement. Meeting the minimum time requirement does not guarantee the award of tenure. A faculty member

---

1 This list of examples is not designed to be exhaustive, but to illustrate the kind of circumstances which substantially interfere with the obligations associated with progress toward tenure.
initially appointed at the rank of lecturer at a University System of Georgia institution may be awarded tenure after five years, provided that the individual has served at least three years at the rank of assistant professor at Georgia Southern University. A tenure timeline must be completed for each non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member in the department and placed in the faculty member’s personnel file.

Recommendations for probationary credit will typically be initiated at the departmental level subject to approval by the dean and Provost at the time of appointment and will be subject to the following guidelines.

- Persons who served in tenure-track positions at other institutions may be granted up to three years based upon evaluation of years of prior service and professional credentials.
- Persons who were initially appointed as a lecturer at the University System of Georgia institution may be granted probationary credit for up to three years of service as a lecturer.
- The decision whether to use any or all probationary credit should be made by the applicant in consultation with his or her department chair and dean. When such application is made and the individual has combined probationary credit and Georgia Southern full-time service years to equal an “on time” application, the application shall not be viewed as early by any party involved in the process.
- According to Section 8.3.7.4, Board of Regents Policy Manual, in exceptional cases tenure may be granted to “an outstanding distinguished senior faculty member [...] upon the faculty member’s initial appointment [...]. Each such recommendation shall be granted only in cases in which the faculty member, at a minimum, is appointed as an associate or full professor, was already tenured at a prior institution, and brings a demonstrably national reputation to the institution.”

Faculty who apply and are not recommended for tenure in minimum time or who use probationary credit and are not recommended may apply for tenure only once more. The maximum number of years to earn tenure is seven years. Individuals are not required to include probationary credit in the calculation of this maximum. Typically, individuals are considered for tenure in their fifth or sixth year, including any probationary credit.

In considering the tenure of an academic administrator (vice president, dean, department chair), the immediate supervisor must obtain the appropriate input from the tenured faculty in the academic department involved. Decisions regarding tenure of an academic administrator will be based upon the criteria outlined above and below and will be independent of administrative performance.

Departmental tenure committees shall consist of three or more tenured faculty members and shall seek input from all tenured faculty in the department. In instances where departments do not have enough tenured faculty members to serve, the existing tenured faculty members shall work with the dean of the college to establish an appropriate committee. Tenure committees at the college level shall be made up of tenured faculty members.

Areas for evaluation for the award of tenure and annual renewal of probationary tenure-track faculty at Georgia Southern University include the following:

- teaching;
- service (institutional and/or professional);
- scholarship;
- professional growth and development; and
- ability of the professor to function within the Georgia Southern academic community.

Specific guidelines for tenure should be found in the departmental and collegiate policies and procedures.

Tenure-track faculty serve a probationary period as described above in a series of one-year appointments. The offer of a one-year contract in no way implies a commitment or obligation on the part of the University to offer contracts for subsequent years. Notice of the intention not to renew a non-tenured faculty member shall be furnished in writing according to the following schedule:

- at least three months before the date of termination of an initial one-year contract (February 1);
- at least six months before the date of termination of a second one-year contract (November 1);
• at least nine months before the date of termination of a contract after two or more years of service at the institution (August 1).

This schedule of notification does not apply to faculty holding limited-term or part-time positions.

Tenure resides at the institutional level. Only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors are eligible for tenure. Faculty members with part-time appointments shall not acquire tenure, nor does tenure apply to honorary (adjunct) appointments.

Procedure for Appeals
Appeals of post-tenure, tenure, and promotion review recommendations made by department or college committees or department/unit chairs must first be carried out according to college procedures, but may culminate in an appeal for reconsideration of the recommendation to the dean. Colleges should structure their timetables to allow for appeals to be acted upon in advance of the due date of the college recommendations to the Provost. Recommendations made by a dean may be appealed to the Provost within 20 calendar days of notification of the decision.

Final decisions are made by the President. In accordance with the Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 8.6, any appeal of the President’s decision must be made to the University System of Georgia Board’s Office of Legal Affairs within 20 calendar days of notification of the President’s decision.

Renewal/Nonrenewal of Faculty
Renewal/Nonrenewal of Probationary Faculty
Department chairs will seek the advice of the tenured faculty on decisions of renewal of probationary (non-tenured, tenure-track) faculty. In cases of non-renewal of probationary (non-tenured, tenure-track) faculty, the department chair shall call for a vote of the department’s Tenure and Promotion Committee. Chairs may seek additional advice as they deem appropriate. Before written notice is given to the faculty member, the department chair will discuss the outcome of the vote with the dean, and then the dean will discuss with the Provost, each intention not to renew.

Grounds for Removal: Regents Policy
A tenured or non-tenured faculty member may be dismissed before the end of his/her contract term for any of the following reasons, provided that the institution has complied with procedural due process requirements:

1. Conviction or admission of guilt of a felony or of a crime involving moral turpitude during the period of employment—or prior thereto if the conviction or admission of guilt was willfully concealed.

2. Professional incompetency, neglect of duty, or default of academic integrity in teaching, in research, or in scholarship.

3. Unlawful manufacture, distribution, sale, use or possession of marijuana, a controlled substance, or other illegal or dangerous drugs as defined by Georgia laws; teaching or working under the influence of alcohol which interferes with the faculty member’s performance of duty or his/her responsibilities to the institution or to his/her profession.

4. Conviction or admission of guilt in a court proceeding of any criminal drug offense.

5. Physical or mental incompetency as determined by law or by a medical board of three or more licensed physicians and reviewed by a committee of the faculty.

6. False swearing with respect to official documents filed with the institution.
7. Disruption of any teaching, research, administrative, disciplinary, public service, or other authorized activity.

8. Violation of, among other policies, Board Policy 8.2.1 (non-discrimination), Board Policy 8.2.16 (sexual harassment), or Board Policy 8.2.23 (amorous relationships).

9. Such other grounds for dismissal as may be specified in the Statutes of the institution.

Each institution, as part of its Statutes, may supplement Regents’ policies governing causes for dismissal and procedures for dismissal. Each institution should provide for standards governing faculty conduct, including sanctions short of dismissal, and procedures for the implementation of such sanctions. In the imposition of sanctions, the burden of proof lies with the institution (Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.9.1).

Procedures for Dismissal: Regents Policy

These procedures shall apply only to the dismissal of a faculty member with tenure, or a non-tenured faculty member before the end of the term specified in his/her contract. It is intended that the procedures set forth below shall be considered as minimum standards of due process and shall not be construed as a limitation upon individual standards or procedures, consistent with the Policy Manual and Bylaws of the Board, which a University System of Georgia institution may elect to adopt for its own improvement or to make adjustment to its own particular circumstances. Such additional standards or procedures shall be incorporated into the Statutes of the institution.

The president may at any time remove any faculty member for cause. Cause or grounds for dismissal are set forth in the Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 8.3.9.1 and in the approved Statutes or Bylaws of an institution. Whenever the words “president” or “administration” are used in these procedures, they shall be construed to include the designated representative of the president.

Preliminary Procedures

The dismissal of a tenured faculty member, or a non-tenured faculty member during his/her contract term should be preceded by:

1. Discussion between the faculty member and appropriate administrative officers looking toward a mutual settlement.

2. Informal inquiry by an appropriate faculty committee which may, upon failing to effect an adjustment, advise the president whether dismissal proceedings should be undertaken; its advisory opinion shall not be binding upon the president.

3. A letter to the faculty member forewarning that he/she is about to be terminated for cause and informing him/her that a statement of charges will be forwarded to him/her upon request. The faculty member may also request a formal hearing on the charges before a faculty committee. Failure to request charges or a hearing within a reasonable time shall constitute a waiver of the right to a hearing.

4. A statement of charges, if requested by the faculty member, framed with reasonable particularity by the president or his or her designated representative. Along with the charges, the faculty member shall be advised of the names of the witnesses to be used against him or her together with the nature of their expected testimony.

Provision for Hearing Committee

A dismissal as defined above shall be preceded by a statement of charges or causes (grounds for dismissal) if so requested, including a statement that the faculty member concerned shall have the right to be heard by a faculty hearing committee.
The Hearing Committee shall consist of not fewer than three or more than five impartial faculty members appointed by the executive committee (or its equivalent) of the highest legislative body of the faculty, from among the members of the entire faculty, as defined in Section 8.1.1 of the Board of Regents Policy Manual, of the institution. Members of the Hearing Committee may serve concurrently on other committees of the faculty. The Hearing Committee will meet as a body when it is called into session by the chair of the body that selected them either at his/her discretion, or upon the request of the president or the faculty member who is subject to dismissal.

When the Hearing Committee is called into session, it shall elect a chair from among its membership. A member should remove himself/herself from the case, either at the request of a party or on his/her own initiative if he/she deems himself/herself disqualified for bias or interest. Each party shall have a maximum of two challenges without stated cause, provided, however, that all challenges whether with or without cause shall be made in writing and filed with the chair of the Hearing Committee at least five days in advance of the date set for the hearing. The chair shall have the authority to decide whether a member of the committee is disqualified for cause. If the chair determines that a member is so disqualified or if a committee member removes himself/herself from a case, the replacement shall be made in the same manner as the original committee was selected. If the chair is thus removed, the committee shall elect a new chair after committee replacements have been appointed. A minimum of three members is required for any action to be taken.

**Dismissal Procedures**

In all instances where a hearing is requested, the following hearing procedures shall apply:

1. Service of notice of the hearing with specific reasons or charges against the faculty member together with the names of the members of the Hearing Committee shall be made in writing at least 20 days prior to the hearing. The faculty member may waive a hearing or he/she may respond to the charges in writing at least five days in advance of the date set for the hearing. If a faculty member waives a hearing, but denies the charges or asserts that the charges do not support a finding of adequate cause, the Hearing Committee shall evaluate all available evidence and rest its recommendation upon the evidence in the record.

2. The Hearing Committee, in consultation with the president and the faculty member, may exercise its judgment as to whether the hearing should be public or private.

3. During the proceedings the faculty member and the administration shall be permitted to have an academic advisor and/or counsel of his/her choice. The Hearing Committee will be permitted to have advisory counsel.

4. At the request of either party or the chair of the Hearing Committee, a representative of a responsible education association shall be permitted to attend as an observer.

5. A tape recording or transcript of the proceedings shall be kept and made available to the faculty member and the administration in the event an appeal is filed.

6. An oath or affirmation shall be administered to all witnesses by any person authorized by law to administer oaths in the state of Georgia.

7. The Hearing Committee may grant adjournments to enable either party to investigate evidence as to which a valid claim of surprise is made.

8. The faculty member and the administration shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity to obtain necessary witnesses and documentary or other evidence.
9. The faculty member and the administration will have the right to confront and cross-examine all witnesses. Where the witness cannot or will not appear but the Committee determines that the interests of justice require the admission of his/her statement, the Committee will identify the witness, disclose his statement and if possible provide for interrogatories.

10. The Hearing Committee will not be bound by strict rules of legal evidence and may admit any evidence which is of probative value in determining the issues involved. Every possible effort will be made to obtain the most reliable evidence available. All questions relating to admissibility of evidence or other legal matters shall be decided by the chair or presiding officer.

11. The findings of fact and the decision of the Hearing Committee will be based solely on the hearing record.

12. Except for such simple announcements as may be required covering the time of the hearing and similar matters, public statements and publicity about the case by either the faculty member or administrative officers should be avoided until the proceedings have been completed, including consideration by the Board of Regents in the event an appeal is filed. The president and the faculty member will be notified in writing of the decision and recommendation, if any, of the Hearing Committee.

13. If the Committee concludes that adequate cause for dismissal has not been established by the evidence in the record, it will so report to the president. If the president does not approve the report, he/she should state his/her reasons in writing to the Committee for response before rendering his/her final decision. If the Committee concludes that an academic penalty less than dismissal would be more appropriate than dismissal, it may so recommend with supporting reasons. The president may or may not follow the recommendations of the Committee.

14. After complying with the foregoing procedures, the president shall send an official letter to the faculty member notifying him/her of his/her retention or removal for cause. Such letter shall be delivered to addressee only, with receipt to show to whom and when delivered and address where delivered. The letter shall clearly state any charges which the president has found sustained and shall notify such person that he/she may apply for discretionary review as provided for in Policy 8.6 [of the Board of Regents Policy Manual].

15. Upon dismissal by the president, the faculty member shall be suspended from employment without pay from the date of the final decision of the president. Should the faculty member be reinstated pursuant to an application under Policy 8.6, he/she shall be compensated from the date of the suspension.

Policy on Pre-Tenure Review

(Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 8.3.9.2)

In addition to the annual review of faculty, the University conducts a comprehensive review of achievements and performance in the third year of the probationary period as a basis for recommending renewal or nonrenewal of the contract beyond the following year. Each department or unit must develop procedures and criteria within the parameters established by Regents policy and the university policy outlined below. The procedures and criteria shall be described to faculty by the department chair/unit head and provided to each incoming faculty member in a written set of departmental/unit procedures. The written procedures shall make clear that a positive pre-tenure review is not a guarantee of promotion and/or tenure.

Because the pre-tenure review looks ahead to tenure and, in many cases, promotion, criteria at the unit level must mirror the unit’s tenure and promotion criteria, emphasizing excellence in teaching. The pre-tenure review must assess progress toward tenure and promotion and provide written feedback to the faculty member with specific suggestions for continued progress. The pre-tenure review may lead to a decision of nonrenewal in those cases where tenure is not possible.
The pre-tenure review is carried out in the third year of the probationary period or, in those cases where the faculty member has prior years of service toward tenure, at the midpoint of the remaining probationary period. By September 15 of each year, candidates for pre-tenure review are notified of their review and asked to prepare materials specified in the unit’s procedures for submission by February 1. Submissions should include copies of annual reviews and materials related to achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service. Unit procedures must outline how and by whom the materials will be evaluated; how input will be sought from peers, students, unit heads, and others; and the specific criteria for the review. All input will be considered by a committee of tenured faculty which must include at least three members. Committees which function as part of the pre-tenure review should be diverse in their composition. Units are not required to substitute the pre-tenure review for the annual review but may do so.

The review committee shall deliver its written report to the unit head who is responsible for making a recommendation to the next level of administrative oversight. Unit heads who are department chairs will discuss the content of the review committee’s report and their own recommendations with their dean. Unit heads shall then give the faculty member a written summary of their recommendation, a copy of the committee’s report, and any suggestions for continued progress; discuss all materials with the faculty member; and give the faculty member an opportunity to provide a written response which will be appended to the written report. Feedback from the pre-tenure review should be candid and future-oriented. Unit heads are responsible for assisting faculty with implementing plans for continued progress. Such plans should be integrated with campus resources such as the Centers for Teaching and Technology; internal and external grant programs; and formal and informal mentoring systems. In cases where tenure is not possible, the unit head will deliver a letter of nonrenewal consistent with timetables in Regents and university policies.

Both parties sign the report to indicate that they have discussed it. The unit head should remind the faculty member that a positive pre-tenure review is not a guarantee of promotion and/or tenure. The unit head apprises the next higher level of administrative oversight of the results of the pre-tenure review conference and provides that officer with a copy of the signed report. A copy shall be placed in the faculty member’s file at the unit level, along with materials submitted for the review. Subsequent annual reviews should assess continued achievement and provide feedback regarding acceptable progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The dean compiles a memorandum to the Provost, summarizing the findings at each level of review for each candidate and including a final assessment on whether the candidate meets, exceeds, or falls below expectations. This memorandum is submitted electronically to the Provost’s Office no later than mid-April.

Policy on Post-Tenure Review

Introduction

Post-tenure review, the systematic, periodic, cumulative review of all tenured faculty, is an extension of the evaluation system currently in place. Coupled with any evaluation process is the obligation to provide faculty development opportunities that allow all faculty to realize their full potential. Post-tenure review focuses on identifying faculty development opportunities for tenured faculty that mutually benefit the individual and the institution. The ultimate purpose of post-tenure review is to recognize, reward, and enhance the performance of tenured faculty.

Purpose and Criteria

The post-tenure review process and the process for deciding promotion and tenure share the same evaluation criteria; however, their purposes and evaluation standards are different. The purposes of post-tenure review are:

- to recognize and reward tenured faculty who have made and continue to make significant contributions to the missions of their departments, colleges, and the University;
- to provide faculty development opportunities for tenured faculty for the primary purpose of enhancing teaching, but also scholarship and/or service, in a way that is mutually beneficial to the individual and the University; and
Post-tenure review not only concentrates on the period under review, but also considers the cumulative contributions of faculty. For this reason, and because it focuses on continuing a mutually beneficial relationship between the institution and the individual, judgments regarding post-tenure review should be based on contributions over one’s career as well as those since the last review. A satisfactory post-tenure review indicates that the individual continues to make contributions which benefit the University, its students, and its other constituents.

In an institution devoted to “teaching first,” teaching and contributions to the learning environment are of paramount importance in the post-tenure review process. Evidence of contributions in the areas of scholarship and service is also required. The three criteria, teaching, scholarship, and service, are described in Section 205.01 of the Faculty Handbook. Each unit should define the exact criteria and how they will be assessed (see Roles and Responsibilities at IV), taking into consideration the uniqueness of the individual, the variations within disciplines, and the differing expectations and assignments that influence faculty contributions. Individual differences are reflected in varying combinations of emphasis in teaching, scholarship, and service; however, teaching and contributions to the learning environment are the primary focus of post-tenure review.

Schedule
Board of Regents policy stipulates that each tenured faculty member is to be reviewed five years after the most recent promotion or personnel action, as defined below, and at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a promotion, a written declaration to retire within five years (submitted through the appropriate dean’s office to the Provost’s Office), or a leave of absence. In the latter case, the faculty member will be reviewed upon returning to active employment. Tenured faculty whose primary responsibilities are in administration, including interim appointments, will be reviewed five years after returning to a full-time faculty position. Faculty members undergoing post-tenure review will submit their materials for evaluation to the department chair or unit head by mid-January.

Roles and Responsibilities
Each department, school, college, and the library will develop written procedures and specific criteria for post-tenure review as outlined below and will provide a copy of the procedures to each tenured and tenure-track faculty member. Reviews may be carried out at the department, school, or college level as agreed upon and described in the units’ written procedures. The phrases “department chair” and “unit head” as used in this document refer to the line officer who is the immediate supervisor of the faculty member undergoing post-tenure review.

Faculty are responsible for providing documentation of their performance as follows:
- an up-to-date curriculum vitae and copies of the annual performance review for each of the five years under consideration;
- measures of effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service (including but not limited to a combination of written (or online) student ratings of instruction and peer evaluations);
- a self-evaluation narrative of accomplishments for the period under review and projected goals for the next five-year period; and
- other documentation as specified by the college or department/unit.

Faculty may submit other materials which may enhance the review committee’s understanding of their performance. It is recognized that materials submitted by non-teaching faculty will differ substantially from those submitted by teaching faculty. The faculty member and the department chair or unit head will develop the documentation and provide it to the review committee.
The post-tenure review process will be conducted by a committee of at least three faculty peers with tenure, with the committee composition and selection process to be determined at the department, school, or college level in consultation with the appropriate dean. Units should strive to ensure diversity of membership in post-tenure review committees. After reviewing documentation of performance as outlined in the unit’s post-tenure review document, the committee will be expected to provide informed and candid feedback in a written report on the quality of the faculty member’s performance, accomplishments, and contributions in teaching, scholarship, and/or service. Meritorious accomplishments should be noted by the committee in any review. Likewise, major, chronic, or ongoing deficiencies should be identified and supporting documentation provided.

The committee will provide a written summary of its findings and any recommendations for faculty reward or development to the department chair or unit head who will transmit the written summary to the faculty member and discuss it with him or her. The unit head should append his/her comments, and both the faculty member and the unit head should sign the document to indicate that they have discussed the committee’s report and the unit head’s comments. The faculty member may append a written response. A copy of the committee’s report, the unit head’s comments, and any written response by the faculty member will then be sent to the administrative officer at least one level above the faculty member’s administrative unit where they will be reviewed and commented on by the dean/administrative director. All written comments will also be forwarded to the faculty member. These comments, along with all other documents that played a substantive part in the review not readily available elsewhere, will then be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file at the department/unit level. The dean composes a memorandum to the Provost, summarizing the findings at each level of review for each candidate and including a final assessment on whether the candidate meets, exceeds, or falls below expectations. This memorandum is submitted electronically to the Provost’s Office by mid-March.

In response to post-tenure review, the unit head will be responsible, in consultation with the faculty member, for deciding whether the faculty member should be rewarded for meritorious accomplishments (see “Relationships to Other Campus Processes” below) and/or engage in faculty development activities that would be helpful to the faculty member and in the best interest of the institution. Funding for any required development plan will be arranged by the unit head and the administrative officer at least one level above. In most cases, the results of the post-tenure review are likely to reveal that the faculty member is performing well, and any development plan would focus on further enhancing the faculty member’s performance (e.g., enhancing knowledge and skills in the use of current technologies in teaching or scholarship). Faculty development is an important opportunity for all faculty members as they seek to reach their full potential and perform at their full capacity.

In cases where a faculty member is identified in the post-tenure review as having deficiencies, the administrative unit head, in consultation with the faculty member, must establish a formal plan of development. A formal plan includes identifying appropriate resources for faculty development on campus, on other campuses of the University System, at the System level, or in other locations. The plan for faculty development should (a) define specific goals or outcomes that the plan is designed to achieve; (b) outline the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals or outcomes; (c) set appropriate times within which the goals or outcomes should be accomplished; and (d) indicate appropriate criteria by which the faculty member will monitor progress. The faculty member’s unit head will be responsible for forwarding the formal faculty development plan resulting from a post-tenure review to the appropriate administrative office at least one level above the faculty member’s unit. The unit head and the administrative officer at least one level above are jointly responsible for arranging for appropriate funding for the development plan, if required.

At the time of the annual evaluation, the administrative unit head will meet with each faculty member who is working on a development plan because of deficiencies to review progress toward achieving the goals of the formal faculty development plan. A progress report, which will be included in the annual review, will be forwarded each year to the appropriate administrative officer at least one unit above the faculty member’s unit. It will be the responsibility of the unit head and the current post-tenure review committee to determine if, after a specified period of three years, the faculty member has been successful in completing the formal faculty development plan; they will report that finding to the appropriate administrative officer at least one level above the faculty member’s unit. An individual who successfully completes a development plan will be reviewed five years from the date of the
original post-tenure review. If the faculty member has not been successful in completing the formal faculty development plan, the University may move for dismissal for cause under existing Board of Regents policy, Section 8.3.5.4, provided that the deficiencies meet the strict requirements of that policy.

A faculty member who disagrees with the results of a post-tenure review, including the need for a development plan, shall have the right to appeal as defined by the unit in implementing this policy. Each unit will develop an appeal procedure. The unit will provide the Provost as well as all tenured and tenure-track faculty with a copy of this procedure.

Relationships to Other Campus Processes

Academic Freedom  This policy is written in the spirit of upholding the University’s commitment to academic freedom, and committees and individuals who act under this policy must ensure the academic freedom of faculty under review. The policy is not designed to abridge academic freedom, hinder the tenure or annual review process, or facilitate the dismissal of faculty (see the Academic Freedom Policy, approved by the Faculty Senate in June 1998, in § 201 of the Faculty Handbook).

Termination for Cause  Nothing in the post-tenure review policy alters current Regents policy on dismissal for cause or its due process requirements. While dismissal for cause as the result of the post-tenure review process will be rare, it may be justified in certain instances as defined in Regents policy, Section 8.3.9.

Non-Tenure Track Appointments

Institutions of the University System are authorized to establish professional positions designated as non-tenure track positions. Such positions may be established for full-time professional personnel employed in administrative positions or to staff research, technical, special, career, and public service programs or programs that are anticipated to have a limited life span or that are funded, fully or partially, through non-System sources. There shall be no maximum time limitation for service in positions of this category.

Positions originally designated as non-tenure track positions or as tenure-track positions may be converted to the other type only with approval by the institution’s president. Individuals employed in non-tenure track positions may apply, on an equal basis with other candidates, for tenure-track positions that may become available. The transfer of individuals from tenure-track to non-tenure track positions shall be effected on a voluntary basis only. Probationary credit toward tenure shall not be awarded for service in non-tenure track positions, except for lecturers and senior lecturers (§ 8.3.8, Board of Regents Policy Manual).

Notice of intention not to renew contracts of non-tenure track personnel who have been awarded academic rank shall follow the schedule required for tenure-track personnel. There is no maximum time limit for non-tenure track faculty at the rank of instructor. Non-tenure track faculty are eligible for promotion and all other faculty rights except that they shall not be eligible for consideration for the award of tenure.

Lecturers

The appointment and promotion of lecturers at Georgia Southern University are based upon the experience and academic background of the candidate as well as the instructional needs in the position. The designation applies to non-tenure track positions that carry out special instructional functions. The position is governed by all provisions of Board of Regents’ policy 8.3.8.1, including being capped at no more than 20% of the FTE corps of primarily undergraduate instruction. The administration shall facilitate a reasonable distribution among departments and schools in usage of these positions across the University.

As described in the Board of Regents Policy Manual 3.2.1.1, lecturers are part of the corps of instruction and members of the faculty. As such, lecturers have access to grievance procedures which are defined in the Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook, Section 220.01, as available to “all members of the faculty.”
An initial appointment to a lecturer position is for a one-year period. Subsequently, renewal is on an annual basis. In no case will the service as lecturer or senior lecturer imply any claim upon tenure. However, as stated in the Board of Regents Policy Manual 8.3.4.3: “Lecturers and senior lecturers who have served full-time for the entire previous academic year have the presumption of reappointment for the subsequent academic year unless notified in writing to the contrary.” Notification of non-reappointment will be provided as early as possible, preferably following the schedule for notification of tenure-track faculty, as stated in the Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook, Section 205.02, but no later than the following (Board of Regents’ policy 8.3.4.3):

For lecturers with less than six years of full-time, continuous service in that position, institutions must provide non-reappointment notice at least 30 calendar days prior to the institution’s first day of classes in the semester. For senior lecturers or lecturers with six years or more of full-time, continuous service in that position, institutions must provide non-reappointment notice at least 180 calendar days prior to the institution’s first day of classes in the semester.

As stated in the Board of Regents Policy Manual 8.3.4.3, “Lecturers or senior lecturers who have served for six or more years of full-time service at an institution and who have received timely notice of non-reappointment shall be entitled to a review of the decision in accordance with published procedures” of Georgia Southern University.

**Annual Evaluations**

Every lecturer and senior lecturer shall have an annual review conducted along the same schedule as individuals in the professorial ranks. Any additional requirements for departmental input or constitution of the review committee may be adopted by the individual department and/or college in which they are appointed. For lecturers, annual performance reviews should show achievement in teaching and achievement in at least one of the following areas: (1) service; (2) professional growth and development. The faculty in each unit and college should establish its own formal review process (mechanisms and policies) for lecturers and senior lecturers, including definitions of “exceptional teaching ability,” “extraordinary value to the institution,” and “noteworthy achievement.”

As stated in the Board of Regents Policy Manual 8.3.8.1, reappointment of a lecturer who has completed six consecutive years of service to an institution will be permitted only if the reviews of the lecturer demonstrate “exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution.” After the sixth year or promotion, a further major review will take place every five years. The intent of this review is to focus on continuing a mutually beneficial relationship between the institution and individual, to provide development opportunities, and to recognize, reward, and enhance faculty performance. Input for evaluating lecturers and senior lecturers at these points of major review will follow established unit and college policies as specified in the required policy documents. The departmental review committee shall be composed of at least three members, including both tenured faculty and senior lecturers, if any exist in the unit.

**Promotion to Senior Lecturer**

To be promoted to senior lecturer, a lecturer must have served in rank for a minimum of five years and demonstrate through annual performance reviews and other credible evidence noteworthy achievement in teaching and achievement in at least one of the following areas: (1) service; (2) professional growth and development. Recommendations for promotion to senior lecturer are made utilizing the process and documentation described in Section 208, Promotion Guidelines, of the Faculty Handbook.

In keeping with Board of Regents’ policy, promotion to senior lecturer requires approval by the President. Reappointment procedures for senior lecturers follow the same reappointment procedures as those for lecturers.

**Appeals**

The candidate for promotion or retention beyond the sixth year may appeal a negative decision, except in the case of programmatic changes or financial exigency. The appeal must be based on the perception of significant omissions or commissions in the review process, impermissible bias in the review, or procedural errors that
precluded an objective, fair review. The appeal must be to the next level of review. The responsible administrator at the appeal level shall review the appeal and make a recommendation. If the decision on appeal is to support the promotion or retention, the review process shall continue through the remaining review levels as if the decision from which the appeal was filed had been positive. If the decision on appeal is against the applicant, a further appeal may be filed. The process of appeals may continue until a final decision by the President.
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OWG Number: ___5-2______________________________
OWG Name: ___Faculty Welfare_____________________
OWG Co-Chairs: ___Dr. Jim LoBue, Dr. Bob LeFavi__________
Date submitted: ___2/8/18__________

OWG Recommendation:

That the attached statement on promotion and tenure for tenure-track faculty as well as corresponding guidelines for lecturers be adopted as the policy of the new Georgia Southern University and be included in the new faculty handbook.

Explanation of Recommendation:

This working group believes that, as one university, the new Georgia Southern University must have one set of guidelines for promotion and tenure for all faculty. Clearly each college and department must cast their own guidelines appropriate to the culture of the discipline. This statement is primarily an edit of the faculty handbook for the “old” Georgia Southern University. Specifically, the following numbered sections addressed in this proposal are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Armstrong Faculty HB</th>
<th>Georgia Southern Faculty HB</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Changes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Desired Attributes</td>
<td>Deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Faculty Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.2.1</td>
<td>205.1</td>
<td>Criteria for Fac. Evaluation</td>
<td>Significant Changes scattered throughout section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.4.1, 107.4.2, 107.4.6</td>
<td>205.2</td>
<td>Evaluation of Faculty</td>
<td>Very minor changes except for 3 lines added at end 3rd parag.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td>205.3</td>
<td>Fac. Evaluation Guidelines</td>
<td>1 line begin. First parag., 2 lines begin. Second parag. 1 line at the end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td>205.4</td>
<td>Types of Evaluation</td>
<td>Only minor differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td>205.5</td>
<td>Sched. of Complet. of Eval.</td>
<td>Essentially the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>205.6</td>
<td>Procedures for Fac. Eval.</td>
<td>Section A (remove advisement and other wording), other changes in Sec E4 and F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.2.2</td>
<td>205.7</td>
<td>Student Ratings of Inst.</td>
<td>Essentially unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.2.2</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Annual Reports</td>
<td>Essentially unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td>207</td>
<td>Salary Increases</td>
<td>Essentially unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.4.4</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>Promotion Guidelines</td>
<td>First parag. minor changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA (2XX)</strong></td>
<td>Proposed New Section: Extension of the Tenure Clock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.4.1</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Tenure Guidelines</td>
<td>Minor add. 3rd sentence Rewording in 1st bullet pt. Delet. of parag on Admin Pos and faculty lines Last bullets: replace 4th bull. Delete 6th bull. Add minor statement after bull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Procedure for Appeals</td>
<td>Significant change in number of calendar days Significant addition last line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Renewal/Nonrenewal of Faculty</td>
<td>Significant changes in this short section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td>211.1</td>
<td>Renew./Nonrenew. of Probationary Faculty</td>
<td>Significant changes in this short section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.5.5</td>
<td>211.2</td>
<td>Grounds for Removal</td>
<td>Essentially unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td>211.3</td>
<td>Procedures for Dismissal</td>
<td>Essentially unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.4.2</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Policy on Pre-Tenure Rev.</td>
<td>Minor changes in wording within the last 3 – 4 sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.4.3</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Pol. On Post-Tenure Rev.</td>
<td>II – second sentence following bullets is shortened III – deleted confusing stmtnt on post tenure review sched</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NA</th>
<th>214</th>
<th>Non-Tenure Track Appts.</th>
<th>Sentence 4 replace “which” for “that”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107.4.5</td>
<td>214.01</td>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.4.5</td>
<td>214.0101</td>
<td>Evaluations</td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.4.5</td>
<td>214.0102</td>
<td>Promotion to Senior Lec.</td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.4.5</td>
<td>214.0103</td>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

205.2 – Important lecturer language was added.
205.3 – Syntax changes added
205.4 – Lecturer language added as well as then schedule logic.
205.6 – Language added for clarity between the two faculty handbooks.
208 – Changes harmonize language between the two handbooks.
209 – Mainly updating and clarifying language.
212 – Syntax changes
Appendix D

Below are the two versions of the transitional tenure and promotion language that were developed by the faculty welfare OWG. The first version was approved by electronic vote by all the committee members except one. Because of this, a second version was written. This was discussed and approved by some but the vote was never completed. The second is more in line with the provost’s comments during the February senate meeting.

Version 1

Transition effects of consolidation of Georgia Southern University and Armstrong State University on scheduled mandatory performance reviews of faculty.

This section expires July 1, 2025

Proper consideration must be given in the pre-tenure, tenure, and post-tenure review process and promotion decisions for consolidated faculty members, as well as the review of continuing lecturers, who have worked under different sets of performance expectations during a review period. At all levels of review, administrative officers and faculty reviewers are required to evaluate the performance of a faculty member relative to the expectations enforced for the duration of the review period. Not performing according to the guidelines of a different institution during a pre-consolidated period under review will not be considered evidence of poor performance.

All consolidated faculty who have worked under different performance expectations due to consolidation will document the time frame and nature of different performance and workload expectations, as well as provide corresponding evidence of pre-consolidation performance expectations, in all review materials. Colleges and departments are encouraged to develop clear reporting expectations for consolidated faculty as well as keep accurate and organized records of pre and post-consolidation performance criteria for all past colleges and departments on record and publicly available.

In order to earn tenure and/ or promotion, a faculty member must be able to provide sufficient evidence for some portion of the review period of the potential to meet future performance expectations under the policies and procedures of the new consolidated institution. Determination of whether or not a consolidated faculty member is prepared for tenure and/or promotion, and has demonstrated the potential to meet future performance expectations, should be determined according to published university guidelines/timelines and in consultation with the department chair, with input from the dean and the college faculty executive committee if requested by the candidate.

In the event a pre-tenured consolidated faculty member who has operated under different guidelines during the period of review requires additional time to demonstrate evidence of the ability to meet future performance expectations, they will be allowed to request an extension of the tenure clock according to the stipulations outlined in the consolidated faculty handbook. Any request for extension of the tenure clock by a consolidated faculty member must take place before or in conjunction with the faculty member’s evaluation during the first year of consolidation.

Notes: All committee members voted Yes except 1. This lead to a new version of the language.
Version 2

Transition effects of consolidation of Georgia Southern University and Armstrong State University on scheduled mandatory performance reviews of faculty.

This section expires July 1, 2025

Proper consideration must be given in the pre-tenure, tenure, and post-tenure review process and promotion decisions for consolidated faculty members, as well as the review of continuing lecturers, who have worked under performance expectations that have been replaced during the review period ("transitional faculty"). At all levels of review, administrative officers and faculty reviewers must evaluate the performance of a faculty member using the performance expectations the faculty member was bound to when hired. Not performing according to the guidelines established by the new institution during consolidation will not be considered evidence of poor performance for subsequent reviews.

The department chairs and deans that oversee transitional faculty must keep careful records of performance expectations that the transitional faculty will be evaluated by as well as target dates for significant performance review. Transitional faculty are encouraged to remind reviewers of these details in their dossiers. For tenure-track transitional faculty, the period of evaluation under former performance expectations ends after the sixth year of employment, when the decision for tenure and promotion to associate professor is to be made. For lecturer transitional faculty, the period of evaluation under former performance expectations ends after the sixth year of employment when the decision for senior lecturer is to be made. Colleges and departments must develop clear reporting expectations for transitional faculty. Further, the university, colleges, and departments must keep accurate and organized records of pre and post-consolidation performance expectations on record and publicly available for all past colleges and departments.

Promotion to full professor for all tenure-track faculty will be judged based on the promotion guidelines established for the new university regardless of the faculty member’s professional timeline, unless the dean and department chair in question provide a compelling argument for special consideration.

Notes:

The double negative construction in the last sentence of the first paragraph ("not performing . . . will not be considered") is potentially confusing and probably unnecessary given what's said above.

Change "that" to "who" after Dept Chairs and Deans . . .

Subsequent reviews at the new institution should be based on performance after consolidation and not attempt to compare pre-consolidation performance with the new guidelines.

Add: “For tenure-track transitional faculty, the period of evaluation under former performance expectations ends when the decision for tenure and promotion to associate professor is to be made.”

Should we include "post tenure" review in the first line of the draft if promotion from associate to full is under the new guidelines?
If we are allowing all faculty members to continue with their existing tenure performance expectations, is the wording in the first line "that have been replaced" appropriate?

Instead of "remind reviewers" how about "refer reviewers to the details of their performance expectations when hired in their dossiers"?

I think we should delete the part of the last paragraph that reads, "unless the dean and department chair in question provide a compelling argument for special consideration." If we must replace it, we should replace it with something like, "special consideration will be determined in consultation with the department chair, with input from the dean and the college faculty executive committee if requested by the candidate."

Add: "Transitional faculty who wish to perform under the guidelines of the new university before going on the next level of advancement may do so. Early transition to new guidelines must be done according to published university timelines and in consultation with the department chair, with input from the dean and the college faculty executive committee if requested by the candidate."

Add: "Although transitional tenure track faculty and lectures will be strictly evaluated by the guidelines under which they were hired, they are encouraged to show evidence of adequate preparation for the next level of advancement based on the guidelines of the new institution." This will acknowledge those concerns and show compromise.
Current Faculty Senators by College at Armstrong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Fall 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COE (2)</td>
<td>Patricia Holt</td>
<td>Patricia Holt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greg Wimer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LindaAnn McCall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Loyd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business (1)</td>
<td>Maliece Whatley</td>
<td>Maliece Whatley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBSS (2)</td>
<td>Dennis Murphy</td>
<td>Dennis Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin Jennings</td>
<td>Kevin Jennings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wendy Wolfe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAH (6)</td>
<td>Rachel Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emily Grundstand-Hale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benjamin Warsaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Benjamin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Todesca</td>
<td>James Todesca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol Andrews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Rago</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol Jamison</td>
<td>Carol Jamison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christy Mroczek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jack Simmons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSM (5)</td>
<td>Tricia Brown</td>
<td>Sungkon Chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sungkon Chang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim Swanson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clifford Padgett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donna Mullinax</td>
<td>Donna Mullinax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catherine MacGowan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Zettler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aaron Schrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Coltrone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Rooney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Professions (5)</td>
<td>Pam Cartight</td>
<td>Jeffery Secrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dzyyana Nazaruk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TimMarie Williams</td>
<td>TimMarie Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sherry Warnock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gina Crabb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Katrina Embrey</td>
<td>Katrina Embrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan Bradshaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Bringman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering &amp; C (1)</td>
<td>Hongjun Su</td>
<td>Christy Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wayne Johnson</td>
<td>Wayne Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Public Health (1)</td>
<td>Dziyana Nazaruk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library(1)</td>
<td>Aimee Reist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Georgia Southern University, Armstrong Campus
Faculty Senate Bill FSB-2018-02-19-01:
Class Scheduling to Meet Unique Campus Needs

Presidential Action

The attached bill is provided to the University President for approval.

Delivered:

Signature: [Signature] Date: 2/20/18

Approve: ___
Disapprove: ___
Remand: [Checkmark]

Comments: (please attach an additional sheet if necessary)

Since registration is already set for Fall 2018, I suggest following the proposed M-F schedule, collecting data on enrollments & success, then revisiting the matter at a later date.

Signature: [Signature] Date: 3-5-18

Dr. Jaimie Hebert, President
Georgia Southern University
Class Scheduling to meet Unique Campus Needs

Whereas the three campuses of Georgia Southern University serve different student populations, with more residential and traditionally aged college students on the Statesboro campus and more commuter and non-traditionally aged college students on the Savannah and Hinesville campuses;

Whereas students on the Savannah and Hinesville campuses more often need to balance their classes with work and family obligations;

Whereas students on the Savannah campus are more often employed in service-industry jobs associated with Savannah tourism that require full day Friday through Sunday hours;

Whereas the Savannah and Hinesville campuses utilize part-time faculty to a much higher degree than the Statesboro campus (For Fall, 2015: 182PT vs. 286FT in Armstrong Factbook and 97PT vs. 841FT in GSU Factbook);

Whereas part-time faculty benefit from a class schedule that requires fewer days on campus;

Whereas Savannah State University offers a variety of once and twice weekly classes to meet the needs of the local Savannah student and part-time instructor population;

Whereas the FAQ section of the consolidation website for student questions articulates an objective of “trying to limit the need for commuting” and therefore little impact of divergent class schedules across the three campuses;

In order to mitigate the likely adverse impact on the Armstrong campus of adopting the class schedule guidelines used by the Statesboro campus on Armstrong class enrollment, RPG, and retention of faculty, the Armstrong Faculty Senate requests that the class scheduling needs of the Savannah and Hinesville campuses and local community be placed above the goal of unified scheduling with the Statesboro campus.

Specifically, the Savannah and Hinesville campuses have integrated many MW, TR, and once weekly classes into the class schedule because these best serve our campus and community needs. The Armstrong Faculty Senate requests to continue using a class schedule and timetable that work best for the Savannah and Hinesville campuses.
Appendix G

Faculty Senate Resolution on Student Protests

Whereas we, the faculty senates at Georgia Southern University, support student engagement in the social and political issues of our times, including the right to engage in peaceful protest, we resolve that such protest action will not negatively affect any future admission decisions made for students involved in such actions. We support the right of students to protest peacefully and encourage civic engagement in our future Georgia Southern Eagles.