



## Faculty Evaluations

Area: Division of Academic Affairs	Number:	205.03/205.04/ 205.05/205.06
Subject: Faculty Evaluations	Issued:	6/1/1981
Applies To: Division of Academic Affairs	Revised:	10/1/2014
Sources:	Updated:	
Responsible Party: Provost's Office	Page(s):	Page 1 of 3

### I. Purpose

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."

### II. Policy Statement

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

- 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

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).
      - 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).
- 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.
  - 4. Post-tenure review: due in the Provost's Office mid-March.

**III. Procedures**

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.

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.
1. 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.