

BoR Policy

8.3.5 Evaluation of Personnel

8.3.5.1 Faculty

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. Each institution, as part of its evaluative procedures, will utilize a written system of faculty evaluations by students, with the improvement of teaching effectiveness as the main focus of these student evaluations.

The evaluation procedures may also utilize a written system of peer evaluations, with emphasis placed on the faculty member's professional development. In those cases in which a faculty member's primary responsibilities do not include teaching, the evaluation should focus on excellence in those areas (e.g., research, administration) where the individual's major responsibilities lie. Institutional policies and procedures shall ensure that each faculty member will receive a written report of each evaluation and that the results of the evaluation will be reflected in the faculty member's annual salary recommendations. Institutions will ensure that the individuals responsible for conducting performance evaluations are appropriately trained to carry out such evaluations (BoR Minutes, 1979-80, p. 50; 1983-84, p. 36; May, 1996, p. 52).

Each institution shall conduct in-depth pre-tenure reviews of all faculty in their third year of progress toward tenure. The criteria established for promotion and tenure, emphasizing excellence in teaching, shall be used as the focus for these reviews. The institution shall develop pre-tenure review policies, as well as any subsequent revisions (BoR Minutes, April 1996, p. 39-47; May 1996, p. 52; February 2007).

USG Academic & Student Affairs Handbook

4.7 Evaluation of Faculty

SOURCES: [BoR POLICY 8.3.5, EVALUATION OF PERSONNEL](#)

Each institution is responsible for establishing definite and stated criteria for faculty performance that are consistent with Regents' policies and the statutes of the institution. These criteria must be stated in writing and available in a faculty handbook posted on an institution's website. All changes to these performance criteria must be updated in the faculty handbook in a timely fashion. At a minimum, faculty evaluation systems must include the following:

- Annual reviews (for faculty and senior administrators)
- Pre-tenure progress reviews for faculty in their third year
- Reviews of graduate teaching and laboratory assistants
- Subordinate (one level down) reviews of senior administrators at least once every five years
- Tenure reviews
- Promotion reviews
- Post-tenure reviews

The following steps should be made a part of all faculty evaluation systems:

- The immediate supervisor will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's annual written evaluation.
- The faculty member will sign a statement to the effect that he/she has been apprised of the content of the annual written evaluation.
- The faculty member will be given a specific period of time (e.g., 10 working days) to respond in writing to the annual written evaluation, with this response to be attached to the evaluation.
- The immediate supervisor will acknowledge in writing his/her receipt of this response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made as a result of either the conference or the faculty member's written response. This acknowledgement will also become a part of the records.

GEORGIA COLLEGE POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND PRACTICES MANUAL

FACULTY REVIEW PHILOSOPHY AND GENERAL PROCEDURES (PART ONE)

Policy: Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 803.05, <http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8/>

The Faculty Review System is a summative review of faculty performance, the major purpose of which is to provide information for administrative decision making in areas such as salary, retention, tenure and promotion. It may also be used for formative purposes by the faculty member. The Faculty Review System gives greatest weight to teacher effectiveness as the primary area of a faculty member's duties.

The department chairperson is responsible for evaluating the performance of each faculty member in his or her department. During their last year, retiring faculty are exempt from the faculty evaluation process. In addition, non-tenured faculty on a terminal contract will also be exempt from this process. Each of these performance evaluations is subsequently reviewed by the college dean. The college dean is responsible for the performance evaluation of each department chairperson in his/her role as a faculty member and evaluates department chairpersons with the same procedures used by the department chairpersons in administering a performance evaluation of their faculty. This evaluation of a chairperson by a dean is performed in addition to the Dean's Performance Evaluation of the chairperson in his/her role as an administrator. The annual review of the faculty is timed in order to be of use in counseling and decisions regarding salary, retention, tenure, and promotion and is based on the performance during the prior calendar year.

This policy is the minimum faculty evaluation policy for the whole university. Colleges and departments may adopt higher requirements with the prior written approval of the Provost. In the performance of their instructional duties as contained in this policy, faculty members will be evaluated only on the criteria and in accordance with the procedures set forth in this faculty review system.

General Procedures

1. The faculty member completes the Individual Faculty Report (IFR) and submits it to the chairperson on March 15 [or the first business day following March 15 should March 15 be a Saturday or Sunday] of the academic year to which it applies.
2. The chairperson reviews the IFR, and, along with other relevant information writes the Department Chairperson's Evaluation of Faculty Performance (DCEFP), and sends it to the faculty member.
3. The chairperson discusses the content of the IFR and DCEFP with the faculty member in the annual scheduled conference no later than May 1 [or the first business day following May 1 should May 1 fall on a Saturday or Sunday], following the academic year to which this evaluation applies.
4. The faculty member signs a statement to the effect that he or she has read the DCEFP.
5. The faculty member is given the opportunity to respond in writing to the DCEFP; this response is attached to the IFR/DCEFP.
6. The chairperson acknowledges in writing his or her receipt of this response, noting changes, if any, in the DCEFP made as a result of either the conference or the faculty member's written response. This acknowledgement will also become a part of the record.
7. The entire Performance Evaluation of a Faculty Member is comprised of the following parts and is assembled in a packet in this order:

- a. Department Chairperson's Evaluation of Faculty Performance (DCEFP)
 - b. Signature Sheet
 - c. Individual Faculty Report (IFR)
 - d. Faculty Member's Self-Evaluation of Performance (optional)
 - e. Faculty Member's Response to Chairperson's Evaluation (if any)
 - f. Department Chairperson's Acknowledgement of Faculty Member's Response and Statement of Change (if any)
 - g. Student Opinion Survey (SOS) Computer Summary Sheet(s)
 - h. Adviser Rating Forms Received for Faculty Member
 - i. Other Documentation (optional)
8. The department chairperson sends this packet, in time for review for decisions involving merit salary increases, retention, tenure, and promotion, to the college dean who, after review as signified by his/her signature on the Signature Sheet. The college dean who keeps it if the faculty member is a department chairperson or returns it to the department chairperson of the home department for faculty members without administrative assignments. The Provost will evaluate annually the administrators report directly to him/her and review the evaluations of the administrators who report directly to the administrators who report to that position.
9. Faculty members have the right to a) review their own personnel files that are used by department chairpersons, deans, and the Provost in personnel decisions, b) place in the file information that explains their position on any matter contained in the file and e) appeal their evaluations. Such appeals will follow the grievance procedures.

Forms/Materials:

[FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW TIMETABLE](#)

[Individual Faculty Report Format Form Link](#)

[Department Chair's Evaluation of Faculty Performance Link](#)

GEORGIA COLLEGE POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND PRACTICES MANUAL

USE OF FACULTY REVIEW SYSTEM

The annual Faculty Review will include written assessments in each of the following four major categories, teaching effectiveness, academic achievement/professional development, service to the institution, and public service. Each review shall be based on a academic year's performance.

Faculty members shall receive merit salary increases primarily based upon their performance as evaluated in the most recently completed annual Faculty Review. These increases are determined by department chairpersons in consultation with the dean and shall be based on performance criteria, emphasizing teacher effectiveness.

For the purposes of retention, tenure and promotion, the cumulative Faculty Reviews on the faculty member shall be considered. Recommendations are based upon the following minimum standards,

(a) **RETENTION.** In order to be recommended for retention as a faculty member at Georgia College & State University, the faculty member's annual review must contain a minimum "fully acceptable" rating in teaching effectiveness and a minimum "fully acceptable" rating in at least one other area. It is expected that the department chairperson will counsel the faculty member who is retained in any area in which there is a less than a "fully acceptable" rating.

(b) **TENURE.** Whenever a faculty member is to be recommended for tenure, in addition to Regents' time and service regulations, he/she must receive at least one "commendable" rating as well as a minimum rating of "fully acceptable" in teaching effectiveness. No one can be recommended for tenure who has an "unsatisfactory" or "needs improvement" rating in any area during the year in which they are recommended. .

(c) **PROMOTION.** "Commendable" achievement in all areas need not be demanded, but should be expected in at least two, including a "fully acceptable" rating in teaching effectiveness. No one can be recommended for promotion who has an "unsatisfactory" or "needs improvement" rating in any area during the year in which they are recommended.

(These are minimum standards for eligibility. No one is guaranteed salary increases, retention, tenure, or promotion as a result of good performance ratings. Other considerations, such as enrollment, financial exigency, and program change, are also factors used in making these decisions.)

[FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW TIMETABLE](#)