Faculty Review System

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA POLICIES

BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY MANUAL: [8.3.5 Evaluation of Personnel](https://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8/C245/#p8.3.5_evaluation_of_personnel)

  ACADEMIC AFFAIRS HANDBOOK: [4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems](https://www.usg.edu/academic_affairs_handbook/section4/C2845); [4.8 Evaluation of Faculty](https://www.usg.edu/academic_affairs_handbook/section4/C691/)

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, pre- and post-tenure, 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 areas of a faculty member's duties. The criteria shall include evaluation of instruction, student success activities, research/scholarship/creative endeavors, and service as is appropriate to the institution, college, school, and departmental responsibilities. Faculty workload percentages for teaching, research/scholarship/creative endeavors, and service will be clearly defined and agreed upon between the faculty member and the immediate supervisor. The process will utilize a system of faculty evaluations by students, with the improvement of teaching effectiveness and student success as the focus of these student evaluations. The evaluation procedures may also utilize a system of peer evaluations, with emphasis placed on the faculty member’s professional development across the scope of their responsibilities.

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 to be of use in counseling and decisions regarding salary, retention, pre- and post- tenure, 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.

Common Likert Scale

The following scale with descriptions will be used at each stage and evaluation point of a faculty member’s career, whether tenure-track or non-tenure track: annual evaluations, pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure. **Noteworthy achievement as referenced in BOR Policy****is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the**common **Likert Scale below. Deficient and unsatisfactory as referenced throughout this document is reflective of a 1 or a 2 on the**common **Likert Scale below.**

**Exemplary (5)**: Rating for faculty whose performance far exceeds requirements in principal professional responsibilities on a consistent basis. Normally reserved for those few individuals whose performance is outstanding to all.

**Exceeds Expectations (4)**: Rating for faculty whose performance clearly and consistently exceeds requirements in principal professional responsibilities.

**Meets Expectations (3)**: Rating for faculty whose performance consistently meets requirements in principal professional responsibilities. This rating recognizes satisfactory accomplishment and achievement.

**Needs Improvement (2)**: Rating for faculty whose performance has approached, but not yet met, requirements in principal professional responsibilities. The need for further development is definitely recognizable.

**Does Not Meet Expectations (1)**: Rating for faculty whose performance clearly fails to meet requirements in principal professional responsibilities. Improved performance is expected and required as a condition of continued employment in the position.

Philosophy

GC places the most emphasis on excellent teaching in its evaluation of faculty members. Consequently, every GC instructor is required to administer the Student Opinion Rating of Instruction Survey (SRIS) in all courses~~at least two courses per term~~ during the fall and spring semesters. In this way, instructors obtain summative feedback from students. GC utilizes a system of faculty evaluations by students, with the improvement of teaching effectiveness and student learning as the main focus of these student evaluations. The evaluation procedures may also utilize a system of peer evaluations, with emphasis placed on the faculty member’s professional development across the scope of their responsibilities.

GC values learner-centered teaching and noteworthy involvement in student success activities, and it believes that effective assessment of teaching is entwined with the assessment of learning. The measure of Teaching Effectiveness and Student Learning should include assessments of both instructional quality and quality learning. GC maintains that effective assessment should go beyond opinions collected from the SRIS. Faculty members are welcome to submit their own documentation in addition to that required by the college or department. Criteria should include measures such as an assessment of student perception, evidence of effective student learning, the use of continuous improvement methodologies, peer assessment of pedagogy, an evaluation of curricular design, quality of assessment and course construction, and the use of established learning science methodologies.Seeking continuous improvement, every instructor at GC should consider assessing teaching and learning in their classes with at least one instrument or measure, in addition to the administration of the SRIS.

Evaluation of the Student Success component of teaching effectiveness will involve an assessment of the faculty member’s involvement in activities inside and outside the classroom that deepen student learning and engagement for all learners. These aspects may include effective advising and mentoring; undergraduate and graduate research; other forms of experiential learning; engagement in other high impact practices; the development of student success tools and curricular materials; strategies to improve student career success; involvement in faculty development activities; and other activities identified by GC to deepen student learning. Examples include, but are not limited to, Centers for Teaching and Learning, Chancellor’s Learning Scholars, Faculty Learning Communities and MomentumU@USG.

These institutional policies, processes, and stated criteria incorporate appropriate due process mechanisms and support the principles of academic freedom.

Plans for Addressing Faculty Performance

There are two different plans for addressing faculty performance: a *performance remediation plan*and a *performance improvement plan*. For faculty who do not meet annual performance expectations a *performance remediation plan*is put in place. The purpose of this plan is to scaffold faculty growth and development, and to strengthen tenure and promotion possibilities. The second, a *performance improvement plan,*is developed subsequent to an unfavorable post-tenure review or corrective post-tenure review. The components of the PIP and the PRP plans must include the following:

1. Clearly defined goals or outcomes,
2. An outline of activities to be undertaken,
3. A timetable,
4. Available resources and supports,
5. Expectations for improvement
6. Monitoring strategy

Performance Remediation Plan (PRP)

The Performance Remediation Plan is used to document faculty deficiencies based on the outcomes from the annual review. The purpose of the PRP is designed to enable the faculty member to correct unsatisfactory (**1 or a 2 on the**common **Likert Scale**) performance in some aspect of their role or responsibilities. The plan must be approved by the Dean and submitted to GC’s Office of Academic Affairs. Two meetings during the fall semester and two during the spring semester must be held to review progress, document additional needs/resources, planned accomplishments for the upcoming quarter. After each meeting, the academic administrator should summarize the meeting and indicate if the faculty member is on track to complete the PRP. Consequences for failure to meet the expectations of the PRP must be stated at the conclusion of each meeting.

Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)

The Performance Improvement Plan is used to document deficiencies based on an unfavorable Post Tenure Review. The plan must be approved by the Dean and submitted to GC’s Office of Academic Affairs. Two meetings during the fall semester and two during the spring semester must be held to review progress, document additional needs/resources, planned accomplishments for the upcoming time period. After each meeting, the academic administrator should summarize the meeting and indicate whether the faculty member is on track to complete the PIP. The assessment of the PIP will take the place of that year’s annual review. At the conclusion of the academic year the faculty member’s progress will be determined by the department chair and dean after taking into account feedback from a committee of faculty colleagues.

If the faculty member successfully completes the performance improvement plan, then the faculty member’s next post-tenure review will take place on the regular five-year schedule.

If the faculty member fails to make sufficient progress in performance, then the institution shall take appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member’s deficiencies. The President will make the final determination on behalf of the institution regarding appropriate remedial action. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution’s final decision pursuant to the Board Policy on Applications for Discretionary Review.

Forms/Materials

All forms related to faculty evaluation can be found on MyGCSU --> Academic Affairs --> [Evaluative Forms](https://mygc.gcsu.edu/academic-affairs/academic-affairs-evaluative-forms)
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