

College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

POLICY ON ANNUAL EVALUATION OF REGULAR FACULTY

Policy Title:	College of Arts and Sciences Policy on Annual Evaluation of Regular Faculty
Version:	1
College Approval:	Promotion and Tenure Review Board, 03/25/2015
Effective:	01/01/2016

College of Arts and Sciences
Georgia State University
POLICY ON ANNUAL EVALUATION OF REGULAR FACULTY

I. Purpose

Consistent with the personnel policies of the University System of Georgia Board of Regents, Georgia State University requires that all faculty members at the university be evaluated at least once annually in writing by their immediate supervisor on the basis of “scholarly attainment and professional growth.” In the College of Arts and Sciences, all regular faculty, as defined in Bylaws of the Faculty (Article II, Section 1), will be evaluated on an annual basis by their department/school/institute (hereafter referred to as “department”) chair/director¹ (hereafter referred to as “chair”) during the spring semester.

For each faculty member undergoing review, the annual evaluation will take into account the expectations appropriate to his or her rank, workload, and any assigned duties. The evaluation is based on the annual report and curriculum vitae (hereafter referred to as “CV”) submitted, in addition to other information requested by or available to the chair, such as the faculty member’s teaching portfolio, prior annual evaluations and annual reports. The chair’s evaluation of each faculty member incorporates input from the departmental executive committee and the associate dean and the other department chairs of the relevant academic area of the college. All evaluations of regular faculty in the college are reviewed by the dean.

The annual evaluation is distinct from promotion and other structured faculty reviews. Because these different evaluations cover different time periods and may involve different evaluating bodies, in some cases with the input of external reviewers, the results of these reviews may diverge. Therefore, a reliable inference cannot necessarily be made from the conclusions of one of the reviews to those of the others.

II. Considerations Specific to Rank

A. Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty

Annual evaluations of faculty at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor will address accomplishments and effectiveness in the categories of teaching, professional development (i.e., research, scholarship, and creative work), and service, using the terms *outstanding*, *excellent*, *very good*, *good*, *fair*, and *poor*. Guidelines for the application of the six terms are specified in appendices to each department’s promotion and tenure guidelines. In the categories of teaching and service, the record under review includes only the previous calendar year, whereas in professional development the review may extend further back, with a limit of no more than three years, to allow for appropriate consideration of continuous work, depending on disciplinary norms within the academic area of the college (fine arts, humanities, natural and computational sciences, social and behavioral sciences).

¹ Faculty administrators in the position of department chair, school or institute director will be evaluated annually by their area associate dean. The evaluation is distinct from the triennial evaluation process. Faculty administrators in the position of associate dean will be evaluated by the dean on an annual basis.

40 **B. Non-Tenure Track Lecturers**

41 Annual evaluations of faculty at the rank of lecturer, senior lecturer, or principal senior
42 lecturer will address effectiveness in the categories of teaching and service. The
43 evaluation of teaching and service will employ the ratings *outstanding, excellent, very*
44 *good, good, fair, and poor*. The specific criteria for the application of the ratings are
45 defined in the individual department's non-tenure track faculty promotion guidelines.
46

47 **C. Non-Tenure Track Academic Professionals**

48 Annual evaluations of faculty at the rank of academic professional or senior academic
49 professional will address effectiveness in the category of service, primarily as it relates
50 to the department's mission and the specific service responsibilities of the candidate,
51 and in the category of teaching, when the faculty member's workload includes
52 teaching. The terms *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor* will be used
53 in the evaluation of the service and teaching records. The specific criteria for the
54 application of the ratings are defined in appendices to the individual department's non-
55 tenure track faculty promotion guidelines.
56

57 **D. Non-Tenure Track Professors of Practice**

58 Annual evaluations of faculty in the position of Professor of Practice will address
59 effectiveness in the category of service, primarily as it relates to the department's
60 mission and the specific service responsibilities of the candidate, and in the category of
61 teaching, when the faculty member's workload includes teaching. The terms
62 *outstanding, excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor* will be used in the evaluation of
63 the service and teaching records. The specific criteria for the application of the ratings
64 are defined in appendices to the individual department's non-tenure track faculty
65 promotion guidelines.

66 **III. Evaluation Process**

67 Early in the spring term each year, the Office of the Dean will distribute to department
68 chairs the annual evaluation calendar for the review period that covers the prior year. The
69 calendar will include specific dates for the steps described herein and any other relevant
70 deadlines. The faculty member will complete an annual report and update their CV before
71 submitting both items to the designated departmental coordinator by the college-specified
72 deadline. Faculty should also prepare a teaching portfolio in accord with the college's
73 Teaching Effectiveness Policy and submit to the department by the deadline set by the unit
74 early in the spring semester. The Office of the Dean will collect all faculty annual reports
75 and CVs and make them available to chairs in a timely and uniform manner, along with the
76 evaluation ratings history of each faculty member. After seeking input from their
77 departmental executive committee, the chair will submit their initial faculty ratings to the
78 area associate dean. The chair will meet individually with the area associate to discuss the
79 ratings before the ratings are forwarded to the area committee of chairs. The area
80 committee will meet to discuss and normalize the ratings, after which point the final
81 scores are forwarded to the dean.

82 After the annual ratings are finalized, the chair will write a letter of evaluation. The chair
83 will discuss the content of the evaluation with the faculty member in a scheduled
84 conference. The faculty member will sign a statement to the effect that he or she has been
85 apprised of the content of the annual evaluation. The faculty member will be given the
86 opportunity to respond in writing to the annual evaluation, with this response to be
87 attached to the evaluation. The chair will acknowledge in writing his or her receipt of this
88 response, noting changes, if any, in the annual evaluation made as a result of either the
89 conference or the faculty member's written response. By the college-specified deadline,
90 the chair will submit the final written evaluation, complete with the faculty member's
91 response and subsequent chair's response, if applicable, to the Office of the Dean. The
92 department and college will maintain records of the chair's evaluation letter, any response
93 from the faculty member, and any acknowledgment by the chair of the faculty member's
94 response for the appropriate amount of time, as defined by the records retention
95 schedules set by University System of Georgia and approved by the Georgia Division of
96 Archives and History.

97
98 The annual evaluation serves as one method of assessing the progress of faculty members
99 who have their contracts renewed annually, including untenured tenure track faculty and
100 regular non-tenure track faculty. The chair may document renewal concerns through other
101 means as well.