



**Georgia College  
School of Nursing**

***Philosophy, Policy, & Procedures  
for  
Faculty Performance Appraisal***

**Revised May 2018**

## Table of Contents

<b>PURPOSE</b> .....	3
<b>SECTION I</b> .....	4
<b>The Context for Promotion and Tenure at Georgia College</b> .....	4
Tenure .....	4
Promotion.....	5
<b>Definitions of Teaching, Scholarship and Professional Development, and Service</b> .....	6
Superior Teaching .....	6
Scholarship & Professional Development .....	6
Service.....	7
<b>Critical Components of Superior (Commendable and/or Excellent) Teaching, Scholarship and Professional Development, and Service</b> .....	9
Critical Components of Superior (Commendable and/or Excellent) Teaching .....	9
Critical Components of Superior (Commendable and/or Excellent) Scholarship and Professional Development .....	12
Critical Components of Superior (Commendable and/or Excellent) Service .....	13
<b>SECTION II</b> .....	17
<b>General Information on the Tenure and Promotion Processes</b> .....	17
Guiding Principles .....	17
<b>Committees Involved in Promotion and Tenure Evaluations in the SON</b> .....	18
<b>External Review for Promotion to Professor</b> .....	19
<b>Academic Tenure at Georgia College</b> .....	19
Pre-Tenure Review .....	20
Tenure Review .....	21
Post-tenure Review .....	23
<b>Academic Promotion at Georgia College</b> .....	24
Guidelines for Award of Promotion .....	24
Procedures for Promotion at Georgia College .....	24

**Georgia College  
School of Nursing  
Philosophy, Policy, & Procedures for Faculty Performance Appraisal**

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this document is to provide department-level guidelines to assist individual faculty in applying for tenure and/or promotion. It provides an overview of the philosophy guiding performance appraisal of School of Nursing (SON) faculty members, a review of the processes, delineating criteria, and offers evidence and practical recommendations for the development of compelling portfolios for tenure and promotion in the SON. Links to supporting documents offer additional detail. This document should be revised on a regular basis in order to keep the SON in line with College of Health Sciences (COHS), university, and system-wide developments, as well as changes in practices and knowledge of Nursing.

- Section I provides an overview of the way in which promotion and tenure are conceptualized for the practice discipline of Nursing. This section includes the following sub-sections:
  - **The Context for Promotion and Tenure at GC:** frames the processes of promotion and tenure within the vision statements for the University System of Georgia, GC, the COHS, and the SON.
  - **Definitions of Minimal Teaching, Scholarship and Professional Development, and Service**
  - **Definitions of Superior Teaching, Scholarship and Professional Development, and Service:** definitions that reflect the Boyer model of scholarship
  - **Critical Components of Superior Teaching, Scholarship and Professional Development, and Service:** those components believed to be critical in demonstrating those qualities of teaching, scholarship, and service deserving of promotion and tenure. This section also includes Examples of Evaluative Evidence to demonstrate each critical element in a faculty portfolio.
  - **Critical Components for Professorial Ranks When Considering Promotion Materials:** a matrix tracing the critical components across professorial ranks
- Section II guides SON faculty through the policies and procedures for applying for promotion and/or tenure at GC.

## SECTION I

### The Context for Promotion and Tenure at Georgia College

The processes of applying for tenure and promotion are career-defining moments for faculty. Portfolios prepared for Promotion and Tenure applications clarify professional development and document the academic paths of the faculty member. These milestones in the professional journey of the faculty members are opportunities to reflect and synthesize the value of their contributions to GC through Superior Teaching, Scholarship and Professional Development, and Service.

To help guide understanding of the processes of promotion and tenure, it is instructive to remember that what drives our efforts at Georgia College is defined by the University System of Georgia (USG) Board of Regents as core characteristics of state universities:

- a commitment to excellence and to being responsive to the needs of the state and region;
- a commitment to a teaching/learning environment that exists in and out of the classroom;
- a high quality general education program;
- a commitment to public service; and
- a commitment to scholarly and creative work to enhance instructional effectiveness and to encourage faculty scholarly pursuits (<http://www.usg.edu/inst/mission/stateuniv.phtml>).

The USG core characteristics are translated into the GC unique vision as a public, liberal arts university where faculty are “dedicated to challenging students and fostering excellence in the classroom and beyond,” as well as being “committed to community service and are creatively engaged in their fields of specialization” (<http://www.gcsu.edu/about>).

The COHS’ mission further aligns with the GC vision and the USG core characteristics of state universities in noting that its graduates “emerge with a comprehensive world view that promotes leadership, initiative, accountability, stewardship and a moral and ethical respect for others to effect change in a dynamic society.” Faculty members representing the practice disciplines within the COHS are said to be dedicated to:

- fostering student learning through superior teaching;
- discovering and disseminating knowledge through scholarship and continued professional development; and
- engaging in service to the institution, profession, & community.

In concert with the GC liberal arts mission, the SON is committed to the formation of nurse leaders to engage in evidence-based practice, lifelong learning, and civic participation in a health information intensive environment through the development and mastery of clinical reasoning, professional nursing skills, and values. The GC SON aspires to be recognized as a national leader in nursing education. GC nurses will serve at the forefront of the changing healthcare delivery system.

### Tenure

Length of service at GC is considered in determining if a faculty member can be considered for tenure. Tenure may be recommended upon completion of a probationary period of at least five complete years of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor or higher. According to the USG, tenure shall be based on (1) superior teaching, (2) outstanding service to the institution, (3) academic achievement, and (4) growth and development. Noteworthy achievement is expected in superior teaching and at least one other area. An award of tenure not only requires excellence in

performance, but a promise of continued excellence in teaching, research, and service. Tenured faculty members are expected to maintain standards of professional performance and to lead by professional example, in all cases being subject to annual evaluations and post-tenure review (<http://gcsu.smartcatalogiq.com/en/Policy-Manual/Policy-Manual/Faculty-Handbook>).

Promotion

Recognized faculty ranks at GC are Instructor, Lecturer and Senior Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. Promotions to the rank of Associate Professor and Professor require a terminal degree or equivalent. Promotion to a specific rank is dependent on length of service at GC as follows:

<b>For promotion to:</b>	<b>Minimum service in rank:</b>
Assistant Professor	3 years in Instructor rank
Associate Professor	4 years as Assistant Professor
Professor	5 years as Associate Professor

The tenure track faculty ranks show a progression of faculty competence from beginner (assistant professor), to competent (associate professor), and finally to expert (professor). Promotion to associate and/or professor professor requires the faculty to build upon their record of achievement at the previous rank.

- The assistant professor demonstrates:
  - 1) superior teaching resulting in learning, evidenced by positive documented changes in learners' growth in cognitive/ psychomotor/ affective domains;
  - 2) successful scholarly productivity and professional development in area of specialization;
  - 3) a record of service that positively reflects on the department, college, institution, and/or USG.
- The associate professor demonstrates consistent:
  - 1) superior teaching resulting in learning, evidenced by positive documented changes in learners' growth in cognitive/ psychomotor/ affective domains;
  - 2) successful scholarly productivity and professional development in area of specialization;
  - 3) a record of service that positively reflects on the department, college, institution, and/or USG.
- The professor shows a long-term record of:
  - 1) superior teaching resulting in learning, evidenced by positive documented changes in learners' growth in cognitive/ psychomotor/ affective domains;
  - 2) successful scholarly productivity and professional development in area of specialization;
  - 3) a record of service that positively reflects on the department, college, institution, and/or USG.

Neither the terminal degree nor longevity of service is a guarantee, per se, of promotion. Criteria for promotion to all professorial ranks include at a minimum: (1) superior teaching, (2) outstanding service to the institution, (3) academic achievement, and (4) professional growth and development. Noteworthy achievement in all four need not be demanded, but should be expected in at least two, one of which is superior teaching (see complete university policy at

### **Definitions of Teaching, Scholarship and Professional Development, and Service**

Due to the professional nature of the SON, the categories of academic achievement and professional growth and development are combined into a single category called “Scholarship and Professional Development” for both tenure and promotion within the SON.

#### **Superior Teaching**

As an institution with a liberal arts mission, GC values teaching above all other faculty accomplishments to the extent that it is a primary and constant consideration in all personnel decisions related to faculty. Superior teaching reflects the art and science of helping students to learn that extends beyond the classroom to include all faculty-student engagement. Superior teaching involves careful planning, continual examination, and learner-centered assessment. It makes use of innovative measures that provide high levels of academic challenge, opportunities for active and collaborative learning, interaction between students and faculty, educationally enriching experiences, and a supportive campus environment (Kuh, 2001).

Within the COHS and SON, intradisciplinary and transdisciplinary interactions and collaboration are the norm as aggregates of faculty make decisions to affect unit operations, program curricula, program evaluation, and in some cases curriculum delivery. An attitude of professionalism and collegial behaviors--such that one has a reputation as a “good citizen” of the unit, college, university and profession--can be critical to effective collaboration. Professional collaboration and collegiality are modeled through establishing relationships that promote a positive work environment, sharing expert knowledge through mentoring/supporting peers and/or students; advocating for programs, unit, and college; and increasing visibility of SON programs in a positive manner. As such, there is a place in the evaluation of teaching to address evidence of professional collaboration and collegiality.

#### **Scholarship & Professional Development**

Due to the nature of the Nursing profession, faculty members must constantly update their knowledge of best practices in their specialty area, identify new knowledge generated in their specialty area, and take advantage of appropriate professional development opportunities. The work of being a faculty member involves constantly recreating ourselves by integrating new knowledge and practices into our teaching, service and scholarship.

The traditional concept of research as scholarship is too constrictive to represent the wide range of scholarship that characterizes practice disciplines. Thus, the model of scholarship proposed by Ernest Boyer (1990) is used to guide decisions about promotion and tenure within the SON at GC. Consistent with Boyer’s concept of what should count as scholarship, **faculty efforts must include some product, peer reviewed, and publicly presented in some scholarly forum.**

In concert with Boyer’s conceptualization, we believe that scholarship in its four forms - discovery, application, integration, and teaching - embraces the collective talents of our faculty as they engage in rigorous academic processes with the intent to shape and understand all aspects of holistic health. Scholarship and professional development are defined for our purposes as creative intellectual work that is disseminated and professionally reviewed, and activities that lead to maintenance or improvement of credentials.

*The Scholarship of Discovery* refers to a process of meticulous and thorough inquiry with which faculty engage intentionally to validate and refine existing knowledge and/or to generate new knowledge. Systematic inquiry within the

quantitative and qualitative research paradigms is used to contribute to the disciplines. All discovery begins with an element of intellectual curiosity. Further, a spirit of inquiry lends to critiquing the current evidence base and applying best practices to teaching, evaluation, program development, and practice.

*The Scholarship of Application* refers to an integrated and reflective interaction of current knowledge of theory and practice in the respective discipline so that new understandings can occur. Engaging in practice enables faculty to test theory for goodness of fit and usefulness in improving practice itself and the outcomes for patients/clients/families/groups/ communities we serve. Opportunities to apply theory and research to practice abound and include both direct care experiences as well as consultation.

*The Scholarship of Integration* relates to the synthesis of knowledge that incorporates and promotes interdisciplinary collaboration in making meaningful connections and synthesis across disciplines, and seeking broader insights through multiple perspectives.

*The Scholarship of Teaching & Learning* refers to the evolving pedagogical process that is carefully planned and continually examined and revised. This scholarship involves a systematic inquiry into the teaching learning process, examines how learning occurs, and facilitates adjustments to methods to assure that learning is sustained.

Beyond these four forms of scholarship, we believe in the importance of faculty continuing their own professional development. Professional development includes those activities that strengthen teaching, scholarship, or service, and can be documented.

Because Nursing faculty have a diverse interests in research and/or clinical practice, faculty may choose to focus their **scholarship** activities towards practice, discovery, and/or application. All scholarship foci are valued in the SON. The choice may be based on the faculty's education and/or clinical background, the faculty's teaching assignments, or the faculty's interest. Activities documented in the portfolio should support the faculty's focus on their scholarship interests.

### Service

Universities function in various contexts, and faculty members *serve* in different roles in these contexts. *Service* includes those activities, other than teaching and research, which contribute to the daily operation of the University, as well as those which contribute to the Nursing profession, publicize the programs of the SON, enhance the reputation of GC, and contribute to the health and well-being of the public. Thus, "service" includes functions that benefit various constituencies, including the institution, the profession, and the community.

*Service to the institution* includes activities such as academic advising and serving on committees, task forces, commissions, governance, and other groups that contribute to the daily operation of GC, the COHS, and the SON. It also includes serving at campus events which publicize the University, COHS, and SON.

*Service to the profession* includes activities that contribute to the Nursing

profession, such as being active in professional organizations, convening conferences, assuming leadership roles, participation in accreditation activities, providing continuing education activities to professionals.

*Service as a professional* benefits the community, and is related directly to the faculty member's area of expertise. Service as a citizen also benefits the community, but does not flow directly from the faculty's specific skills. For example, a nurse providing health education at local colleges would be doing "service as a professional." The same person serving on a zoning committee in local government would be doing "service as a citizen." While GC values all types of service, service as a professional garners more weight in terms of faculty contribution than service as a citizen.

### **Annual Performance Evaluation**

All faculty are evaluated by the SON Director annually for the purpose of providing direction and advice to the faculty member regarding their performance and tenure and/or promotion progress. Annual performance evaluations are reviewed and considered by review committees at each level of review during the tenure and/or promotion process. Because annual performance evaluation findings are an important component within the tenure and/or promotion portfolio, information regarding the review of faculty performance is included here.

### **Minimal Expectations for Continued Faculty Employment**

Activities performed within the faculty role can be categorized as:

- 1) those that meet minimal expectations of teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- 2) those that demonstrate superior components of teaching, scholarship, and service. Annual performance evaluations of all faculty should demonstrate, at a minimum, the following activities related to teaching, scholarship, and service.

It is expected that all faculty, regardless of rank, will perform the minimum activities as listed below to earn a "Fully Acceptable" rating on the annual performance evaluation. Missing activities listed as minimum requirements will earn a rating of "Unsatisfactory" or "Needs Improvement". Activities completed beyond these requirements as listed below are to be used in the self-evaluation to earn a rating of "Commendable" or "Excellent". Please note that these activities alone do not meet tenure and/or promotion expectations, and do not guarantee a continued Tenure-Track contract.

#### **Teaching:**

- Syllabi that reflect learning outcomes, methods, and delivery system
- Preparation for classes
- Attendance at classes
- Grading of student assignments
- Completion of course report using template
- Clinical or field-based arrangements for individual courses as appropriate
- Formative and summative assessments to include the analysis of data and proposed changes
- Self-reflection and course changes documented based on student evaluations



- Minutes from team, unit, or college meetings related to course planning or redesign

**Scholarship:**

- Incorporation of evidence-based teaching methods into classes
- Minimum of one Scholarship of Teaching and Learning activity per year
- Terminal degree in the appropriate discipline earned if applicable as per USG policy
- All current information entered into Digital Measures
- Curriculum Vitae printed from Digital Measures and attached to annual performance evaluation

**Service:**

- Attendance at NFO Meetings
- Attendance at NFO Sub-Committee Meetings
- Attendance at CoHS Meetings
- Attendance at at least one graduation ceremony per year
- Attendance at School of Nursing Celebration Ceremonies

**Critical Components of Superior (Commendable and/or Excellent) Teaching, Scholarship and Professional Development, and Service**

When faculty members apply for tenure or promotion, they are evaluated on Superior Teaching, Scholarship and Professional Development, and Service. Given that the primary role of GC is teaching, it is expected that all of the *critical components* of superior teaching are met. Evidence of noteworthy achievement in either scholarship or service is also an expectation, with evidence of achievement in the remaining category.

A description of both **required evidence** and **suggested evidence** for a faculty member to provide in the tenure or promotion portfolio is listed below:

**Required evidence:** the Chairperson evaluation from the annual individual faculty report for all years under the period of review.

**Suggested evidence:** Individual faculty will not be expected to provide all types of possible evidence listed for the areas of superior teaching, scholarship and service. Neither is the list of examples provided exhaustive. Certain activities may fit under more than one of the three areas or under multiple critical components of a specific area. In such cases, it is the faculty members' task to explain this throughout their application materials. Faculty members will use the evidence to craft a narrative that makes the argument addressing the critical components. The following tables outline the critical components of each of these areas and provide suggested evidence that may be used to support the application.

**Critical Components of Superior (Commendable and/or Excellent) Teaching**

The purpose of teaching is to improve/impact learning. The evidence presented should be used to indicate that teaching has positively impacted student learning in the cognitive, affective, and/or psychomotor domains.

Critical Components	Evidentiary Support
1.1 Demonstrate professionalism and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private communication (emails, letters, cards from</li> </ul>

<p>collegiality such that one has a reputation as a "good citizen" of the unit, college, and university.</p>	<p>peers, colleagues, students)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public communication and recognition, such as news article or informal presentation</li> <li>• Formal mentorship and orientation of new faculty.</li> </ul>
<p>1.2 Develops course materials and pre-course planning documents that demonstrate effective planning and develops measures to assess instructional design and implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Active participation in major course revision or new course planning (beyond routine planning)</li> <li>• Active participation in planning, implementing and evaluating learning that ties didactic course with clinical experiences.</li> <li>• Development of new contracts or community clinical partnerships</li> <li>• Proposal development for a new course</li> <li>• Utilization of formal peer evaluation to improve course(s)</li> <li>• Award for teaching excellence received</li> </ul>
<p>1.3 Demonstrates responsiveness to learner needs through reflective innovation in course delivery methods.</p>	<p>Uses reflection from evaluation findings to implement and/or revise high impact educational practices and/or creative teaching strategies such as:</p> <p><i>High Impact</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service Learning (registered with the University)</li> <li>• Study Abroad</li> <li>• Student-faculty research</li> <li>• Collaborative assignments and projects</li> <li>• Diversity/global learning</li> <li>• Simulation development utilizing NLN Standards with student evaluation of the simulation experience</li> </ul> <p><i>Creative Teaching Strategies</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writing across the curriculum</li> <li>• Speaking to Learn</li> <li>• Reader's Theater</li> <li>• Flipped Classroom</li> <li>• Problem-based learning (new problem development)</li> <li>• Case study development</li> </ul> <p><i>Uses best practices in designing course within LMS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course is Quality Matter Certified</li> <li>• Learning management system reflects best practices (peer review required)</li> <li>• Other – you will need to define and evaluate</li> </ul>
<p>1.4 Engage in curriculum or program planning design, revision and/or program evaluation to reflect current trends in evidence-based educational practice or accreditation requirements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curriculum content mapping to outcomes and professional standards</li> <li>• Active participation in curriculum, evaluation, and assessment committee</li> <li>• Documented course revision based on student feedback and outcomes</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Participation in elements of program evaluation or self study such as writing a self-study, progress and planning reports, etc.</li><li>• Participation in multi-course teams to improve curriculum</li><li>• Other– you will need to define and evaluate</li></ul>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Critical Components of Superior (Commendable and/or Excellent) Scholarship and Professional Development

Scholarly and creative activities must include some tangible product, be peer reviewed, and be publicly presented in some scholarly forum. Professional development includes those activities that strengthen teaching, scholarship or service and can be documented.

Critical Component	Evidentiary Support
2.1 Development and dissemination of knowledge through any of Boyer's four forms of scholarship. Knowledge may take the form of empirical, historical, basic, applied, conceptual, theoretical, or philosophical scholarship.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer reviewed or edited book, book chapter, journal article or monograph published or accepted for publication</li> <li>• Grant award for research</li> <li>• Reviewed or invited presentation at professional conference or public lecture on scholarly topic</li> <li>• Award for scholarship excellence received</li> </ul>
2.2 Review or editing of scholarly work and professional consulting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of editing or review of books, creative activities, professional journal, conference presentations</li> <li>• Mentorship of undergraduate student research</li> <li>• Mentorship of graduate student research</li> <li>• Summary or communication documenting consultation contribution</li> </ul>
2.3 Acquisition and maintenance of professional credentials and training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional certification earned</li> <li>• Professional certification maintained</li> <li>• Maintains clinical competency in area of clinical expertise</li> <li>• Attendance at conference/training or completion of online training to expand clinical expertise</li> <li>• Attendance at conference/training or completion of online training to expand teaching expertise</li> </ul>

Critical Components of Superior (Commendable and/or Excellent) Service

Supporting documents for service should include not only membership in a given organization, but should indicate active engagement, commitment, and overall impact of service.

Critical Component	Evidentiary Support
3.1 Service to the Institution or the University System of Georgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair, Secretary or special assignment in School of Nursing committee</li> <li>• Chair, Secretary or special assignment in College of Health Sciences committee</li> <li>• Active participation in University-Wide committee such as Senate, Faculty Recognition, etc.</li> <li>• Active participation in University Senate sub-committee</li> <li>• Active participation in campus programs of short duration, such as circle leader, research conference, training, others</li> <li>• Active participation in councils or task forces</li> <li>• Major coordinator role (no course reduction or extra compensation) such as School of Nursing Accreditation, CoHS International Coordinator, GCANS</li> <li>• Award for service excellence received</li> </ul>
3.2 Service to the Profession	<p>Involvement in professional organizations such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee membership</li> <li>• Leadership role</li> <li>• Board of Directors</li> <li>• Task force</li> <li>• Conference planning</li> <li>• Accreditation site-visitor</li> </ul>
3.3 Service to the Community (as a professional or a *citizen)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation in a community non-profit organization or governmental agency in a capacity that requires professional nursing expertise. Participation may include committee membership, leadership role, member of Board of Directors, or task force member</li> <li>• Leadership in a professional organization performing a service to the community</li> <li>• Delivery of direct nursing care or educational services requiring nursing expertise to a community organization</li> <li>• Involvement in any community service as a citizen (something that does not require nursing expertise)</li> </ul>

\* Please note the "citizen" service receives less weight than as a professional

### **Critical Components for Professorial Ranks When Considering Promotion Materials**

To receive tenure, faculty provide evidence of noteworthy achievement at their current rank for Teaching and *either* Scholarship or Service, with evidence of achievement in the remaining category. To receive promotion, faculty provide evidence of noteworthy achievement at the rank sought for Teaching and *either* Scholarship or Service, with evidence of achievement in the remaining category.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	PROFESSOR
<b>1. Superior Teaching:</b>		
<p><i>An assistant professor demonstrates superior teaching resulting in learning, evidenced by positive documented changes in learners' growth in cognitive/ psychomotor/ affective domains. This must be demonstrated in <b>all</b> of the following criteria:</i></p>	<p><i>An associate professor demonstrates consistent superior teaching resulting in learning evidenced by positive documented changes in learners' growth in cognitive/ psychomotor/ affective domains. An associate professor achieves the associate professor role by exceeding the criteria for assistant professor. This must be demonstrated in <b>all</b> of the following criteria:</i></p>	<p><i>A (full) professor demonstrates consistent long term record of superior teaching resulting in learning evidenced by positive documented changes in learners' growth in cognitive/ psychomotor/ affective domains. A professor achieves the professor role by exceeding the criteria for associate professor. This must be demonstrated in <b>all</b> of the following criteria:</i></p>
<p>1.1 Demonstrates developing professionalism and collegiality through private and public communications from a variety of stakeholders.</p>	<p>1.1 Demonstrates consistent professionalism and collegiality through private and public communications from a variety of stakeholders.</p>	<p>1.1 Demonstrates long term record of professionalism and collegiality through private and public communications from a variety of stakeholders.</p>
<p>1.2 Demonstrates development of course materials and pre-course planning documents that reflects effective planning and assessment of instructional design and implementation.</p>	<p>1.2 Demonstrate consistent development of course materials and pre-course planning documents that demonstrate effective planning and assessment of instructional design and implementation.</p>	<p>1.2 Demonstrate long term record of consistent development of course materials and pre-course planning documents that demonstrate effective planning and assessment of instructional design and implementation. Examples of leadership should also be evident in this area.</p>
<p>1.3 Demonstrates innovation in instructional design and delivery that results in improved learning.</p>	<p>1.3 Demonstrates consistent implementation of innovation of instructional design and delivery that results in improved learning.</p>	<p>1.3 Demonstrates long term record of consistent implementation of innovation of instructional design and delivery that results in improved learning. Examples of leadership should also be evident in this area.</p>
<p>1.4 Demonstrates engagement in curriculum or program planning design, revision or evaluation that reflects current trends in evidence-based educational practice or accreditation requirements.</p>	<p>1.4 Demonstrates consistent engagement in curriculum or program planning design, revision or evaluation that reflects current trends in evidence-based educational practice or accreditation requirements.</p>	<p>1.4 Demonstrates long term record of consistent engagement in curriculum or program planning design, revision or evaluation that reflects current trends in evidence-based educational practice or accreditation requirements. Examples of leadership should also be evident in this area.</p>

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	PROFESSOR
<b>2. Scholarship and Professional Development:</b>		
<p><i>An assistant professor demonstrates successful scholarly productivity and professional development in area of specialization. Achievement must be shown in both Scholarship (2.1-2.3) and Professional Development criteria (2.4). This may be demonstrated by the following criteria, although not all areas are required:</i></p>	<p><i>An associate professor demonstrates established scholarly productivity and professional development in area of specialization. Achievement must be shown in both Scholarship (2.1-2.3) and Professional Development criteria (2.4). An associate professor achieves the associate professor role by exceeding the criteria for assistant professor. This may be demonstrated by the following criteria, although not all areas are required:</i></p>	<p><i>A (full) professor demonstrates established, consistent record of scholarly activity and professional development of such quantity and quality that there exists a noted reputation as recognized by peers at the state, regional and/or national level. Achievement must be shown in both Scholarship (2.1-2.3) and Professional Development criteria (2.4). A professor achieves the professor role by exceeding the criteria for associate professor. This may be demonstrated by the following criteria, although not all areas are required:</i></p>
<p>2.1 Development and dissemination of knowledge through the submission of peer-reviewed scholarly efforts, presentation at state and regional level conferences, and/or submission of internal or external funding of research initiatives.</p>	<p>2.1 Development and dissemination of knowledge through the publication of peer-reviewed scholarly efforts, presentation at state, regional, and national level conferences, and/or receipt of internal or external funding of research initiatives.</p>	<p>2.1 Development and dissemination of knowledge through the regular publication of peer-reviewed scholarly efforts, presentation at state, regional, national and international level conferences, and/or receipt of multiple internal or external funding of research initiatives.</p>
<p>2.2 Review or editing of scholarly work through the submission of reviews of other work, informal mentorship of student research, and professional consulting on a state and regional level.</p>	<p>2.2 Review or editing of scholarly work through the publication of reviews of other work, service as a reviewer of professional journals and presentations, formal mentorship of student research, and professional consulting on a state, regional, or national level.</p>	<p>2.2 Review or editing of scholarly work through the regular publication of reviews of other work, service as an editor or reviewer of professional journals and presentations, formal mentorship of student research leading to dissemination, and professional consulting on a state, regional, national, or international level.</p>
<p>2.3 Acquisition of professional credentials or training; and/or recognition at the state or regional level.</p>	<p>2.3 Acquisition and maintenance of professional credentials or training; and/or recognition at the state, regional, or national level.</p>	<p>2.3 Ongoing acquisition and maintenance of professional credentials or training; and/or recognition at the state, regional, national or international level.</p>

Note: Completion of a terminal degree is a requirement for promotion. When used as evidence for either tenure or promotion, attainment of the terminal degree may only be used as evidence of Professional Development (not Scholarship).

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	PROFESSOR
<b>3. Service:</b>		
<i>An assistant professor demonstrates record of service that positively reflects on the department, college, institution, and/or USG. This may be demonstrated by the following criteria, although not all areas are required:</i>	<i>An associate professor demonstrates established record of service that positively reflects on the department, college, institution, and/or USG. An associate professor achieves the associate professor role by exceeding the criteria for assistant professor. This may be demonstrated by the following criteria, although not all areas are required:</i>	<i>A (full) professor demonstrates established, consistent record of service of such quantity and quality that there exists a noted reputation for service as recognized by peers at the community or state level. A professor achieves the professor role by exceeding the criteria for associate professor. This may be demonstrated by the following criteria, although not all areas are required:</i>
3.1. Demonstrates involvement in committees, task forces, or initiatives at the department, college or institution level; effective academic advising; volunteering with special campus events; mentoring student organizations; and/or submission of internal or external funding of non-research initiatives (i.e., academic programming).	3.1. Demonstrates involvement in committees, task forces, or initiatives at the department, college or institution level and/or leadership at the department and college level; effective academic advising and work as representative at orientation and recruitment events; mentorship of faculty peers within department; regular volunteering with special campus events; and/or receipt of internal or external funding of non-research initiatives (i.e., academic programming).	3.1. Demonstrates involvement in committees, task forces, or initiatives at the department, college, institution or system level and/or leadership at the department, college or institution level; mentorship on advising to junior faculty; mentorship of faculty peers outside of department; coordinating special campus events; and/or receipt of multiple internal or external funding of non-research initiatives (i.e., academic programming).
3.2. Demonstrates commitment to their profession through active participation in organization activities and initiatives at the community, state or regional level.	3.2 Demonstrates strong commitment to their profession through active participation in organization activities and initiatives at the state, regional and national level and/or leadership in organization activities and initiatives at the state or regional level, and/or work as an accreditation reviewer.	3.2 Demonstrates strong consistent commitment to their profession through active participation in organization activities and initiatives at the state, regional, national, or international level and/or leadership in organization activities and initiatives at the state, regional, or national level, mentoring professional peers, and/or work as a lead accreditation reviewer.
3.3 Demonstrates ability to provide service to the community, district, or state.	3.3 Demonstrates ability to provide leadership in service work to the community, district, or state.	3.3 Demonstrates recognition for sustained leadership in service work to the community, district, or state.



## SECTION II

### General Information on the Tenure and Promotion Processes

The process through which personnel advice is submitted to duly appointed academic authorities and ultimately to the University President is grounded in the belief that faculty members comprising the University's academic departments are best qualified to determine their own composition and to evaluate the evidence for tenure and/or promotion of the individuals within the unit. Therefore, the SON Tenure & Promotion Committee conducts faculty evaluations and makes recommendations to the Director of the SON. Then, the Director of the SON makes a recommendation as well. Both of these recommendations are sent to the COHS Tenure & Promotion Committee. The COHS Tenure & Promotion Committee then makes a recommendation and sends this to the COHS Dean, whose recommendation is submitted for University-level review by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President. These personnel reviews for promotion and tenure prepared at the department/unit, then college level, are subject to review by all appropriately designated higher levels of institutional administration, to afford due process, including recourse, when disputes between applying faculty and committees or institutional administrators arise.

### Guiding Principles

Personnel review for purposes of recommending promotion, pre-tenure, post-tenure, or award of tenure are conducted according to rigorous, documented standards/criteria which are fairly and consistently applied by each advisory body and each decision-making authority at every level of the evaluation process. At each level, reviews are conducted in an atmosphere of fairness and professional integrity. To that end, the following guiding principles are in effect across all units of evaluation for the purposes of promotion and tenure decisions:

*Supporting materials* – the quantity of supporting materials provided in Binder 2 are limited to a single 3-ring binder of reasonable size (approximately 4 inches) (See Appendix A for guidelines for preparing the portfolio). Materials provided should focus on exemplars from areas under review, not an exhaustive inclusion of every example of all possible items. If necessary, exceptions can be made with sufficient justification for materials not easily presented in a binder.

*Confidentiality* - all deliberations, records, and recommendations of the Director of the SON and departmental entities formed for the purposes of evaluating, reviewing, and recommending personnel actions are strictly confidential. Disclosure of such information is permissible only for use by appropriate authorities.

*Voluntary Recusal from Deliberations* - faculty members related to a party being evaluated in any personnel matter must recuse themselves from all evaluation procedures. Any faculty member of a Tenure & Promotion committee at the unit or college level who believes their involvement in a personnel decision would be a conflict of interest, is advised to voluntarily recuse themselves from participation in the review process. Those who have voluntarily recused themselves from the review may not review documents and shall not vote or offer advice, either directly or indirectly, to other committee members.

*Procedural Rules* – all SON advisory bodies making personnel recommendations are encouraged to adopt procedural rules to guide their deliberations using the following definitions:

- proxy – authority, conferred in writing by a qualified voter to another qualified voter, empowering the latter to vote on behalf of the former. *Use of proxy votes is highly*

- discouraged* in deliberations involving personnel recommendations.
- absentee vote – a vote cast *in absentia* in writing by a qualified voter and delivered in a sealed envelope to the chair of the deliberating committee. *Use of absentee votes is highly discouraged* in deliberations involving personnel recommendations.
  - quorum – a majority of eligible voters within unit or college committee that is duly authorized to conduct personnel evaluations or reviews and tender personnel recommendations to a higher administrative authority. *A quorum is required of all committees whose purview involves personnel evaluations and recommendation*
  - A faculty member may only serve at one level (department or college)
  - Once a portfolio is submitted by faculty for review, it should remain intact, except for the addition of new publications or information (since the portfolio was submitted).

### **Committees Involved in Promotion and Tenure Evaluations in the SON**

Two standing committees are used for Promotion and Tenure Evaluations within the SON and COHS. The composition and criteria for eligibility for service on each committee is described below.

#### **SON Tenure & Promotion Committee**

This advisory group consists of full-time tenured faculty within the SON. Only faculty members who have achieved tenure may evaluate a faculty colleague seeking an award of tenure. Likewise, promotions may be considered only by faculty who are tenured and hold a rank equal to or higher than the rank being considered. This committee should consist of all faculty who are tenured and/or hold rank equal to or higher than the rank being considered. The committee should never have fewer than three (3) members. The faculty member who serves on the College Tenure & Promotion Committee is recused from the SON review.

The SON Director is ineligible to serve on this committee and is ineligible to nominate or vote during the election process for selection of members of this committee but does convene the committee for pre-tenure assessments, tenure deliberations, post-tenure assessments, and promotion recommendations. The committee itself selects a committee chair. If the SON Tenure & Promotion Committee does not have enough faculty members to meet these requirements, the COHS Dean shall seek the advice of the Academic Chairs Council in appointing a sufficient number of tenured, appropriately ranked members to constitute a minimum three-person committee to consider the faculty application.

#### **College Tenure & Promotion Committee**

The College Tenure & Promotion Committee shall consist of five (5) faculty members: two (2) from the SON, two (2) from the School of Health and Human Performance, and one (1) from the Department of Music Therapy. Each program area will elect the specified number of tenured faculty members with rank of Associate Professor or higher from the unit to serve on the committee. No persons may participate on this committee in any year they are being considered for promotion or tenure. Additionally, Department Chairs, Division Directors, or Deans are ineligible for service on the committee. Each program will forward a list of eligible faculty and the Dean's office will conduct the election electronically immediately before the first COHS meeting of Fall semester. If a qualified committee member is not available from within the unit, a unit election will be held to select a qualified faculty member from another unit within COHS to represent the unit on the committee. In the event of extenuating circumstances that preclude the ability of the committee to conduct an election within the required time frame of the review of applicants for tenure and promotion, replacements on this committee will be assigned by the Dean with input from unit heads.

## External Review for Promotion to Professor

It is highly encouraged that faculty applying for promotion to professor undergo evaluation by an external reviewer as part of the process. Evaluations by accomplished professionals who are not a part of the GC community provide a valuable element in assessing the accomplishments of faculty. External evaluations must be solicited and reviewed in the form of letters of evaluation. The purpose of these letters is to provide an independent and unbiased assessment of the individual's creative activity/research, teaching, and service work with a focus on local, regional, and national engagement and recognition within the discipline. The letter from the external reviewer should be included in the portfolio.

If the applicant chooses to use an external reviewer, the external reviewer will be chosen by the applicant and must be a professor in rank. Reviewers should be highly regarded and recognized professionals in the candidate's field and able to evaluate the quality, productivity, and significance of his/her professional activity. Reviewers may be individuals who know the candidate through professional interactions. External reviewers may not be members of the GC faculty, and should be selected so as to minimize the possibility of conflicts of interest; actual, potential, or apparent. Outside reviewers should not be selected from among those with whom the candidate has had familial or close personal relationships.

## Academic Tenure at Georgia College

“Academic tenure” is defined as the qualified expectation of continuation of annual employment that may be awarded to a full-time tenure-track faculty member after completion of a probationary period at GC. There is no guarantee that tenure will be awarded at the end of the probationary period; neither is tenure a guarantee of lifetime employment. Rather, tenure means that one who has been awarded tenure may not be discharged except upon certain grounds and in accordance with procedures specified by the USG Board of Regents policy. Award of tenure requires excellence in performance and the promise of continued excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. *It is the responsibility of the faculty member applying for tenure to demonstrate that the criteria for tenure have been met.* Faculty applying for tenure are encouraged to pursue peer and supervisory input and guidance.

Academic tenure is a privilege awarded after thorough review that culminates in the University acknowledging the faculty member's excellence and the likelihood that such excellence will contribute substantially over a considerable period of time to the mission and anticipated needs of the SON, COHS, and the University. Excellence is reflected in the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service, including the individual's ability to interact with collegiality with faculty and appropriateness with students.

A recommendation for the privilege of tenure is **typically** made during the eligible faculty member's sixth (6th) year of full-time employment with the University. The individual who wishes to be considered for tenure in the fifth (5<sup>th</sup>) year and who has strong evidence to support such consideration (strong pre-tenure review, feedback from tenured faculty, and/or department chair recommendations) is allowed to apply. This would be an **atypical** application and should be supported by extremely strong evidence. If tenure is not granted during the sixth (6th) full-time year, the faculty will be given a terminal contract for the seventh (7th) year of full-time employment.

If recommended tenure is approved at all requisite levels, the award of tenure takes effect at the beginning of the next contract year following the review and recommendation approval. Credit for prior accomplishment of service applied toward the tenure probationary period must be

specified and approved formally in writing at the individual faculty member's time of initial hire at GCSU. [Note: In cases where a faculty member is employed in the January term (Spring semester), years toward tenure begin in the next full academic year; exceptions to that policy are made at the level of the Department Chair/Dean.]

At GC, an award of academic tenure is associated with three review procedures across years of service as defined below. In advance of seeking tenure, the faculty member undergoes a **pre-tenure** review conducted by a committee of faculty peers to offer guidance, noting progress toward the goal of tenure and recommending strategies to increase the probability of success. Upon notification, the faculty member will develop a portfolio in application for **tenure**. Subsequently, the tenured faculty member on a five-year cycle undergoes a peer review of performance directed toward further career development, known as **post-tenure** review.

### Pre-Tenure Review

Pre-tenure evaluation, sometimes referred to as 3<sup>rd</sup> year review, provides for a thorough peer review of the tenure-eligible candidate's criterion-based performance with the sole purpose of delineating for the individual progress made thus far toward tenure (and promotion). Pre-tenure review occurs during the third year of appointment in a tenure-track position. Faculty members hired with prior credit for service are evaluated at the mid-point of their probationary period. Administrators subject to senior administrative review are exempt from the pre-tenure process. Pre-tenure evaluation does not replace annual performance evaluation. Obtaining a favorable pre-tenure review does not bind GC to recommend the non-tenured individual for tenure or promotion when the requisite years have been achieved. The results of pre-tenure review will have no bearing on subsequent tenure and promotion decisions. However, an unsatisfactory pre-tenure review may justify non-renewal of employment contracts at the discretion of the University President upon recommendation of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the COHS Dean, and the Department Chairperson. (See Rating Form 1 at [http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/acad\\_affairs/forms/pre.doc](http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/acad_affairs/forms/pre.doc) )

*Timing* – In the fall semester of the tenure-eligible faculty's third year of service or at the mid-point of the probationary period for those with prior credit, the Office of Academic Affairs notifies the individual and the line of authority supervisor (Department Chairperson) that pre-tenure documents should be submitted according to the timeline provided.

*Portfolio contents* – The following materials are submitted for the pre-tenure review; no additional materials are accepted:

- Summary in narrative form of major accomplishments achieved during the interval under review related to the Critical Components of teaching, scholarship and professional development, and service to the unit, college, university, the community, and the profession
- Evidence to support the summary narrative
- Copies of the Individual Faculty Reports and the Department Chairperson's evaluations for the interval under review
- Results of student and peer evaluations for the interval under review
- Current curriculum vita

*Conduct of Pre-tenure Review* – A pre-tenure committee within the individual's home department or unit is appointed by the Department Chairperson to consist of at least three (3) tenured individuals from the home department if possible, or from discipline-related departments if necessary. The members of this committee may or may not serve as members of the Department Tenure & Promotion committee. The committee is given the

responsibility of conducting a circumspect evaluation and providing a written report to both the individual faculty and the immediate supervisor, using the Rating Form 1 for Pre-tenure Review. Confidentiality of the results is essential. Because the results serve only for career development, they are not included in the faculty member's personnel file. The committee will provide Pre-Tenure Form 2 for the file, noting that the review was conducted, and that results were shared with the faculty member and supervisor. (These forms are both located at: [http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/acad\\_affairs/forms/pre.doc](http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/acad_affairs/forms/pre.doc).)

*Potential Results of Review* – Three results of the evaluation of faculty's performance are possible: satisfactory, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory, based on written criteria. "Needs improvement" and "Unsatisfactory" are to be applied judiciously and be associated with sound rationale.

*Discussion of Results* – The chair of the pre-tenure committee and the faculty member's immediate supervisor hold a candid discussion of the report with the tenure-eligible colleague. All copies of results are transferred to the faculty member, who signs Pre-tenure Form 2 with the committee chair and immediate supervisor for the file. Recommendations concerning potential faculty development activities that might improve or maintain performance are discussed during this meeting, whether the review is favorable or unfavorable.

### Tenure Review

Tenure resides at the institutional level. Institutional responsibility for employment of a tenured faculty member is the extent of continued employment on a 100% workload basis (the ten-month academic year) until retirement, dismissal for cause, or release because of financial exigency. Assistant professors, associate professors, and professors who are employed full-time are tenure-eligible. Someone with temporary employment status is not eligible for tenure consideration.

Tenure may be recommended upon completion of a probationary period of at least five complete academic terms of full time service at the rank of assistant professor or higher. A maximum of three years credit toward the minimum probationary period may be allowed for service at other institutions or for full-time service at GC at the rank of instructor. Credit for prior service shall be defined in writing by the President and approved by the Chancellor at the time of initial appointment at the rank of assistant professor or higher. The maximum time that may be served at the rank of assistant professor or higher without the award of tenure shall be seven years, provided, however, that a terminal contract for an eighth year may be offered if an institutional recommendation for tenure is not approved. The maximum time that may be served in any combination of full-time instructional appointments (lecturer, instructor, or professorial ranks) without the award of tenure is 10 years, provided that a terminal contract for an 11<sup>th</sup> year is offered if an institutional recommendation for tenure is not approved.

Tenure or probationary credit toward tenure is lost upon resignation from GC, written resignation from a tenured position in order to take a non-tenured position, or written resignation from a position with probationary credit toward tenure is given to take a position in which no probationary credit is given.

Tenured faculty members or non-tenured faculty before the end of the contract term may be dismissed for any of the following reasons, provided due process requirements have been met by the institution:

- conviction or admission of guilt of a felony or of a crime involving moral turpitude during the period of employment or prior to employment if the conviction or admission

- of guilt was willfully concealed;
- professional incompetency, neglect of duty, or default of academic integrity in teaching, research, or scholarship;
- sale or distribution of illegal drugs, teaching under the influence of alcohol or illegal drugs; any use of alcohol or illegal drugs which interferes with the faculty member's performance of duty or responsibilities to GC or the profession;
- 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;
- false swearing with regard to official documents filed with the institution;
- disruption of any teaching, research, administrative, disciplinary, public service or other authorized activity;
- such other grounds as specified in the GC statutes.  
(<http://www.usg.edu/academics/handbook/section4/4.04/4.04.01.phtml>)

#### *Process for Tenure Review*

1. The Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall make available a list of eligible faculty to the "line of authority" supervisors when faculty are tenure-eligible and the dates when recommendation is due to the appropriate GC officials.
2. The tenure-eligible faculty member submits a written tenure portfolio supporting the candidacy for tenure to the Department Chairperson. [A separate portfolio is required if the individual is concurrently seeking promotion]. The Standard Format for Application for Tenure ([http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/acad\\_affairs/forms/tenureformat.doc](http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/acad_affairs/forms/tenureformat.doc)), which is available from the Office of Academic Affairs and should be used for this purpose, provides guidelines for portfolio content as well as instructions for presentation of tenure materials.
3. After a review of the portfolio supporting candidacy, peer faculty in the individual's own department, convened as the Department Tenure & Promotion Committee, formally recommend for or against tenure in writing and accompanied by the faculty member's supporting documents, to the Department Chairperson. A written copy of the recommendation is provided to the faculty member being considered for tenure. If the recommendation is made against tenure, the faculty member has ten (10) calendar days from receipt of such notice to submit to the Department Chairperson a written statement in support of tenure candidacy.
4. The Department Chairperson shall provide a written formal recommendation for or against tenure, accompanied by the faculty member's tenure portfolio, to the COHS Dean. A copy of this recommendation also shall be submitted to the faculty member seeking tenure. If the Department Chairperson recommends against tenure, the faculty member has ten (10) calendar days from receipt of the notice, to submit to the COHS Dean a written statement in support of candidacy for tenure.
5. The COHS Dean provides the faculty members' tenure portfolio to the COHS Tenure & Promotion Committee for review, consideration, and recommendation. The committee's written recommendation with supporting documentation used in making the recommendation, is then submitted to the COHS Dean. If the College Tenure & Promotion Committee recommends against tenure, the faculty has ten (10) calendar days from receipt of notice, to submit to the Dean a written statement in support of tenure candidacy.
6. The COHS Dean provides a formal written recommendation for or against tenure, with the supporting tenure portfolio, to the Vice President for Academic Affairs; a copy of the recommendation also is sent to the faculty member being considered for tenure. If the Dean recommends against tenure, the faculty has ten (10) calendar days from receipt of notice, to submit to the Vice President for Academic Affairs a written statement in

- support of tenure candidacy.
7. The Vice President for Academic Affairs provides a formal written recommendation for or against tenure and supporting documentation in support of the faculty member's candidacy for tenure to the President of GC. The Vice President for Academic Affairs' recommendation to the President also is provided to the faculty member seeking tenure. If the recommendation is against an award of tenure, the faculty member has ten (10) calendar days from receipt of notice, to submit to the President a written statement in support of tenure candidacy.
  8. After a review of documentation supporting the faculty member's candidacy for tenure, recommendations, consultation with supervisors and/or other appropriate faculty, the President of GC may recommend tenure to the Board of Regents. The President's decision shall be provided to the faculty member. If the President does not recommend tenure, the faculty member has a right to appeal in accordance with Board policies.

### Post-tenure Review

Post-tenure review has as its purpose an opportunity to examine, recognize, and enhance performance of tenured faculty, focusing upon career development by identification of opportunities for faculty to reach their full potential in service to the institution. All tenured faculty members are subject to review on a five-year cycle. Exempt are administrators who are subject to senior administrative review. Post-tenure review does not replace annual evaluation.

*Portfolio contents* – The following materials are submitted for the post-tenure review; no additional materials are accepted:

- Summary in narrative form of major accomplishments achieved during the interval under review related to the Critical Components of teaching, scholarship and professional development, and service to the unit, college, university, the community, and the profession
- Evidence to support the summary narrative
- Copies of the Individual Faculty Reports and the Department Chairperson's evaluations for the interval under review
- Results of student and peer evaluations for the interval under review
- Current curriculum vita

*Conduct of Post-tenure Review* – The Department Chairperson will appoint a post-tenure review committee of tenured faculty from the individual's department and/or related departments at GC. The members of this committee may or may not serve as members of the Department Tenure & Promotion committee. The faculty member under review may select two members and the Department Chairperson selects the third. One preemptive challenge to the supervisor's selection is allowed. A circumspect evaluation is conducted. The category "unsatisfactory" is used judiciously and reserved for circumstances in which the colleague's performance is sufficiently severe to constitute grounds for revocation of tenure and cause for dismissal. The Department Chairperson may provide the committee with a description of special conditions within the unit that deserve consideration when evaluating the performance during the previous five years.

*Potential Results of Review* – Satisfactory performance for the previous five years may be identified and is documented by the committee using Form 1 A ([http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/acad\\_affairs/forms/post.doc](http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/acad_affairs/forms/post.doc)) for Post-tenure Review. If unsatisfactory performance is evident, the committee will provide an informed and candid written response using Form 1 B. In the event of unsatisfactory results, the immediate supervisor and faculty member develop a plan for enhancing the quality of

performance, including a timeline and monitoring strategies. Both parties sign the plan, which is stored within the personnel file in the immediate supervisor's office. Further information is available about instances of unsatisfactory results in Section XII – [http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/handbooks/academic\\_affairs/aahandbook/307036.html](http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/handbooks/academic_affairs/aahandbook/307036.html). The committee may provide commendation for noteworthy achievement by the faculty member during the previous five years and to recognize special meritorious achievement. Declaring noteworthy performance is limited to those few individuals who greatly exceed normal expectations in performance. Details are available in Section XI – [http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/handbooks/academic\\_affairs/aahandbook/307036.html](http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/handbooks/academic_affairs/aahandbook/307036.html)

*Discussion of Results* –Confidentiality in the post-tenure review process is imperative; copies of the evaluation are shared only with the individual faculty member and the immediate supervisor.

### **Academic Promotion at Georgia College**

Academic Promotion is defined as advancement in rank or position based on meeting requisite criteria for the respective advancement. Recognized faculty ranks at GC are Instructor, Lecturer and Senior Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. Promotion to a specific professorial rank is dependent on length of service at GC. Promotion from instructor to assistant professor rank requires 3 years in instructor rank; promotion to associate professor requires 4 years in assistant professor rank and promotion to professor rank requires 5 years of service at the rank of associate professor. While both the terminal degree and longevity of service are required for promotion, neither guarantees promotion, *per se*. Instead, noteworthy achievement in Superior Teaching and at least one other area – Scholarship and Professional Development or Service, according to Section I above – is required. Achievement in all three areas is expected.

#### Guidelines for Award of Promotion

Criteria for promotion to all professorial ranks require, include superior teaching, scholarship, professional development, and service. Noteworthy achievement is expected in teaching and one additional area. At GC, because of classification as a state university, “a doctoral degree or equivalent in training, ability, and/or experience “is required for promotion to associate or full professor” (<http://www.usg.edu/academics/handbook/section4/4.03.01.phtml>). A documented record detailing justification for showing evidence of “equivalent” is available online ([http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/handbooks/academic\\_affairs/aahandbook/3080524.html](http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/handbooks/academic_affairs/aahandbook/3080524.html)).

The faculty member's length of service is considered in determining whether or not an individual should be promoted. Faculty should be eligible for promotion consideration as follows:

- From Instructor to Assistant Professor during the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of service.
- From Assistant Professor to Associate Professor during their 5<sup>th</sup> year of service as an Assistant Professor.
- From Associate Professor to Professor during their 5<sup>th</sup> year of service as an Associate Professor.

Promotion to professorial rank is accompanied by a salary supplement over and beyond merit raises received by faculty.

([http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/handbooks/academic\\_affairs/aahandbook/20502.html](http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/handbooks/academic_affairs/aahandbook/20502.html))

#### Procedures for Promotion at Georgia College

1. The Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall make available a list of eligible faculty to the “line of authority” supervisors when faculty are eligible for



promotion and shall specify the dates when recommendation is due to the appropriate GC officials.

2. The promotion-eligible faculty member submits a written portfolio supporting the candidacy for promotion to the Department Chairperson. [A separate portfolio is required if the individual is concurrently seeking tenure]. The Standard Format for Application for Promotion, available from the Office of Academic Affairs, is to be used for this purpose and provides guidelines for portfolio content as well as instructions for presentation of materials supporting promotion. Moreover, the faculty member should be guided by Section I of this document which specifies criteria and a matrix related to promotion across professorial ranks and Section III, which contains examples and templates.
3. After a review of the portfolio supporting candidacy, peer faculty in the individual's own department (Department Tenure & Promotion Committee) convened by the respective Department Chairperson, formally recommends for or against promotion in writing and submit their recommendation, accompanied by the faculty member's supporting documents, to the Department Chairperson. The written recommendations are to include the rationale for the recommendation and vote of the committee. Acting on behalf of the faculty, the committee chair signs the recommendation. A written copy of the recommendation also is provided to the faculty member being considered for promotion. If the recommendation is made against promotion, the faculty member has ten (10) calendar days from receipt of such notice to submit a written statement to the Department Chairperson in support of his/her candidacy for promotion.
4. In all cases, this committee must base their deliberations on the standards and criteria for promotion approved and adopted by the COHS. The committee may consider recommendations and evaluations of the applicant's portfolio submitted by external sources, using the committee's own specified process for collecting such external reviews; however, external reviews are not required.
5. The Department Chairperson shall next provide an independent written formal recommendation for or against promotion, either concurring or disagreeing with the Department Tenure & Promotion Committee, accompanied by the faculty member's portfolio, to the COHS Dean. A copy of this recommendation also shall be submitted to the faculty member seeking promotion. If the Department Chairperson recommends against promotion, the faculty member has ten (10) calendar days from receipt of the notice, to submit a written statement to the COHS Dean in support of candidacy for promotion.
6. Further duties of the Department Chairperson include the following: (a) assuring that the applicant's portfolio is delivered by the specified time and copies of the Department Tenure & Promotion Committee and Department Chairperson's recommendations and any official transmittal paperwork are retained in departmental personnel files; and (b) assuring that copies of the recommendation submitted to the Dean are given to the applicant prior to submission to the Dean.
7. The COHS Dean convenes the College Tenure & Promotion Committee for review, consideration, and recommendation of the applicant's portfolio. The committee's written recommendation - with supporting documentation used in making the recommendation - is sent to the COHS Dean. If the College Tenure & Promotion Committee recommends against promotion, the faculty has ten (10) calendar days from receipt of notice, to submit to the COHS Dean a written statement in support of candidacy.
8. The COHS Dean next provides a formal written recommendation for or against promotion, and submits the recommendation with the supporting portfolio to the Vice President for Academic Affairs; a copy of the recommendation also is sent to the faculty member being considered for promotion. If the Dean recommends against promotion, the faculty has ten (10) calendar days from receipt of notice, to submit to the Vice President

- for Academic Affairs a written statement in support of candidacy.
9. The Vice President for Academic Affairs next provides a formal written recommendation for or against promotion and supporting documentation in support of the faculty member's candidacy to the President of GC. A copy of the Vice President for Academic Affairs' recommendation to the President also is provided to the faculty member seeking promotion. If the recommendation is against an award of promotion, the faculty member has ten (10) calendar days from receipt of notice, to submit to the President a written statement in support of candidacy.
  10. After a review of documentation supporting the faculty member's candidacy for promotion, recommendations, consultation with supervisors and/or other appropriate faculty, the President of GC may approve promotion. The President's decision shall be provided to the faculty member once determined and to the faculty member's immediate supervisor and the COHS Dean.
  11. An unsuccessful promotion application shall have no bearing on subsequent promotion decisions, annual performance evaluations, or other personnel decisions.

### **Appendix A: Portfolio Preparation Guidelines**

**Candidates applying for Tenure and/or Promotion consideration should follow these format guidelines in preparation and assembly of their Folios (Binders).**

- Candidates for tenure or promotion must use two different 3-hole punch binders for each decision they are requesting.
- Binder A should have an inside pocket feature. The College tenure and promotion document should be placed in this inside pocket sleeve – separate from other materials.
- Both binders should clearly identify the candidate and the application (tenure or promotion to \_\_\_\_\_) on the front cover.
- The binders should also have the external spine labeled with the candidate's name and again whether it is tenure or promotion.
- Binder A should be no more than 1.5-2 inches in width. Binder B should be no more than 3 inches in width.
- Tabbed dividers should be used to designate the separate sections of Binder A. & B.
- Documents should be 3-hole punched and placed in the relevant section of the binders.
- **Under no circumstances should plastic sleeves be used in any binder.**

**For Binder A (1.5 - 2 inches in width), the candidate will prepare a table of contents and**

**dividers for the following content:**

1. Most Current COHS Performance Appraisal Guidelines placed on inside cover pocket.
2. GC Cover Sheet with specific Candidate Information & signature section. i.e. The BOR prescribed Cover Sheet.
3. Dean's recommendation letter.
4. COHS T & P Committee recommendation letter.
5. Department/School Chair/ Director's recommendation letter.
6. Department/ School Peer Review Committee recommendation letter.
7. **Candidate self-evaluation/narrative.** The candidate will provide a narrative self-evaluation, not to exceed six single-spaced pages. The narrative shall document and evaluate the candidate's achievements and aspects of their professional performance that address the criteria for tenure or promotion in the areas of teaching; scholarly/creative activity and professional development; and institutional, professional, and/or community service. The candidate should also address the time and material resources available to support his or her work. If this is the candidate's second promotion, he or she will also address ways in which his or her work is qualitatively better than that which earned the previous promotion and specify what activities or achievements since the last action merit the current action.
8. **Candidate Academic / Professional Vita.**
9. **Performance Reviews**  
Director/Department Chairperson's Evaluation of Faculty Performance reports.  
(Inclusive of first employment year of tenure track appointment and each year until present; or all annual evaluation since award of rank/tenure).

**For Binder B of the portfolio (no more than 3 inches in width), candidates will include a table of contents with dividers separating the supporting documentation in the following order:**

**1. Teaching Materials**

Student Evaluations of the candidate's courses. These must comprise two evaluations per semester over the past three years. The quantitative summaries will be provided for two courses each semester over the past three years. In addition, the candidate and the department chair will select three representative courses for which all student comments will be photocopied for inclusion in the portfolio. The director/chair and candidate shall each initial the pages of these photocopies, to certify that they are complete.

Course Materials Representative syllabi, class handouts, assignments, examinations, and other documentation for a maximum of three courses. The courses used may be chosen by the candidate but should reflect the spectrum of levels at which the candidate teaches, such as core courses, upper division courses for majors, and graduate courses. The materials selected shall reflect the candidate's teaching objectives, organization, and style.

**2. Scholarly/Creative Activity and Professional Development**

Evidence of the candidate's scholarly/creative activity: tables of contents of books, reprints or copies of articles or chapters, published copies of abstracts, presentations, slides or CDs of creative work. Candidates may also include reviews of their work, such as book reviews, reviews of creative performances, or reviews of grant proposals. Works in progress may also be submitted. Departmental policies shall provide more detail on acceptable documentation for scholarly/creative activity and professional development. The amount of "evidence" included should be determined in consultation with the departmental chair/director.

### 3. **Service**

Evidence of the candidate's service activity: documentation of candidate's university, professional, and/or community service. This shall include brief descriptions of the scope of the work, frequency of meetings, leadership responsibilities on committees and special projects, outcomes of the work, and the like. Letters or certificates of appreciation might also be included in this documentation. The COHS tenure and promotion document shall provide more detail on acceptable formats for documenting service activities.

### 4. External letters of support (acceptable but not mandatory)

The portfolio will include this section **ONLY** if the candidate chooses to solicit these letters. The letters may be added by the candidate or by the department chairperson/director. Must be completed prior to time of folio submission.