



FACULTY EVALUATION MODEL
Recommendations and Report

Prepared by
The Faculty Evaluation Model Revision Taskforce

Work Conducted
April 2016 to October 2016

COMMITTEE

Members

Byron K. Brown, Chair	<bbrown@valdosta.edu>
Lois Ann Bellflowers	<labellflowers@valdosta.edu>
Emily G. Cantonwine	<egcantonwine@valdosta.edu>
Steven E. Downey	<sedowney@valdosta.edu>
Travis Craig Hawkins	<tchawkins@valdosta.edu>
Kenneth Nathan Moates	<knmoates@valdosta.edu>
Darrell L. Ross	<dross@valdosta.edu>
Michael Paul Savoie	<mpsavoie@valdosta.edu>
Laura Bell Wright	<lbwright@valdosta.edu>
Eric B. Howington	<ebhowington@valdosta.edu>
Kathleen S. Lowney	<klowney@valdosta.edu>

Ex Officio Members

Michael M. Black	<mblack@valdosta.edu>
Denise Bogart	<dbogart@valdosta.edu>
Sharon L. Gravett	<sgravett@valdosta.edu>
James T. LaPlant	<jlaplant@valdosta.edu>
Tony G. Thomas	<tgthomas@valdosta.edu>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED REVISIONS	iii
Reasons for Revision	
Summary of Proposed Changes	
FACULTY EVALUATION MODEL	1
Introduction	
Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI)	
Annual Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan	
Annual Faculty Evaluation	
Merit Salary Review	
Promotion and Tenure Review	
Pre-Tenure / Third-year Review	
Post-Tenure / Fifth-year Review	
APPENDIX	
Proposed Revision of Annual Faculty Evaluation Form	12

OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED REVISIONS

Reasons for Revision

Completed and approved by the Faculty Senate in June 2007, the current Faculty Evaluation Model presented a theoretical framework that linked all of the evaluation processes affecting VSU's faculty members. As a part of that process, the taskforce charged with developing this document also created the current documents used for the Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI), the annual Faculty Activity Report (FAR), and the Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE).

Many changes have occurred since that time, including the Faculty Senate's approval of a University Tenure and Promotion Policy in April 2011. Student evaluations were moved online in 2010, and in spring 2016 both faculty activity reports and annual faculty evaluations were moved online and are now stored and formatted in Digital Measures. In addition, dates for submitting promotion and tenure document, for example, have changes, and as a result the 2007 document now contains a number of factual errors.

This revised document is designed to reflect these new realities as well as to make other changes that the present FEM Task Force believes will be beneficial. These changes are outlined below.

Summary of Proposed Changes

These revisions reconceive the scope and purpose of the Faculty Evaluation Model document. Specifically, the plan presented here proposes the following:

- that the FEM document should provide a concise orientation that explains how all faculty evaluation activities at VSU are sequenced and related but not attempt a full statement of policy in any area;
- that it should be formatted as an online document; and
- that it should be hyperlinked to complete statements of VSU policy as well as to official forms and other materials that faculty members and administrators may need to consult during the faculty evaluation process.

In addition, it proposes the following changes in existing faculty evaluation documents:

Revised FEM document. This revision is significantly shorter than the original and eliminates the appendices attached to the current version. Descriptions of each form of assessment follow the same pattern: a brief quotation or quotations from USG Board of Regents policy to justify and contextualize VSU policy, a summary of the main elements and principles contained in the VSU and USG statements, and links to more complete statements of VSU policy, when available.

Revised Annual Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan. This document will no longer exist in print or Microsoft Word format. Instead, faculty members will complete and submit the required information through Digital Measures.

Several realities make the transition to an online format desirable. An electronic format saves paper, labor, and time, and it also allows such data as Student Opinion of Instruction reports from each semester to be saved and automatically populated in annual reports. Digital Measures also offers a flexible, customizable, and regularly upgraded instrument that has the power to meet the evolving needs of VSU's department and colleges to store, format, and print data in various formats.

To align the Annual Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan with USG terminology and to strengthen its reflective dimension, this revision proposes four substantive changes in this document:

Current Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan	Proposed Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan
Asks faculty members to reflect on their SOI responses only	Asks faculty members to reflect on their teaching (including but not limited to SOIs), on their scholarly/creative activity, and on their service. These reflections need not be long but should help department/unit heads prepare annual evaluations as well as provide a foundation for setting goals in these three areas.
Refers to the second category of faculty activity as "Professional Growth and Development"	Refers to this category as "Research, Scholarship, and Creative Productivity." This title more accurately reflects the activities that faculty members are asked to report in the second section of the Annual Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan.
Asks faculty members to set Goals in each area of activity	Asks faculty members to set Goals and Action Plans in each area of activity. Currently, statements of goals have ranged from very broad aspirations (e. g. "to develop a national reputation in XYZ studies") to very specific ones. This document continues to ask for goals, then it asks faculty members to identify at least one actionable activity to achieve this goal. If the goal is to develop a national reputation, for example, the action plan for the coming year might be to submit an article to a national journal.
Refers to "Service to the College and Community"	Refers to "Service to the University, Community, and Profession." This change aligns this document with current promotion and tenure guidelines.

Revised Annual Faculty Evaluation Form. This document expands the number of evaluative categories to allow for more nuanced evaluations of faculty performance. It also offers a more detailed description of these categories than the current form offers for its two performance categories.

Current Annual Faculty Evaluation Form	Proposed Annual Faculty Evaluation form
Offers two evaluative categories: “Satisfactory” “Unsatisfactory”	Offers four evaluative categories: “Distinguished” “Successful” “Needs Improvement” “Unsuccessful”
Offers a one-sentence description of each performance level	Offers paragraph-length descriptions of each level designed to provide useful but flexible parameters for characterizing faculty members’ performance.

Updated Merit Pay statement. This section is revised to improve readability but contains no substantive changes.

Updated Pre-Tenure Review statement. This statement is revised to improve readability and to update current submission deadlines, among other things.

Revised Post-Tenure Review statement. This statement proposes a substantive change in VSU’s current policy, recommending that department/unit heads rather than faculty personnel committees¹ write post-tenure reviews and design remediation plans and that departmental personnel committees act as the first level of appeal, if needed.

[Note: This report has been prepared for review by various campus stakeholders. It contains several elements, including this Overview of Proposed Changes, an Appendix, and Explanatory Notes (in red font throughout) that will not be part of Faculty Evaluation Model statement when it is posted on the Academic Affairs web site.]

¹ This document uses the generic term “personnel committee” to refer to bodies tasked with evaluating faculty members’ job performance at the departmental/unit level and variously referred to as “Promotion and Tenure Committee,” “Faculty Evaluation Committee,” “Tenure, Promotion, and Faculty Evaluation Committee,” or similar titles.

FACULTY EVALUATION MODEL AT VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY²

Introduction

Valdosta State University helps faculty members develop successful, productive careers by regularly evaluating their performance, providing constructive feedback, and facilitating their professional growth. Consisting of a structured, flexible process of continuous planning, communication, and feedback, faculty evaluation begins at the point of initial employment, it guides the promotional and tenure process, and it informs the years of post-tenure service.

Faculty members are evaluated in three areas: (a) teaching and student learning; (b) research, scholarship, and creative productivity; and (c) service to the institution, community, and profession.

Several principles shape this evaluation model:

Transparency. VSU’s Faculty Evaluation Model provides a conduit for early and consistent communication between department/unit heads and faculty members about university expectations, faculty goals, and departmental needs;

Intentionality. It emphasizes the value of annual, faculty-developed action plans that are devised in consultation with department/unit heads and designed to meet the long-term goals of individual faculty members as well as of the units in which they serve.

Flexibility. It recognizes and rewards the shifting emphases in professional activity that may occur during an academic year as well as over the course of individual faculty members’ careers.

Breadth of Perspective. It yields feedback from diverse perspectives, including students, department/unit heads, and departmental, college, and university peers.

Ease of Access. It employs an online system, which provides a consistent format, automatically populates some data, and organizes reports in various formats, as needed.

VSU’s evaluation model employs the following assessment activities:

Review	Reviewers	Frequency	Location
Student Opinion of Instruction	Students voluntarily provide feedback on faculty members’ teaching effectiveness.	Each term	SOI Portal

² “Model” indicates that colleges and units will modify elements of the evaluative procedure (e.g., arrangement of professional categories or addition of questions to the SOI, etc.) to facilitate planning, program evaluation by external accrediting bodies, or other disciplinary requirements.

Review	Reviewers	Frequency	Location
Annual Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan	Faculty members report on their activities for the past year, reflect on their accomplishments, and set goals for the upcoming year.	Annual	Digital Measures
Annual Faculty Evaluation	Department/unit heads use faculty members' Action Plans and Annual Faculty Activity Reports to evaluate their performance during the past year.	Annual	Digital Measures
Merit Pay Review	Department/unit heads use individual department/college standards to reward faculty members' performance since the last award of merit pay.	Periodic, depending upon legislative appropriations	Department/College Policy Manual
Pre-tenure / Third-year Review	Department committees and department/unit heads evaluate tenure-track faculty members' progress toward meeting standards for promotion and tenure and non-tenure track faculty members' success in meeting departmental and unit standards	Generally, during the third year of service, unless the faculty members brings years toward tenure	College Promotion and Tenure Documents
Promotion and Tenure Review	Department committees and department/unit heads; college committees and deans; and university committee and Provost evaluate faculty members' performance in teaching and student learning; scholarship and creative productivity; and service to the university, community, and profession.	Tenure and first promotion review usually between fourth and seventh year of full-time university service; subsequent promotions not sooner than five years after the last promotion	College and University Promotion and Tenure Documents
Post-tenure / Fifth-year Review	Department/unit heads evaluate faculty members' professional activity since the last review and design remediation plans, if needed. Department personnel committees will act as the first level of appeal if needed.	Every five years unless interrupted by another personnel action	University Policy

Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI)

Student Opinions of Instruction (SOIs) provide regular feedback designed to help faculty members enhance their instructional effectiveness. They also provide one source of data among many that departments and colleges use to evaluate their faculty members' performance in the area of teaching and student learning. SOIs are provided for each course,³ including summer sessions.

SOIs include open-ended and closed-ended questions about faculty performance. These are available soon after the end of the semester and are stored electronically. Information from them is used in Annual Evaluations and Promotion and Tenure documents.

Guidelines for interpreting Student Opinions of Instruction are available online through the Office of Academic Affairs.

Resources to be hyperlinked when placed on webpage:

Office of Academic Affairs → Faculty Resources → Teaching and Course Materials

- ***SOI Procedures and Timelines***
- ***Directions for Accessing and Completing SOIs***
- ***Guidelines for Administering SOIs***
- ***Guidelines for Colleges, Departments, and Programs Using SOIs***

Annual Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan

According to the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, "Each institution shall establish definite and stated criteria, consistent with the Regents' Policies and the statutes of the institution against which the performance of each faculty member will be evaluated. The evaluation shall occur at least annually and shall follow stated procedures as prescribed by each institution" (BOR *Policy Manual*, section 803.07).

Valdosta State University combines an action plan with the self-reporting of annual activities required for this USG-mandated annual evaluation. The resulting document, the Annual Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan (AFARAP), performs a variety of important functions:

- it engages faculty members in a structured process of reflection, self-evaluation, and personal career planning;
- it allows department and unit heads to assess faculty members' progress toward their next personnel action or merit determination and to help faculty reach departmental expectations and goals; and

³ Exceptions include student teaching, practicum courses, thesis courses, directed studies, internships, and other courses with low enrollments (<5) where the student's anonymity could be compromised.

-
- it provides documentation for future personnel actions as well as for strategic planning and development at the department, college, and university level.

The Annual Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan fulfills three distinct but closely related purposes:

- First, it clearly and accurately details faculty members' specific activities and accomplishments in the areas of (a) Teaching and Student Learning, (b) Research, Scholarship and Creative Production, and (c) Service to the University, Community, and Profession during the past year. This information is stored electronically and may be entered at the faculty member's convenience.
- Second, it allows faculty members to reflect upon their professional accomplishments and growth during the past year as well as to identify perceived needs and new professional interests they have developed during the year. Faculty members must refer specifically to SOI reports from the past year as part of their reflection upon their teaching and instruction. They should also comment upon their progress toward meeting the action plan they outlined for the year under review. If new assignments or responsibilities interrupted the pursuit of these plans, the reflective comments should explain.
- Third, it identifies specific tasks that faculty members intend to pursue in the coming year. Since these plans help define the standards used to evaluate the faculty member's performance in the coming year, they should be phrased in actionable and not merely aspirational terms: e. g., "to prepare and submit at least one conference paper" or "to revise and resubmit an article to XYZ journal," or "to finish editing a book under contract," rather than "to become a recognized scholar in XYZ studies."

Faculty members are responsible for uploading a syllabus for each course and teaching qualifications each semester. They can update their scholarly activities and additional professional experiences at any time. Instruction on accessing the database, using it, and printing reports; information required for the AFARAP; and timelines for submitting and reviewing this document are available online through the Office of Academic Affairs.

Department/unit heads are responsible for meeting with new faculty members during their first semester of employment to discuss the Faculty Evaluation Model, to clarify departmental expectations, and to set appropriate action plans for the coming year.

Copies and supporting documentation are housed in the employee's official personnel file. Department/unit heads respond to each Annual Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan through the Annual Faculty Evaluation form.

Resources to be hyperlinked when placed on webpage:

Office of Academic Affairs → Faculty Resources → Teaching and Course Materials

- ***Faculty Credentials and Uploading Course Syllabi***

Office of Academic Affairs → Faculty Resources → Appointment, Promotion, Tenure, Evaluation

- ***Annual Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan (to be completed by faculty members)***
- ***Using Digital Measures to Record Faculty Activities***
- ***Annual Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan (AFARAP): Submission and Review Timeline***

Annual Faculty Evaluation

Conducted by Department/Unit Heads, the Annual Faculty Evaluation provides faculty members with a qualitative and quantitative evaluation of their past year's performance in teaching and student learning; research, scholarship and creative production; and university, community, and professional service.

The following principles inform this document:

- it uses written departmental or college standards as the basis for evaluation;
- it documents faculty members' success in meeting individualized action plans or remediation plans;
- it employs a four-point scale: "Distinguished," "Successful," "Needs Improvement," or "Unsuccessful";
- it includes written comments that explain and/or document the basis for the rating given in each category; and
- it offers specific recommendations if activity in any given area is determined to need improvement or is unsuccessful.

During the Annual Faculty Evaluation process, department or unit heads meet with faculty members (a) to review the past year's activities, (b) to assure that faculty members' goals and plans for the upcoming year are aligned with departmental, college, and university goals, and (c) to determine that they are prioritized in a way that may lead to tenure and promotion where appropriate.

Both the faculty member and the head sign the Annual Faculty Evaluation to certify that they have met and discussed this document. Faculty members have the right to append a

response to this evaluation before it leaves the department. Copies of the Annual Evaluation document will be forwarded to the appropriate dean and then to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. A copy of this evaluation form as well as the schedule for the departmental and college review of this document appears online through the Office of Academic Affairs.

Resources to be hyperlinked when placed on webpage:

Office of Academic Affairs → Faculty Resources → Appointment, Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation

- ***Annual Faculty Evaluation (to be completed by Department Heads/Directors/Deans)***
- ***Annual Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan (AFARAP): Submission and Review Timeline***

Merit Pay Review

Institutions in the University System of Georgia are authorized to offer performance-based salary increases as often as once per year. However, both the availability and the amount of increase depend on the appropriation of money for this purpose by the Georgia General Assembly (*Human Resources Administrative Practice Manual: Classification, Compensation, and Payroll*).⁴

When funding is available, salary increases are awarded on the basis of merit. Criteria for determining merit may include teaching and job performance; completion of significant professional development activities, including the attainment of additional academic degrees; promotion in rank; seniority; research productivity; academic achievements and publications; academic honors and recognitions; relevant professional achievements and recognitions; and non-teaching services to the institution.

Individual colleges and departments are responsible for developing standards of evaluation for use within their respective units and for working with the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs to ensure that these standards comply with university policies.

Department/unit heads and deans are responsible for communicating these standards to all members of their unit.

⁴ While compensation could be reduced as a consequence of actions of the governor or General Assembly, it is the stated intent of the Board "to maintain current salary commitments in so far as possible to every employee and the Board will exert its composite influence and best efforts to that end." (*Human Resources Administrative Practice Manual: Classification, Compensation, and Payroll*).

Faculty members who are not satisfied with their merit evaluations may submit a written explanation and request for re-evaluation to their department/unit head. Cases that are not settled at the department level may be submitted to the appropriate dean. Final appeals may be sent to the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Grievances with specific evidence of discrimination based on race, color, sex, religion, national origin, disability, or age may be appealed through the Office of Social Equity.

Resources to be hyperlinked when placed on webpage:

Office of Human Resources and Employee Development → Policies and Procedures

- ***Section 806: Employee and Employer Relations***
- ***Office of Social Equity***

Promotion and Tenure Review

General guidelines for promotion and tenure within the University System of Georgia appear in its Board of Regents' *Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Handbook* (4.5) as well as in three sections of its Board of Regents' *Policy Manual*: 8.3.5.1 (Evaluation of Faculty), 8.3.6 (Criteria for Promotion), and 8.3.7 (Tenure and Criteria for Tenure).

Tenure is reserved for faculty members in tenure-track positions. Tenure is not guaranteed. Normally, faculty members must be employed in a tenure-track position for at least four years of full-time consecutive service before they are eligible to apply for tenure.

Faculty with non-tenure track appointments and honorific appointments, including adjunct appointments, are not eligible for tenure. (*BoR Minutes*, October 2008). Depending on their academic rank, individuals employed in non-tenure track positions may be eligible for promotion (*BoR Policy Manual* 8.3.8.2). Faculty members in non-tenure track position may apply on an equal basis with other candidates for tenure track positions which may become available (*Policy Manual* 8.3.8).

VSU's general policies and procedures for promotion and for awarding tenure as well as the guidelines used in its various units, including its colleges and Odum Library, are available online through the Office of Academic Affairs.

The timeline for submitting promotion and tenure materials appears in the resources below.

Resources to be hyperlinked when placed on webpage:

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs → Tenure and Promotion Procedures.

- [**Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures**](#)
- [**Resource Guide for Peer Evaluations of Teaching**](#)
- [**Promotion and Tenure Submission Timeline**](#)
- [**Tenure and Promotion Cover Sheets**](#)

Pre-Tenure / Third Year Review

According to BOR *Policy Manual 8.3.5.1*, “Each institution shall conduct in-depth pre-tenure reviews of all faculty in their third year of progress toward tenure. The criteria established for promotion and tenure, emphasizing excellence in teaching, shall be used as the focus for these reviews. The institution shall develop pre-tenure review policies, as well as any subsequent revisions.”

Pre-tenure review is advisory. Its purpose is to highlight probationary faculty members’ strengths and potential weaknesses at least two years before probationary faculty members submit applications for promotion and tenure.

Pre-tenure review typically occurs during faculty members’ third year of employment in a tenure-track position at the assistant professor level or higher. However, faculty members who bring prior years of service will receive a pre-tenure review at the mid-point of the remaining probationary period.

Keeping in mind the University System’s emphasis upon superior teaching/job performance, pre-tenure review carefully assesses faculty members’ instructional competence. It also evaluates their progress toward meeting departmental, college, and institutional standards for research, scholarship, and creative production and assesses their service to the institution, community, and/or profession.

When undergoing pre-tenure review, faculty members should complete the Application for Promotion and Tenure form currently used by their unit. Pre-tenure dossiers must be submitted by the date specified for their unit. Copies of these forms and the *Personnel Action Cover Sheet*, a list of materials required in the dossier, and timelines for submitting dossiers for each unit are available in *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures*.

Faculty members in non-tenure track positions will also undergo review in their third year of service. This review is tailored to their specific duties and is designed to assure that non-tenure track faculty members are successfully meeting departmental standards for performing these duties. If a non-tenure track position can lead to promotion, then this review will serve as a pre-promotion review and will follow the process outlined below.

Departmental personnel committees evaluate candidates' pre-tenure, pre-promotion, and third-year review dossiers in light of their respective unit guidelines. Following that analysis, committees prepare a written report identifying areas of strength, noting areas where additional attention is warranted, and making recommendations. These reports are submitted both to department heads and to candidates. Department heads independently evaluate pre-tenure dossiers, review advisory committees' recommendations, and submit reports and recommendations to the dean. Deans review material prepared by committees and department heads, meet with faculty members if a meeting is desired, and provide a letter of notification to the faculty member and to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Post-Tenure / Fifth-year Review

Post-tenure /fifth-year review provides a multi-year perspective on tenured faculty members' on-going performance. While its primary purpose is to document their continued commitment to professional excellence, it also offers opportunities for longer-term reflection upon changing professional interests, responsibilities, and roles in the university.

Since tenured faculty members continue to participate in the thorough annual evaluation process required of all VSU faculty members, post-tenure/ fifth-year review requires much less documentation than promotion and tenure review. The primary documents include

- (1) the five most recent annual evaluations,
- (2) a current curriculum vita, and
- (3) any additional materials the faculty member chooses to submit.

These materials will be submitted to department/unit heads by the dates identified by the faculty members' college.

Annual performance ratings in the three areas of Teaching and Student Learning; Research, Scholarship, and Creative Production; and Service to the University, Community, and Profession will provide the basis for post-tenure review. Annual performance ratings in areas of their assigned duties will provide the basis for fifth-year reviews of non-tenure track faculty. Faculty members who receive three or more ratings of "Needs Improvement" or "Unsuccessful" in a single area, with at least one of these ratings within the three years prior to post-tenure or fifth-year review, will be candidates for remediation in that area.

Process

The post-tenure review process begins five years after a faculty member's most recent personnel action (promotion, tenure, and/or third-year review) and continues at five-year

intervals unless interrupted by a promotion, impending candidacy for promotion within a year, or an approved leave of absence. A statement will be added to each annual contract stating the anticipated year for post-tenure review. Tenured faculty who hold administrative positions, including department heads, will be reviewed five years after returning to a full-time teaching appointment.

Department/unit heads are responsible for preparing post-tenure reviews and reviewing these with faculty members. Both the department/unit head and the faculty member must sign the report indicating the results have been presented and discussed.

If the department/unit head recommends a post-tenure development plan, it must (1) define specific goals or outcomes; (2) outline activities to be undertaken to achieve these goals or outcomes; (3) contain a schedule; and (4) define the criteria by which the faculty member's progress will be monitored.

The department/unit head will be responsible for forwarding the faculty member's development plan to the appropriate administrator at least one level above the faculty member's unit as well as to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The department/unit head and administrative officer are responsible for arranging appropriate support for the approved plan, if required. This process will be integrated into the timetable for personnel decisions and merit pay decisions established by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

If faculty members wish to appeal a post-tenure review and/or remediation plan, their department/unit's personnel committee shall review the department/unit head's report, the materials submitted by the faculty member, and any other materials the department head and faculty member wish to present. A copy of this committee's findings shall be presented to the faculty member and the department/unit head within two weeks after the date the materials are received. If the departmental committee and department head do not agree, the appeal shall be submitted to the Dean for a final decision.

If a faculty member is engaged in a remediation plan, the department/unit head will review his or her progress as part of the annual review process, and the outcome of this review will be reported as part of the annual evaluation. If, in a period of time not to exceed three years, the department/unit head determines that the faculty member has been successful, he or she will report this to the dean and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. A faculty member who successfully completes the development plan will be reviewed again 5 years from the date of the original review.

If a department head determines that a faculty member has failed to make the required improvements within the agreed-upon timetable, both the faculty member and head will be asked to submit a written explanation to the personnel committee. The faculty member's account should explain why the faculty member has been unable to meet the terms of the development plan. The committee may respond to these written explanations in one of three ways:

-
- (1) it may determine that the faculty member has achieved the desired improvement;
 - (2) it may accept the faculty member's explanation of why the performance goal(s) have not been met; in this case, the department head will work with the faculty member to revise the development plan; or
 - (3) it may determine that the faculty member has not achieved the desired improvement and not accept the faculty member's explanation of why the performance goals were not met; in this case the committee will prepare a report of the entire post-tenure review process specific to the case, and forward it to the faculty member, the department/unit head, and the dean with the recommendation that appropriate sanctions be implemented.

Regardless of the committee's recommendation, the faculty member can follow the appeals process established by the Board of Regents (*BoR Policy Manual 8.2.21: Employment Appeals*). If the administration decides to initiate sanctions or dismissal procedures because of an unsatisfactory performance on the part of the faculty member, it will adhere to the University and Board of Regents guidelines for dismissal for cause (*BoR Academic and Student Affairs Handbook, 4.5: Post-tenure Review*).

Establishing Standards of Performance

Each department/unit will periodically review and maintain its statement of expectations for satisfactory performance applicable to all faculty members (tenured and non-tenured). Departmental/unit statements will address expectations for the areas of teaching and student learning; research, scholarship, and creative production; and service to the university, community, and profession. These must be as specific as possible, without arbitrarily precluding the diverse contributions that individual faculty members might make to the university community. Individual differences in teaching, scholarship, and service are valued. After approval by the members of the department/unit, the statement will be submitted to the dean for review.

The dean of each unit will certify in writing that department/unit expectations are in keeping with the established mission of the college, that they meet minimum standards, and that expectations are equitable throughout the college. These expectations will be provided to all new faculty. Questions concerning these policies and procedures will be answered at annual meetings open to all faculty of the college.

Conclusion

This post-tenure review provides an opportunity to assess faculty development goals and achievements and provides assistance to faculty in ensuring continuous intellectual and professional growth. The post-tenure review is distinguished from the annual review in that it requires faculty and administrators to assess achievements and goals over a longer term. It also merges the faculty and administration into a unit dedicated to expanding and strengthening the overall quality of education at VSU by encouraging highly motivated and professionally active tenured faculty.

Resources to be hyperlinked when placed on webpage:

Office of Academic Affairs → Faculty Resources

- ***Post-Tenure Review* [PROPOSED NEW DOCUMENT: COPY ATTACHED]**

Human Resources and Employee Development → Policies and Procedures

- ***Section 806: Employee and Employer Relations***

Appendix A:
VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY
ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION
(CALENDAR YEAR _____)

[Note: While this template is not part of the FEM document, the Task Force anticipates that it will be linked to the Academic Affairs web site in a non-reproducible format to provide easy access to the descriptions of the new performance categories. When downloaded and printed from Digital Measures, the actual report may appear slightly different from this template.]

Date of Evaluation: _____

I. BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

College: _____

Department: _____

Name: _____

Highest Degree Earned: _____ Year: _____

Appointment Year: _____ Appointment Rank: _____

Present Rank: _____

Year First Promotion: _____ Year Second Promotion: _____

Total Years at VSU: _____ Years in Present Rank: _____

Next Scheduled Personnel Action: _____ Eligibility Date: _____

ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION

The Annual Faculty Evaluation assesses faculty members' performance in the areas of Teaching and Student Learning; Research, Scholarship, and Creative Production; and Service to the University, Community, and Profession. Conducted by department and unit head, it applies departmentally established standards for successful performance in these areas. In addition, it reflects load adjustments related to faculty members' duties within the department and/or unit, and it takes into account faculty members' progress towards action plans they set for the year.

The Annual Faculty Evaluation helps faculty members be sure they are engaging in activities that assure their success at VSU and alerts them to any areas in which improvement is needed. In some departments/units, the Annual Faculty Evaluation also forms the basis for calculating merit pay. If faculty performance is determined to need improvement, it also includes specific recommendations for improvement.

The Annual Faculty Evaluation recognizes four levels of performance:

DISTINGUISHED: Distinguished performance significantly exceeds departmental standards for the performance area. Depending on the area, this level of performance may include such notable achievements as significantly exceeding the approved Faculty Action Plan, excelling on a specific project, task, or special assignment; assuming added responsibility for an assignment beyond the Action Plan that requires extraordinary commitment of time and energy; providing leadership or a major contribution to activities that significantly impact the department, college, or university; or receiving an honor or award in an area of professional activity or responsibility.

SUCCESSFUL: Successful performance clearly meets the Faculty Action Plan agreed upon for the calendar year. In addition, it is characterized by regular, productive contributions to department, college, and university goals. Successful faculty members are consistently perceived by peers and students as knowledgeable, skilled, and reliable, and they consistently interact with students, peers, and other university personnel in a professional and effective way.

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT: Performance that needs improvement may fall short of the Faculty Action Plan for the calendar year, or it may not consistently meet stated departmental standards of quality or quantity of performance during the year. Faculty members whose performance needs improvement may require more than expected levels of supervision; they may respond ineffectively to monitoring or guidance; they may not consistently interact appropriately and professionally with students, peers, or other university personnel; or they may ignore or violate departmental, college, or university policies and procedures.

UNSUCCESSFUL: Unsuccessful performance falls significantly below stated departmental standards. This performance level may fail to attempt one or more elements of the Faculty Action Plan for the calendar year, or it may fail to address or complete an assigned remediation plan. To a significant degree, faculty members who perform unsuccessfully may frequently or egregiously interact in inappropriate or unprofessional ways with students, peers, or other university personnel; or they may repeatedly ignore or violate departmental, college, and/or university policies and/or procedures.

II. Performance Analysis

Check the appropriate box for each performance category. Part-time and Non-tenure track faculty members should be evaluated in applicable categories only. Non-applicable categories should be left blank or N/A entered.

<i>Performance Category</i>	<i>Performance level</i>			
	Distinguished	Successful	Needs Improvement	Unsuccessful
Teaching and Student Learning				
Research, Scholarship, and Creative Production				
Service to the University, Community, and Profession				

III. Comments about Performance

Teaching and Student Learning

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Production

Service to the University, Community, and Profession

IV. Overall Evaluation

Performance Summary (circle one):

Distinguished Successful Needs Improvement Unsuccessful

Recommendations for calendar year (optional):

[N. B. Sign-offs will occur through the Digital Measures workflow module.]

Department/Unit Head

Date

Faculty Member

Date

The faculty member's signature on this document does not indicate agreement with its contents but that the faculty member has read the evaluation and discussed it with the evaluator. The faculty member has the right to append a response to this evaluation.

Dean's Signature

Date

Provost and VPAA's Signature

Date