

MFT Program Policy on Faculty Roles, Qualifications, and Effectiveness

Policy Availability

This **Policy on Faculty Roles, Qualifications, and Effectiveness** is available to the public via the [MFT Homepage > Accreditation > Policies and Handbook](#).

MFT Faculty Qualifications

This policy addresses accreditation **Standards V12.5, Standard II: Program Leadership, Program Faculty, and Program Clinical Supervisor**, which states that *“program faculty and program clinical supervisors are qualified to provide the education and MFT relational/systemic supervision needed for the program to meet its commitments, including those for student learning outcomes and graduate achievement data defined in Standard I. The roles of the program director, program faculty, program clinical supervisors and others in program leadership positions are clearly defined and align with the program's goals.”*

In keeping with the above statement and with **KE II-B: Qualifications of Program Faculty and Program Clinical Supervisors**, which states *“all program faculty members and program clinical supervisors are academically, professionally, and experientially qualified to fulfill their specific program responsibilities,”* MFT core faculty members will be academically, professionally, and experientially qualified to achieve the program’s mission, goals, and outcomes and must have documented expertise in their area(s) of teaching responsibility and knowledge of the content delivery method (e.g., distance learning). Thus, MFT core faculty will have the following professional qualifications:

- A terminal degree (PhD) in MFT from a COAMFTE accredited program
- Membership in AAMFT as a Clinical Fellow
- Membership in GAMFT, the Georgia state MFT association
- Liability insurance
- Adoption of the AAMFT Code of Ethics as the guide for professional conduct and practice
- Licensure in the state of Georgia as an MFT
- Up-to-date continuing education credits required for biennial license renewal

MFT Faculty Roles

The MFT core program faculty are expected to play active roles in teaching, scholarship, and service as outlined by the College of Education and Human Services (COEHS) [Faculty Evaluation Model](#). The relative emphasis on teaching, scholarship, and service may vary according to individual faculty contracts (e.g., non-tenure-track instructor contracts may require little or no scholarship, whereas tenure-track assistant professor contracts require consistent scholarly productivity). In addition, faculty are expected to engage in academic advising, student mentoring, and clinical supervision; maintain the minimum required weekly office hours; and

This policy addresses Standards V12.5, Eligibility Criterion E: Accuracy and Program Transparency in Policies and Publications Standard II – Program Leadership, Program Faculty, and Program Clinical Supervisors, KE II-A, B, & D, and Eligibility Criterion E: Accuracy and Program Transparency in Policies. Updated Spring 2026. Scheduled for update Spring 2030 or sooner when necessary.

participate in weekly faculty meetings, program governance, and activities related to accreditation, systematic program evaluation, and continuous program improvement in accordance with COAMFTE standards.

MFT Faculty Effectiveness

Marriage and family therapy is a moving, dynamic field, and the practice of systems-based family therapy requires faculty to stay abreast of the latest research, innovations in therapy, and changes in policy and law. Thus, faculty strive for continuous improvement, which occurs through review by self and others.

Every three years, or more frequently when indicators suggest a need for review, the faculty evaluates the overarching effectiveness of itself using multiple evaluative methods:

- promotion and tenure processes
- SOIs (student evaluations)
- end of semester practica supervisor evaluations
- peer review
- advisor evaluation
- faculty self-assessment
- annual Department Head AFARAP review of scholarship, service, teaching, program contributions.
- Informal, unsolicited in-person, written student statements of appreciation and gratitude
- promotion and tenure actions
- Curriculum mapping activities

Indicators suggesting need for evaluation sooner than three years may include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following:

1. patterns of course difficulty
2. an unusual number of low grades or other concerns related to student performance.
3. consistently low or declining student evaluation scores
4. repeated concerns raised through peer review
5. changes in professional standards, accreditation requirements, or licensure expectations
6. evidence of outdated course content or misalignment with current curriculum goals
7. substantiated student complaints or patterns of concerns reported through formal or informal channels
8. evidence of inconsistent adherence to program, university, or ethical standards
9. significant changes in assigned responsibilities (e.g., new courses, modality shifts, or clinical supervision roles)
10. marked declines in student learning outcomes or competency attainment linked to specific courses or instruction
11. feedback from site supervisors or community partners regarding student preparedness or performance
12. extended absence from teaching or clinical practice that may affect instructional currency
13. introduction of new technologies or delivery formats requiring updated pedagogical approaches

This policy addresses Standards V12.5, Eligibility Criterion E: Accuracy and Program Transparency in Policies and Publications Standard II – Program Leadership, Program Faculty, and Program Clinical Supervisors, KE II-A, B, & D, and Eligibility Criterion E: Accuracy and Program Transparency in Policies. Updated Spring 2026. Scheduled for update Spring 2030 or sooner when necessary.

14. concerns identified during accreditation reviews or external program evaluations

Faculty Promotion and Tenure

COEHS [Promotion and Tenure Performance Guidelines](#) require that faculty teaching, scholarship, and service are evaluated. Further, the MFT accreditation standards assume that faculty will be evaluated so that the program can demonstrate faculty effectiveness in achieving its mission, PGs, and SLOs. The mechanisms for review and evaluation of faculty effectiveness are as follows:

1. **The faculty annual review (AFARAP)** completed by the Department Head on all program faculty.
2. **A quantitative assessment of the Program Director's qualifications** to help the program achieve its missions, PGs, and SLOs, completed by the Department Head.
3. **A quantitative assessment of MFT faculty member's qualifications** to help the program achieve its missions, PGs, and SLOs, completed by the Department Head.
4. MFT Faculty Evaluation of the PD and CD.
5. **Promotion and tenure.** [The P & T Guidelines](#) outline specific benchmarks and baseline expectations that denote minimally acceptable progress toward promotion and tenure. Full time faculty members are expected to divide their time between teaching, scholarship, and service, with an emphasis on teaching. While the university asks for a general balance between these three areas, it does not dictate specific time allotment percentages and faculty members have the freedom to emphasize their strengths and interests in any area. The MFT teaching faculty teach face-to-face courses on campus.
6. **Student opinion of instruction (SOI)** completed by students at the conclusion of each course across all semesters.
7. **Peer review**, completed as requested, to include faculty applications for promotion and tenure.
 - a. Full professors are encouraged to invite colleagues to observe their teaching and supervision.

Adjunct / Part-time Faculty Evaluation

Part-time/adjunct instructors are evaluated annually by their department head via the AFARAP process (see COEHS [Annual Faculty Activity Report.](#))

The difference between adjunct and full-time tenure track instructors are these:

- Adjuncts (whose duties are usually teaching-only) complete only the teaching section of the Annual Faculty Activity Report (AFARAP).
- SOIs, required for all courses, regardless of instructor rank, are a significant component of parttime/adjunct evaluations.
- The department head writes an Annual Faculty evaluation (AFARAP) based mostly on SOIs.

This policy addresses Standards V12.5, Eligibility Criterion E: Accuracy and Program Transparency in Policies and Publications Standard II – Program Leadership, Program Faculty, and Program Clinical Supervisors, KE II-A, B, & D, and Eligibility Criterion E: Accuracy and Program Transparency in Policies. Updated Spring 2026. Scheduled for update Spring 2030 or sooner when necessary.

- Evaluations use the same 5-point rating scale used to evaluate fulltime faculty:
 - Exemplary
 - Exceeds Expectations
 - Meets Expectations
 - Needs Improvement
 - Does Not Meet Expectations
-