



J. Whitney Bunting College of Business and Technology

Procedures for Faculty Management: Annual Review of Untenured Faculty by Tenured Faculty

Untenured, tenure-track faculty members within each department of the College of Business and Technology are reviewed annually by tenured faculty in their department. Completion of these annual reviews is an aspect of mentoring carried out by senior faculty members in the College. The criteria for these annual reviews are consistent with the College's Promotion and Tenure Document and the Academic Affairs requirements for annual rating of faculty performance by the department chair. This does not apply to formal third-year pre-tenure review. For the third-year pre-tenure review process and associated forms, please refer to this university document: [Georgia College Approved Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures July 2022.pdf \(gcsu.edu\)](#)

Objectives

Tenured faculty members complete a review of untenured faculty annually to:

- Provide untenured faculty with a clear appraisal each year of their progress in the areas of teaching, student success activities, professional development, research/scholarship, and service toward tenure. Faculty should embed student success activities and professional development within their teaching, scholarship, and/or service.
- Assist the department chair in the creation of the annual review for untenured faculty (this does not apply to the third-year review),
- Help develop a singular opinion of untenured faculty progress toward tenure among tenured faculty, and between tenured faculty and the department chair, and
- Inform tenured faculty of the progress untenured faculty within their department are making toward tenure.

Timeframe

Review of untenured faculty by tenured faculty occurs each year (other than the third-year pre-tenure review) until the award of tenure.

- The annual review by tenured faculty occurs after submission of the Individual Faculty Report (IFR) and before completion of the chair's evaluation of faculty performance.
- The University pre-tenure review is informed by but distinct from this annual review during the year of pre-tenure review.
- In most cases the tenured faculty members who perform the annual review will also constitute the departmental promotion and tenure committee.

Procedure

Department chairs and tenured faculty members are strongly encouraged to review the College's Promotion and Tenure Document prior to conducting an annual review of untenured faculty in order to become familiar with evaluation criteria for tenure.

- Untenured faculty members submit an IFR, copies of published research and an updated vita to the department chair. A one-page summary of major accomplishments achieved at Georgia College thus far in the areas of teaching, student success, research, professional development, and service. The department chair adds copies of student teaching evaluations and other appropriate departmental teaching evaluations to the portfolio.
- At least three tenured faculty members in a department review the portfolio(s) of that department's

untentured faculty. The chair may (at his/her discretion) add tenured faculty from a related discipline if there are fewer than three tenured faculty members in the department.

- Faculty members use the teaching evaluations as one measure of the untenured faculty member's classroom effectiveness and student success efforts.
- Faculty review the published research to form judgments about the quality of the scholarly activities completed to date by the untenured faculty member.
- Tenured faculty members and the department chair meet as a group to discuss the progress toward tenure of untenured faculty in the department.

Candidate Ratings

- *The university evaluation form for pre-tenure review will be used to evaluate faculty progress towards tenure: Pre-Tenure Review form 1 May 2022.pdf (gcsu.edu)*
 - The discussion between tenured faculty and the department chair informs that chair about the progress untenured faculty are making in the areas of teaching, research, professional development, and service. Faculty may also comment on collegiality.
 - If there is a lack of consensus among the tenured faculty, or between the chair and the tenured faculty, regarding a candidate's rating in a given area the chair will inform the candidate. (Definitions for each category of faculty performance are listed below.)
- The department chair uses this conversation with tenured faculty, along with items such as the IFR and teaching evaluations, when writing the department chairperson's evaluation of faculty performance. The chair discusses this evaluation with each untenured faculty member.

In accordance with University guidelines, obtaining a favorable rating on an annual review does not bind the University to recommend an untenured faculty member for tenure when the requisite years of service have been achieved.

Definitions of Ratings

The following scale with descriptions will be used at each stage and evaluation point of a faculty member's career, whether tenure-track or non-tenure track: annual evaluations, pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure.

Noteworthy achievement as referenced in [BOR Policy 8.3.7.3](#) is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the common Likert Scale below. Deficient and unsatisfactory as referenced throughout this document is reflective of a 1 or a 2 on the common Likert Scale below. (4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems).

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

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

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

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

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

Not applicable: *only applies to non-tenure track faculty*

Philosophy

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

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

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

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

Record of Document Updates

- Substantive changes to this document to align with policy/procedure changes mandated by the BOR. Voted on by faculty September 30, 2022.
- Approved by vote of School of Business Faculty, Friday February 17, 2006 Reviewed by the Department Chairs, Wednesday October 30, 2013
- These procedures were developed by the department chairs in the college, in consultation with the Dean and Associate Dean, and modified by the Faculty Development Committee, February 2006.