



Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures

**Institutional Changes Based on Revisions Made to the
Board of Regents (BOR) Policy Manual: 8.3 Additional Policies for Faculty
and Guided by Implementation Language in the University System of Georgia
(USG) Academic Affairs Handbook: Section 4.0: Academic Personnel**

Finalized July 27, 2022

Academic Affairs links updated February 27, 2024

Table of Contents

Preamble	4
GC Faculty Evaluation Policies & Procedures Implementation Timeline.....	5
Chart of Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures with Links.....	6
Faculty Review System.....	7
GEORGIA COLLEGE POLICIES	7
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA POLICIES	7
Common Likert Scale	8
GEORGIA COLLEGE COMMON LIKERT FORM.....	8
Philosophy.....	8
Plans for Addressing Faculty Performance.....	9
Performance Remediation Plan (PRP)	9
Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)	10
Forms/Materials.....	10
Annual Evaluation	11
GEORGIA COLLEGE POLICIES	11
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA POLICIES	11
Annual Evaluation Procedures.....	11
Forms/Materials.....	12
Pre-Tenure Review (Pre-TR).....	13
GEORGIA COLLEGE POLICIES	13
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA POLICIES	13
Statement of Purpose	13
Pre-Tenure Review Eligibility	13
Relation of Pre-Tenure Review to the Annual Evaluation	13
Limitations	13
Pre-Tenure Review Committee.....	14
Pre-Tenure Review Process	14
Pre-Tenure Review Materials	15
Forms/Materials.....	15
Tenure	16
GEORGIA COLLEGE POLICIES	16
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA POLICIES	16
Eligibility for Tenure	16

Forms/Materials	18
Promotion	19
GEORGIA COLLEGE POLICIES	19
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA POLICIES	19
Eligibility for Promotion	19
Lecturer promotion process	21
Forms/Materials	21
Post-Tenure Review (Post-TR)	22
GEORGIA COLLEGE POLICIES	22
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA POLICIES	22
Overview	22
Guiding Principles	23
Timeline.....	23
Post-Tenure Review Calendar	24
Notification	24
Materials Submitted by the Post-Tenure Review Candidate.....	24
Composition of the Post-TR Committee	25
Responsibilities of the Post-TR Committee	25
Post-Tenure Review Committee Report	25
Discussion of the Results	26
Appeal of the Results of Post-Tenure Review.....	26
Outcomes & Consequences of Post Tenure Review.....	26
Due Process Following an Unsuccessful Post-Tenure Review or an Unsuccessful Corrective Post-Tenure Review	27
Corrective Post Tenure Review.....	28
Forms/Materials	28
Five Year Review of Academic Administrators	29
GEORGIA COLLEGE POLICIES.....	29
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA POLICIES	29
Procedures	29
Interruptions to the Post-Tenure Review (Post-TR) Timeline.....	29
Forms/Materials.....	30
COMMON LIKERT FORM.....	31

Preamble

The Chancellor convened a working group of regents, faculty, and administrators to review the USG policies on post-tenure, “with the charge to support career development for all USG faculty and ensure accountability and strong performance from the system’s tenured faculty members.” Proposed new policy language was drafted from the recommendations and presented at the September 2021 BOR meeting. After feedback from institutions, the USG revised the proposed policy language. More information regarding the post-tenure working group timeline may be found [here](#).

The BOR of the USG met on October 12-13, 2021, on the campus of the Georgia Institute of Technology. During this meeting, the Board approved the amended proposed changes to the following BOR policies: Post-Tenure and Annual Review (8.3) and it was implemented into the BOR Policy Manual. Notable changes to existing 8.3 policy language are: a) addition of student success as a key element of faculty evaluation; b) expansion of the use of annual evaluations for tenured faculty; c) addition of the corrective post-tenure review; d) articulation of actions following an unsuccessful post-tenure review; e) annual reporting on PTR to the BOR; and f) delegation of authority for awarding tenure.

Provost Spirou convened a task force in December 2021 and charged the task force with vetting and revising Georgia College (GC) policies related to faculty evaluation, pre-tenure, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure. The task force was intentionally composed of senate members, along with chair and dean representation. Provost Spirou received additional guidelines and framework from the USG on January 24, 2022, and was asked for institutional feedback. On February 8, 2022, the Final PTR Annual Review Handbook was sent to Provost Spirou, and this language was implemented into the BOR Academic Affairs Handbook.

The GC task force timeline and process included weekly meetings beginning January 4, and a March 4, 2022, deadline for completion of the charge. University faculty senate members received regular updates on the progress and details of the task force work. The Provost Task Force is providing two question and answer sessions on March 9, 2022. These sessions provide an opportunity for all university faculty members to ask questions and provide feedback. The Faculty Affairs Policy Committee and University Senate will review the institutional faculty evaluation policies prior to submission to the USG. The final deadline for submission of institutional PTR and Annual Review policies to the USG Chief Academic Officer is October 17, 2022. Status updates on document revision are due to BOR on April 1, 2022, and on September 1, 2022. GC is following USG encouragement to send forward any completed revisions as soon as they are available.

GC Faculty Evaluation Policies & Procedures Implementation Timeline

Faculty Points of Evaluation/ Semesters	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024	Fall 2024	Spring 2025 and later	Fall 2025 and later
Annual Evaluations		Eval. using old or new policies		<i>Eval. using new policies</i>		Eval. using new policies	
Pre-Tenure Review		Eval. using old or new policies		<i>Eval. using new policies</i>		Eval. using new policies	
Tenure Track Faculty		TT Fac. starting in 2020		TT Fac. starting in 2021		TT Fac. starting in 2022	
Tenure Procedures	Eval. using old or new policies		Eval. using old or new policies		<i>Eval. using new policies</i>		Eval. using new policies
Tenure Track Faculty	TT Fac. starting in 2018		TT Fac. starting in 2019		TT Fac. starting in 2020		TT Fac. starting in 2021
Promotion Procedures	Eval. using old or new policies		Eval. using old or new policies		<i>Eval. using new policies</i>		Eval. using new policies
Tenure Track Faculty	App. Asst. Prof in 2018		App. Asst. Prof in 2019		App. Asst. Prof in 2020		App. Asst. Prof in 2021
Tenured Faculty	Prom. to Assoc. Prof in 2018		Prom. to Assoc. Prof in 2019		Prom. to Assoc. Prof in 2020		Prom. to Assoc. Prof in 2021
Post-Tenure Review	Eval. using old or new policies		*Eval. using old or new policies		*Eval. using old or new policies		<i>Eval. using new policies</i>
Tenured Faculty	Ten. Fac. last rev. or prom. in 2017		Ten. Fac. last rev. or prom. in 2018		Ten. Fac. last rev. or prom. in 2019		Ten. Fac. last rev. or prom. in 2020
Five Year Review of Academic Administrators		*Eval. using old or new policies		*Eval. using old or new policies		<i>Evaluated using new policies</i>	
Academic Administrators		AA last rev. in 2018		AA last rev. in 2019		AA last rev. in 2020	
*Institutional Policy Implementation of Post-Tenure Review should be no later than AY 2023-2024 (Note: Faculty who go up for post-tenure review during the first two years of implementation should be given flexibility based on the adoption of new expectations.)							

Chart of Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures with Links

<u>BOR Policy Manual</u>	<u>BOR Academic Affairs Handbook</u>	<u>GC Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual</u>
8.3.5 Evaluation of Personnel 8.3.5.1 Faculty 8.3.5.4 Post-Tenure Review	4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems 4.7 Post-Tenure Review 4.8 Evaluation of Faculty	Faculty Review System Annual Evaluation Pre-Tenure Review Post-Tenure Review Five Year Review of Academic Administrators
8.3.6 Criteria for Promotion 8.3.6.1 Minimum for All Institutions in All Professorial Ranks	4.6 Award of Promotion	Promotion
8.3.7 Tenure and Criteria for Tenure 8.3.7.1 General Information Regarding Tenure 8.3.7.2 Tenure Requirements 8.3.7.3 Criteria for Tenure 8.3.7.4 Award of Tenure	4.5 Award of Tenure	Tenure

Faculty Review System

GEORGIA COLLEGE POLICIES

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA POLICIES

BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY MANUAL: 8.3.5 Evaluation of Personnel (8.3.5.1 Faculty)

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS HANDBOOK: 4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems; 4.8 Evaluation of Faculty

The Faculty Review System is a summative review of faculty performance, the major purpose of which is to provide information for administrative decision making in areas such as salary, retention, pre- and post-tenure, tenure, and promotion. It may also be used for formative purposes by the faculty member. The Faculty Review System gives greatest weight to teacher effectiveness as the primary areas of a faculty member's duties. The criteria shall include evaluation of instruction, student success activities, research/scholarship/creative endeavors, and service as is appropriate to the institution, college, school, and departmental responsibilities. Faculty workload percentages for teaching, research/scholarship/creative endeavors, and service will be clearly defined and agreed upon between the faculty member and the immediate supervisor. The process will utilize a system of faculty evaluations by students, with the improvement of teaching effectiveness and student success as the 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.

The department chairperson is responsible for evaluating the performance of each faculty member in his or her department. During their last year, retiring faculty are exempt from the faculty evaluation process. In addition, non-tenured faculty on a terminal contract will also be exempt from this process. Each of these performance evaluations is subsequently reviewed by the college dean. The college dean is responsible for the performance evaluation of each department chairperson in his/her role as a faculty member and evaluates department chairpersons with the same procedures used by the department chairpersons in administering a performance evaluation of their faculty. This evaluation of a chairperson by a dean is performed in addition to the Dean's Performance Evaluation of the chairperson in his/her role as an administrator. The annual review of the faculty is timed to be of use in counseling and decisions regarding salary, retention, pre- and post-tenure, tenure, and promotion and is based on the performance during the prior calendar year.

This policy is the minimum faculty evaluation policy for the whole university. Colleges and departments may adopt higher requirements with the prior written approval of the Provost.

In the performance of their instructional duties as contained in this policy, faculty members will be evaluated only on the criteria and in accordance with the procedures set forth in this faculty review system.

Common Likert Scale

GEORGIA COLLEGE COMMON LIKERT FORM

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.

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.

Plans for Addressing Faculty Performance

There are two different plans for addressing faculty performance: a *performance remediation plan* and a *performance improvement plan*. For faculty who do not meet annual performance expectations a *performance remediation plan* is put in place. The purpose of this plan is to scaffold faculty growth and development, and to strengthen tenure and promotion possibilities. The second, a *performance improvement plan*, is developed subsequent to an unfavorable post-tenure review or corrective post-tenure review. The components of the PIP and the PRP plans must include the following:

1. Clearly defined goals or outcomes,
2. An outline of activities to be undertaken,
3. A timetable,
4. Available resources and supports,
5. Expectations for improvement
6. Monitoring strategy

Performance Remediation Plan (PRP)

The Performance Remediation Plan is used to document faculty deficiencies based on the outcomes from the annual review. The purpose of the PRP is designed to enable the faculty member to correct unsatisfactory (1 or a 2 on the [common Likert Scale](#)) performance in some aspect of their role or responsibilities. The plan must be approved by the Dean and submitted to GC's Office of Academic Affairs. Two meetings during the fall semester and two during the spring semester must be held to review progress, document additional needs/resources, planned accomplishments for the upcoming quarter. After each meeting, the academic administrator should summarize the meeting and indicate if the faculty member is on track to complete the

PRP. Consequences for failure to meet the expectations of the PRP must be stated at the conclusion of each meeting.

[Performance Improvement Plan \(PIP\)](#)

The Performance Improvement Plan is used to document deficiencies based on an unfavorable Post Tenure Review. The plan must be approved by the Dean and submitted to GC's Office of Academic Affairs. Two meetings during the fall semester and two during the spring semester must be held to review progress, document additional needs/resources, planned accomplishments for the upcoming time period. After each meeting, the academic administrator should summarize the meeting and indicate whether the faculty member is on track to complete the PIP. The assessment of the PIP will take the place of that year's annual review. At the conclusion of the academic year the faculty member's progress will be determined by the department chair and dean after taking into account feedback from a committee of faculty colleagues.

If the faculty member successfully completes the performance improvement plan, then the faculty member's next post-tenure review will take place on the regular five-year schedule.

If the faculty member fails to make sufficient progress in performance, then the institution shall take appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member's deficiencies. The President will make the final determination on behalf of the institution regarding appropriate remedial action. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution's final decision pursuant to the Board Policy on Applications for Discretionary Review.

Forms/Materials

[MyGCSU Academic Affairs Evaluative Forms](#)

Classroom Observation/Peer Evaluation of Teaching Form

[Student Opinion Surveys--On-Line Process](#)

[Teaching Effectiveness, Department Plans for Additional Technique](#)

Annual Evaluation

GEORGIA COLLEGE POLICIES

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA POLICIES

BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY MANUAL: 8.3.5 Evaluation of Personnel (8.3.5.1 Faculty)

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS HANDBOOK: 4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems; 4.8 Evaluation of Faculty

Faculty are evaluated annually by their appropriate supervisor as defined by the institution against the minimum criteria listed in the BOR Policy 8.3.5.1 and BOR Policy 8.3.7.3. The annual evaluation will encompass teaching; undergraduate/graduate student success activities; research/scholarship/creative activity or academic achievement; professional service to the institution or community; and continuous professional growth appropriate to GC's mission, college or school and department. The annual evaluation will be documented using the Common Likert Form.

Annual Evaluation Procedures

1. The faculty member completes the Individual Faculty Report (IFR) and submits it to the chairperson on January 21 [or the first business day following January 21 should January 21 be a Saturday or Sunday] of the academic year to which it applies.
2. The chairperson reviews the IFR, and, along with other relevant information writes the Department Chairperson's Evaluation of Faculty Performance (DCEFP), that contains a Likert scale with 5 performance indicators. All USG annual faculty evaluations must utilize the common Likert scale.
3. The chairperson discusses the content of the IFR and DCEFP with the faculty member in the annual scheduled conference no later than May 1 [or the first business day following May 1 should May 1 fall on a Saturday or Sunday], following the academic year to which this evaluation applies.
4. The faculty member signs a statement to the effect that he or she has read the DCEFP.
5. The faculty member is given the opportunity to respond in writing to the DCEFP; this response is attached to the IFR/DCEFP.
6. The chairperson acknowledges in writing his or her receipt of this response, noting changes, if any, in the DCEFP made because of either the conference or the faculty member's written response. This acknowledgement will also become a part of the record.
7. The entire Performance Evaluation of a Faculty Member is comprised of the following parts and is assembled in a packet in this order:
 - a. Department Chairperson's Evaluation of Faculty Performance (DCEFP)
 - b. Signature Sheet
 - c. Individual Faculty Report (IFR)
 - d. Faculty Member's Self-Evaluation of Performance (optional)
 - e. Faculty Member's Response to Chairperson's Evaluation (if any)
 - f. Department Chairperson's Acknowledgement of Faculty Member's Response and Statement of Change (if any)
 - g. Student Rating of Instruction Survey (SRIS) Summary Sheet(s)

- h. Other Documentation (optional) - Refer to departmental and/or college expectations/definitions, the Faculty Review System: [Philosophy section](#) for examples.
- 8. The department chairperson sends this packet in time for review for decisions involving merit salary increases, retention, pre- and post- tenure, tenure, and promotion, to the college dean who, after review as signified by his/her signature on the Signature Sheet. The college dean who keeps it if the faculty member is a department chairperson or returns it to the department chairperson of the home department for faculty members without administrative assignments. The Provost will evaluate annually the administrators who report directly to him/her and review the evaluations of the administrators who report directly to the administrators who report to that position.
- 9. Faculty members have the right to a) review their own personnel files that are used by department chairpersons, deans, and the Provost in personnel decisions, b) place in the file information that explains their position on any matter contained in the file, and c) appeal their evaluations. Such appeals will follow the procedures noted in the Georgia College & State University Policy Manual “[Process Appeal of Department Chair's Faculty Evaluation.](#)”
- 10. For an annual review, if the performance in any of the categories is judged to be not successful/not satisfactory the faculty member must be provided with a [Performance Remediation Plan \(PRP\)](#). The appropriate supervisor will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member with feedback from any committee that participated in the third-year review. The PRP must be approved by the Dean of the academic unit. The faculty member will have one year to accomplish the goals/outcomes of the PRP. This will become part of the official personnel records.

Forms/Materials

[MyGCSU Academic Affairs Evaluative Forms](#)

Department Chair/School Director Evaluation of Faculty Performance
[Individual Faculty Report](#) (Link to Faculty Success/Digital Measures to download IFR)

Pre-Tenure Review (Pre-TR)

GEORGIA COLLEGE POLICIES

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA POLICIES

BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY MANUAL: 8.3.5 Evaluation of Personnel (8.3.5.1 Faculty)

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS HANDBOOK: 4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems; 4.8 Evaluation of Faculty

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of the third-year pre-tenure review is to provide a rigorous analysis and detailed feedback of the faculty member's body of work in the areas of teaching, student success activities, professional development, research/scholarship, and service towards tenure. Faculty should embed student success activities and professional development within their teaching, scholarship, and/or service.

Pre-Tenure Review Eligibility

Faculty who are employed on an annual tenure track contract will undergo Pre-TR in their third year of appointment. Persons hired with prior credit for service are evaluated at approximately the mid-point of their probationary period. The results of the review are to be used only for the purpose of providing the tenure-eligible colleague with a peer review of the progress made thus far toward tenure and promotion. Tenure-eligible non-tenured employees of GC are subject to evaluation. Administrators are subject to Five Year Review of Academic Administrators as defined by Regents' and institution's policies, including department chairs, are exempt from Pre-TR.

It is the responsibility of the Office of Academic Affairs to notify tenure-eligible individuals in the fall of the third year of service or at the midpoint of the probationary period in which they are required to submit documents for Pre-TR. The immediate supervisor should be included in the notification.

Relation of Pre-Tenure Review to the Annual Evaluation

The results of the Pre-TR are to have no bearing on departmental determinations of faculty merit. The faculty member undergoing Pre-TR also submits an Individual Faculty Report to their immediate supervisor (e.g. Department Head, Unit Head, Dean, etc.) at the beginning of the calendar year in which Pre-TR is set to take place and the supervisor conducts a Department Chairperson's Evaluation of Faculty Performance (DCEFP). The Pre-TR does not replace the annual evaluation. Prior annual evaluations are included in the required materials listed below and a contributing factor, but not the sole source of documentation in the Pre-TR process.

Limitations

Obtaining a favorable Pre-TR does not bind the university to recommend the non-tenured individual for promotion or tenure when the requisite years in rank or requisite years of probationary service have been achieved. Likewise, an unfavorable result via the Pre-TR process will have no bearing on subsequent tenure and promotion decisions.

Pre-Tenure Review Committee

The Pre-TR Committee/Tenure and Promotion Committee within the faculty member's home department or unit is charged with the responsibility of conducting the evaluation and providing a written report to both the individual faculty member and the immediate supervisor. The "Rating Form 1 for Pre-Tenure Review" will be used for this purpose. The Pre-TR committee, the composition is based on a process established with the department/college, will consist of at least three tenured individuals from the home department if possible or from discipline related departments, if necessary. Pre-TR Reviews will utilize the [common Likert scale](#) and be documented using the [Common Likert Form](#).

It is important that all members of the committee practice circumspection when evaluating a colleague's performance. It is equally important that appraisals of "Exemplary," "Exceeds Expectations," "Needs Improvement," or "Does Not Meet Expectations" be applied judiciously. In particular, an appraisal of "Does Not Meet Expectations" must be reserved for those cases in which problems related to the colleague's performance are sufficiently clear to constitute grounds for dismissal. "Needs Improvement" implies that the faculty member performance in a particular area is considered grounds for rejection of an application for tenure. The criteria used to evaluate an untenured faculty member must be consistent with the mission of the university, college, and department and the criteria must be consistent with the faculty member's official duties. Feedback from the Pre-TR committees should be returned to the faculty member and the immediate supervisor no later than March 1.

Confidentiality of the results of all Pre-TR reviews is the ethical responsibility of the members of the Pre-TR committee. The results are to be shared only with the non-tenured individual and their immediate supervisor. It is to be understood by all parties that the results of the Pre-TR are to be used for department purposes only. Therefore, the results of the Pre-TR must not be included in the faculty member's personnel file.

Pre-Tenure Review Process

1. The overall evaluation must indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion (BOR 8.3.5.1).
2. The faculty member is responsible for providing documentation and materials for the third-year Pre-TR, as outlined in GC's guidelines.
3. The appropriate supervisor and the chair of the Pre-TR committee will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's third year Pre-TR. A written report of the faculty member's progression towards achieving future milestones of tenure will be provided to the faculty member after the conference.
4. The faculty member will sign a statement ([Pre-Tenure Review form 1](#)) to the effect that they have been apprised of the content of the third-year Pre-TR evaluation.
5. The faculty member will be given a specific period (10 working days) to respond in writing to the third-year written evaluation, with this response to be attached to the evaluation.
6. The appropriate supervisor will acknowledge in writing receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made because of either the conference or the faculty member's written response. The specific time period for this response is ten (10)

working days from the faculty member's rebuttal/response. This acknowledgement will become a part of the official records and is not subject to discretionary review.

7. If the performance in any of the categories is judged to be not successful/not satisfactory (Does Not Meet Expectations/Needs Improvement) the faculty member must be provided with a [Performance Remediation Plan \(PRP\)](#). The appropriate supervisor will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member with feedback from any committee that participated in the third-year review. The PRP must be approved by the Dean of the academic unit. The faculty member will have one year to accomplish the goals/outcomes of the PRP. This will become part of the official personnel records.

[Pre-Tenure Review Materials](#)

The following items must be submitted:

- Copies of the immediate supervisor's evaluation of job performance and Individual Faculty Report during all previous years of service at Georgia College.
- A summary of major accomplishments achieved at Georgia College thus far in the areas of teaching, research/creative/scholarly/practitioner-based endeavors, and service to the university, college, department, profession, and community. Note that **student success** activities and continuous professional growth and development will be integrated within the criteria and evaluated individually.
- Results obtained via student, chair, unit head, and/or peer evaluation (normally included as part of #2, non-teaching faculty, Unit head, and peer evaluations and other appropriate tools are required).
- A current curriculum vita.
- Departments and colleges may require additional materials.

Forms/Materials

[MyGCSU Academic Affairs Evaluative Forms](#)

- Pre-Tenure Review form 1 (Committee Review Report)
- Pre-Tenure Review form 2 (Request for Faculty Development Funding)
- Pre-Tenure Review Form 3 (Notification to CAO)

Tenure

GEORGIA COLLEGE POLICIES

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA POLICIES

BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY MANUAL: 8.3.7 Tenure and Criteria for Tenure (8.3.7.1

General Information Regarding Tenure; 8.3.7.2 Tenure Requirements)

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS HANDBOOK: 4.5 Award of Tenure

Eligibility for Tenure

Only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors are eligible for tenure. The award of tenure is limited to the above academic ranks and shall not be construed to include honorific appointments such as adjunct appointments. Faculty with non-tenure track appointments shall not acquire tenure. Faculty are eligible for consideration of tenure during their 5th year of eligible service.

Criteria, as defined by department or college reviewing the applicant, for tenure shall include the following:

The minimum criteria for tenure are demonstrating:

1. Excellence and effectiveness in teaching and instruction (~~4 or 5 on the common Likert Scale~~)
2. Research, scholarship, creative activity, or academic achievement, as appropriate to GC's mission
3. Outstanding service to the institution, profession, or community

Outstanding involvement in student success activities and professional growth and development will be integrated within the criteria above and evaluated individually.

Noteworthy achievement is required in at least two of the above numbered categories, one of which must be teaching/instruction, but is not required in all categories. ~~Noteworthy achievement as referenced in BOR Policy 8.3.7.3 is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the common Likert Scale. (4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems)~~ The faculty member's length of service with an institution shall be taken into consideration in determining whether or not the faculty member should be tenured, but neither the possession of a doctorate degree nor longevity of service is a guarantee of tenure.

Evaluation of Tenure portfolios will utilize the common Likert scale and be documented using the Common Likert Form.

Individual academic units of the University, along with the University Library or any other academic unit, may adopt additional and/or higher standards, as well as more detailed criteria and procedures for tenure.

The following procedures shall govern the recommendations for, or against, grants of tenure to eligible faculty members.

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 tenure and the dates when every tenure recommendation is due to appropriate University officials.
2. Formal recommendation for, or against, tenure shall be made initially by peer faculty within the candidate's own department (or similar body of comparable faculty) to the "line of authority" Department Chairperson. This recommendation shall be presented in writing and accompanied by the faculty member's documentation supporting his or her candidacy for tenure. A copy of the recommendation to the Chairperson shall also be provided to the faculty member being considered for tenure. The faculty member may respond to the recommendation within ten (10) calendar days from receipt of such notice by submitting to the "line of authority" Chairperson a written statement in support of their candidacy for tenure.
3. The "line of authority" Chair shall next provide a formal written recommendation for, or against, the faculty member's tenure to the "line of authority" Dean. This recommendation shall be presented in writing and accompanied by the faculty member's documentation supporting their candidacy for tenure. A copy of the Chairperson's recommendation to the Dean shall also be provided to the faculty member being considered for tenure. The faculty member may respond to the recommendation within ten (10) calendar days from receipt of such notice by submitting to the "line of authority" Dean a written statement in support of his or her candidacy for tenure.
4. The "line of authority" Dean shall next refer the department Chairperson's recommendation for, or against, tenure (along with the faculty member's documentation supporting their candidacy for tenure) to the tenure committee of the eligible faculty member's academic unit for review, consideration, and recommendation. The tenure committee's formal recommendation shall be presented in writing to the "line of authority" Dean with supporting documentation used in making the recommendation.
5. The "line of authority" Dean shall next provide a formal written recommendation for, or against, the faculty member's tenure, along with supporting documentation that has been provided in support of the faculty member's candidacy for tenure, to the Provost. A copy of the Dean's recommendation to the Provost shall also be provided to the faculty member being considered for tenure. The faculty member may respond to the recommendation within ten (10) calendar days from receipt of such notice by submitting to the Provost a written statement in support of his or her candidacy for promotion.
6. The Provost shall next provide a formal written recommendation for, or against, the faculty member's tenure, along with supporting documentation that has been provided in support of the faculty member's candidacy for tenure, to the President of the University. The Provost's recommendation to the President of the University shall also be provided to the faculty member being considered for tenure. The faculty member may respond to the recommendation within ten (10) calendar days from receipt of such notice by submitting to the President of the University a written statement in support of his or her candidacy for tenure.

7. The president makes the final determination for tenure through the delegated authority from the Board of Regents after review of documentation supporting the faculty member's candidacy for tenure, recommendations, consultation with "line of authority" supervisors, and/or other appropriate faculty. The President's decision regarding the eligible faculty member's candidacy for tenure shall be provided to the faculty member once determined. If the President does not recommend tenure, the faculty member shall have the right to appeal to the Board of Regents in accordance with Board policies.

Forms/Materials

[MyGCSU Academic Affairs Evaluative Forms](#)

- T&P Application Form
- T&P Application Form Instructions
- eT&P Timeline
- Best Practices & FAQs

Promotion

GEORGIA COLLEGE POLICIES

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA POLICIES

BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY MANUAL: 8.3.6 Criteria for Promotion (8.3.6.1 Minimum for All Institutions in All Professorial Ranks; 8.3.6.3 State Universities); 8.3.8 Non-Tenure Track Personnel (8.3.8.3 Senior Lecturers and Principal Lecturers)

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS HANDBOOK: 4.6 Award of Promotion

Eligibility for Promotion

Faculty are eligible for consideration of promotion according to the following schedule:

- From Assistant Professor to Associate Professor during their 5th year of service as an Assistant Professor
- From Associate Professor to Professor during their 5th year of service as an Associate Professor
- Departments and Colleges may add additional requirements beyond the minimum years of service for a recommendation for promotion.

The minimum criteria are:

1. Excellent teaching and effectiveness in instruction. (4 or 5 on the [common Likert Scale](#))
2. Noteworthy research, scholarship, creative activity, or academic achievement
3. Noteworthy professional service to the institution or the community or the profession

Noteworthy involvement in student success activities and continuous professional growth and development will be integrated within the criteria above and evaluated individually.

Noteworthy achievement is required in at least two of the above numbered categories, one of which must be teaching/instruction, but is not required in all categories. ~~Noteworthy achievement as referenced in BOR Policy 8.3.7.3 is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the common Likert Scale. (4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems)~~ A written recommendation should be submitted by the head of the department concerned setting forth the reasons for promotion. The faculty member's length of service with an institution shall be taken into consideration in determining whether or not the faculty member should be promoted.

Evaluation of Promotion portfolios will utilize the [common Likert scale](#) and be documented using the [Common Likert Form](#).

The following procedures shall govern the recommendations for, or against, promotion of eligible faculty members.

1. The Office of the Provost shall make available a list of eligible faculty to the "line of authority" supervisors, when faculty are eligible for promotion and the dates when every promotion recommendation is due to appropriate University officials.
2. Formal recommendation for, or against, promotion shall be made initially by peer faculty within the candidate's own department (or similar body of comparable faculty) to the "line of authority" Department Chairperson. This recommendation shall be presented

in writing and accompanied by the faculty member's documentation supporting his or her candidacy for promotion. A copy of the recommendation to the Chairperson shall also be provided to the faculty member being considered for promotion. The faculty member may respond to the recommendation within ten (10) calendar days from receipt of such notice by submitting to the "line of authority" Chairperson a written statement in support of his or her candidacy for promotion.

3. The "line of authority" Chair shall next provide a formal written recommendation for, or against, the faculty member's promotion to the "line of authority" Dean. This recommendation shall be presented in writing and accompanied by the faculty member's documentation supporting his or her candidacy for promotion. A copy of the Chairperson's recommendation to the Dean shall also be provided to the faculty member being considered for promotion. The faculty member may respond to the recommendation within ten (10) calendar days from receipt of such notice by submitting to the "line of authority" Dean a written statement in support of his or her candidacy for promotion.
4. The "line of authority" Dean shall next refer the department Chairperson's recommendation for, or against, promotion (along with the faculty member's documentation supporting their candidacy for promotion) to the promotion committee of the eligible faculty member's academic unit for review, consideration, and recommendation. The promotion committee's formal recommendation shall be presented in writing to the "line of authority" Dean with supporting documentation used in making the recommendation.
5. The "line of authority" Dean shall next provide a formal written recommendation for, or against, the faculty member's promotion, along with supporting documentation that has been provided in support of the faculty member's candidacy for promotion, to the Provost. A copy of the Dean's recommendation to the Provost shall also be provided to the faculty member being considered for promotion. The faculty member may respond to the recommendation within ten (10) calendar days from receipt of such notice by submitting to the Provost a written statement in support of his or her candidacy for promotion.
6. The Provost shall next provide a formal written recommendation for, or against, the faculty member's promotion, along with supporting documentation that has been provided in support of the faculty member's candidacy for promotion, to the President of the University. The Provost's recommendation to the President of the University shall also be provided to the faculty member being considered for promotion. The faculty member may respond to the recommendation within ten (10) calendar days from receipt of such notice by submitting to the President of the University a written statement in support of his or her candidacy for promotion.
7. The President of the University shall be responsible for and approve all promotions for the institution after review of documentation supporting the faculty member's candidacy for promotion, recommendations, consultation with "line of authority" supervisors, and/or other appropriate faculty. The President's decision regarding the eligible faculty member's candidacy for promotion shall be provided to the faculty member once determined.

[Lecturer promotion process](#)

After completing six (6) consecutive years of service at Georgia College, a lecturer may apply for, or be recommended for promotion to Senior Lecturer. Promotion is based upon the recommendation of the Department Chair who shall be provided documentation of a record of assignments and accomplishments that demonstrates “exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution.” Promotion requires the recommendation of the chair, college dean, and provost, and approval by the president.

Forms/Materials

[MyGCSU Academic Affairs Evaluative Forms](#)

- T&P Application Form
- T&P Application Form Instructions
- eT&P Timeline
- Best Practices & FAQs

Post-Tenure Review (Post-TR)

GEORGIA COLLEGE POLICIES

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA POLICIES

BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY MANUAL: 8.3.5 Evaluation of Personnel (8.3.5.4 Post-Tenure Review); 8.3.9 Discipline and Removal of Faculty Members (8.3.9.1 Grounds for Removal)

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS HANDBOOK: 4.7 Post-Tenure Review

Overview

The post-tenure review process shall support the further career development of tenured faculty members as well as ensure accountability and continued strong performance from faculty members after they have achieved tenure.

Each tenured faculty member shall participate in a Post-TR within five years following the award of tenure and again at least once every five years thereafter. The first Post-TR shall assess the tenured faculty member's performance since the award of tenure, and subsequent post-tenure reviews shall assess the performance since the most recent Post-TR.

A tenured faculty member may voluntarily choose to participate in a Post-TR sooner than five years, but no earlier than three years. However, this review must demonstrate the full body of work expected of a five-year cycle. If this voluntary review is successful, then the faculty member's next scheduled Post-TR will take place five years after this voluntary review. In addition, a tenured faculty member whose performance is evaluated as unsatisfactory (**1 or a 2 on the common Likert Scale**)— whether overall or in any particular area – in an annual review process will be provided with a remediation plan. If the faculty member's performance is evaluated as unsatisfactory (**1 or a 2 on the common Likert Scale**) or not meeting expectations – overall or in a particular area – again the next year, the faculty member shall then undergo a corrective Post-TR. That review will not alter the timing of the faculty member's regularly scheduled five-year Post-TR thereafter.

Post-TR shall include evaluation of instruction, student success activities, research/scholarship, and service as is appropriate to the faculty member's institution, school or college, and department. The Post-TR will also incorporate findings from the faculty member's annual reviews from the years since the last Post-TR. The faculty member shall provide review materials and additional information, as provided for in GC's guidelines, to aid the review process.

The Post-TR will include, at a minimum, feedback from the faculty member's department chair and a committee of faculty colleagues. The results of the Post-TR shall be conveyed to the faculty member. The results of the Post-TR shall be considered in subsequent decisions on promotion, merit pay, and other rewards.

If the results of the Post-TR are unfavorable, then a performance improvement plan (PIP) shall be created by the applicable department chair and dean in consultation with the faculty member. If the faculty member successfully completes the performance

improvement plan, then the faculty member's next Post-TR will take place on the regular five-year schedule.

If the faculty member fails to make sufficient progress in performance as outlined in the performance improvement plan (or refuses to engage reasonably in the process) as determined by the department chair and dean after considering feedback from the committee of faculty colleagues, then the institution shall take appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member's deficiencies, as described below. The President will make the final determination on behalf of the institution regarding appropriate remedial action. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution's final decision pursuant to the Board Policy on Applications for Discretionary Review.

Remedial actions may include, but are not necessarily limited to, suspension of pay, salary reduction, revocation of tenure, and separation from employment. The institution must give the faculty member notice of the possibility of such remedial actions when the performance improvement plan begins. The institution's imposition of such remedial action will not be governed by or subject to the Board Policy on Grounds for Removal or Procedures for Dismissal.

Guiding Principles

The post-tenure review process (Post-TR) shall support the further career development of tenured faculty members as well as ensure accountability and continued strong performance from faculty members after they have achieved tenure. The primary purpose of the Post-TR process is to assist faculty members with identifying opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential for contribution to the academic discipline, institution, and the institution's mission. Post-TR is not the venue to address misconduct covered under BOR Policy 8.3.9.1 "Grounds for Removal" regarding the discipline and removal of faculty members for cause. Post-TR is intended to provide a longer-term and broader perspective than is usually provided by an annual review. The review should be both retrospective and prospective, encouraging a careful look at possibilities for different emphases at different points of a faculty member's career.

Timeline

All tenured faculty members who have rank and tenure with an academic unit must undergo Post-TR five years after the award of tenure and subsequently every five years unless it is interrupted by a further review for promotion to a higher academic rank (Associate/Full Professor) or academic leadership promotion (e.g. department chair, Dean, Associate Provost).

A tenured faculty member may voluntarily elect to go up for a Post-TR before the five-year time limit, but no earlier than three years. However, this review must demonstrate the full body of work expected of a five-year cycle. This enables a faculty member to take full advantage of the feedback and insight provided by their colleagues at a strategic moment in their career, rather than having to wait for the usual 5-year cycle. Early Post-TR should include a review of the faculty member's accomplishments since they were last evaluated for tenure or a previous Post-TR, whichever was most recent. If the faculty member has a successful review, the next Post-TR will be five years from the voluntary Post-TR date. If the faculty member is unsuccessful, the 5-year Post-TR date remains in place.

GC should follow existing processes to allow faculty the opportunity to pause the Post-TR timeline.

Academic administrators who hold faculty rank and are tenured at the institution aligned with an academic unit will receive an annual review by their appropriate supervisor and will undergo a comprehensive evaluation, including a 360° feedback assessment every five years. See the [Five-Year Review of Academic Administrators](#) policy.

Post-Tenure Review Calendar

The following timeline outlines the stages for Post-TR. In the event that any of these dates falls on a weekend or holiday, the deadline shall be the next day of university business.

May 1	The Chief Academic Officer notifies the Post-TR candidate.
August 25	The Post-TR Committee shall be determined.
September 1	The Post-TR candidate submits the Post-TR portfolio.
September 22	The Post-TR candidate receives a decision from the Post-TR Committee.
November 1	The Post-TR candidate and immediate supervisor agree to terms of the Performance Improvement Plan , if applicable.
December 1	The immediate supervisor of the Post-TR candidate notifies the Chief Academic Officer and retains the Post-TR portfolio.

Notification

The Chief Academic Officer shall send a letter of notification to each tenured faculty member who is scheduled to undergo a Post-TR during the upcoming academic year in compliance with the Post-TR calendar. This letter of notification shall be copied to the Post-TR candidate's immediate supervisor and dean.

Materials Submitted by the Post-Tenure Review Candidate

The Post-TR candidate shall submit a Post-TR portfolio to her/his immediate supervisor that includes the following: 1) a summary of major accomplishments achieved during the interval under review in the areas of teaching, research/creative/scholarly endeavors, student success activities, and service to the University, academic unit [college or library], department, profession, and community; 2) Annual reviews encompassing the previous five years for the 5-year span and copies of the documents supporting the annual review of faculty performance completed during the interval under review; 3) results obtained via student, Chair, or peer evaluations (normally included as part of 2); and 4) a current Curriculum Vitae. If appropriate, the Post-TR candidate may include letters from relevant individual(s) to provide the Post-TR

committee with a description of special conditions within the department or academic unit that merit consideration. Contributions should be dated from previous tenure and promotion milestones and encompass the previous 5-year period. The immediate supervisor shall convey this portfolio to the Post-TR committee chair. At the conclusion of the Post-TR process, the Post-TR portfolio is returned to the supervisor of the Post-TR candidate by the chair of the Post-TR committee. The supervisor of the Post-TR candidate shall retain the Post-TR portfolio in the department files in compliance with the University System of Georgia Records Retention Schedule.

Composition of the Post-TR Committee

The Post-TR committee shall consist of three tenured faculty members from within the Post-TR candidate's department. The Post-TR candidate shall identify two members of the Post-TR committee, and the Post-TR candidate's immediate supervisor selects the third member. The Post-TR candidate is permitted one preemptive challenge to the Post-TR committee member selected by the immediate supervisor. Faculty members with administrative contracts are ineligible to serve on the Post-TR committee. In the event that there is an insufficient number of tenured faculty from the Post-TR candidate's department, tenured faculty from related departments at GC shall be selected.

Responsibilities of the Post-TR Committee

All members of a Post-TR committee shall practice circumspection when evaluating a colleague's performance. The criteria used to review a Post-TR candidate must be consistent with the missions of the University, Academic Unit (College, Library), and Department, and the criteria must be consistent with the Post-TR candidate's official assignments. The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the Post-TR candidate discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with their position. Post-TR should be flexible enough to acknowledge different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of a Post-TR candidate's career. Observing confidentiality with respect to the results of Post-TR is an ethical responsibility of all members of the Post-TR committee. The Post-TR committee shall provide its report using the form(s) prescribed below. The Post-TR committee chair shall convey copies of the relevant form(s) to only the Post-TR candidate and their immediate supervisor.

Post-Tenure Review Committee Report

The committee shall provide a written evaluation of the candidate's performance, as well as a comprehensive rating using the [common Likert scale](#) for each area of Teaching, Scholarship, Service, Student Success, and Professional Development. Evaluation of Post-TR portfolios will utilize the [common Likert scale](#) and be documented using the [Common Likert Form](#).

If the candidate's performance is rated as unsatisfactory (**1 or a 2 on the [common Likert Scale](#)**), the committee shall include suggestions for improvement and for possible remedial action to guide the development of a [Performance Improvement Plan](#).

The candidate's immediate supervisor shall notify the Chief Academic Officer of the results of the review and place a copy within the candidate's personnel file in the department.

Discussion of the Results

The appropriate supervisor must meet with each faculty member to discuss the results of Post-TR. Each faculty member must receive a letter documenting the summary of the findings of the Post-TR. In the event of an unsuccessful Post-TR the letter must also include next steps, due process rights, and the potential ramifications if the faculty member does not remediate or demonstrate substantive progress towards remediation in the areas identified as unsatisfactory (**1 or a 2 on the [common Likert Scale](#)**). The Post-TR committee chair, the immediate supervisor, and the Post-TR candidate must acknowledge receipt of the report by signing the Post-TR committee report. Signing the report does not represent acceptance of the Post-TR committee's conclusions by the Post-TR candidate. The faculty member can provide a written rebuttal that will be attached to the final document, however, no action is required by the appropriate supervisor.

Appeal of the Results of Post-Tenure Review

The faculty member will have five (5) working days after seeing the Post-TR Report to file the written appeal. The written appeal should specifically state the factual basis for the appeal and provide documentation to support that appeal. The appeal process would begin with the department chairperson or the immediate supervisor of the faculty member. If the matter cannot be resolved by a discussion between the faculty member and the chair, the faculty member could then appeal to the dean of the appropriate college. This appeal should be submitted to the dean with appropriate notice to the department chairperson or supervisor that the appeal is taking place. Upon receipt of an appeal from a faculty member, the dean will schedule conferences to discuss the appeal with (1) the appealing faculty member and (2) with the supervisor of that faculty member. The dean shall, within five (5) working days, make a decision on the validity of the appeal and inform the faculty member and department chairperson whether the appeal has been upheld or denied.

Upon receipt of the decision of the dean, if the faculty member still is in disagreement with the decision, the faculty member may appeal to the Provost within five (5) working days of receipt of the dean's decision. The Provost checks to ensure that the process for the appeal was handled appropriately. Should the Provost determine that due process was not provided, they will refer the matter back to the college dean for resolution. The Provost shall conclude their review within five (5) working days.

Outcomes & Consequences of Post Tenure Review

The results of a positive Post-TR shall be linked to recognition or reward. Faculty members who are performing at noteworthy levels shall receive recognition for their achievements.

In the event of a Post-TR that does not meet expectations or needs improvement, the faculty member's appropriate supervisor(s) and faculty member will work together to develop a formal [Performance Improvement Plan \(PIP\)](#) in consultation with the Post-TR committee based around the deficiencies found by the committee. Consistent with the developmental intent of the Post-TR, the PIP must be designed to assist the faculty member in achieving progress towards remedying the deficiencies identified in the Post-TR. The PIP must contain clearly defined goals or outcomes, an outline of activities to be undertaken, a timetable, available resources and supports, and an agreed-upon monitoring strategy. The PIP's goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable with the timeframe, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty

member. The PIP must be approved by the Dean and submitted to GC's Office of Academic Affairs. Formal meetings for assessing progress on the PIP should be scheduled no less than twice per semester during the fall and spring semesters.

The assessment of the PIP will take the place of the annual review for the calendar year following the Post-TR. Failure to successfully remediate the identified deficiencies, or demonstrate substantive progress towards remediation, within one year subjects the faculty member to disciplinary actions up to and including, but not limited to, reallocation of effort, salary reduction, and tenure revocation and dismissal. The candidate will be able to appeal the final assessment of their PIP and the resulting remedial actions as outlined below.

Due Process Following an Unsuccessful Post-Tenure Review or an Unsuccessful Corrective Post-Tenure Review

The [Performance Improvement Plan](#) will be assessed in place of the relevant year's annual review. The candidate will submit an updated portfolio, including evidence of their progress on the Performance Improvement Plan, to a new Post-TR committee, which will submit an advisory report to the candidate's chair and dean. This report will indicate whether, in the assessment of the committee, the candidate has made satisfactory progress, and if not, it will include recommendations on remediation. The committee shall provide reasons to explain its assessment and recommendation. If, after conducting a final review of appropriate materials, including the assessment of the new Post-TR committee, and allowing the faculty member an opportunity to be heard at the conclusion of the performance improvement plan, the department chair and dean determine that the faculty member has failed to make sufficient progress in performance as outlined in the performance improvement plan (or has refused to engage reasonably in the process), the department chair and dean will propose appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member's deficiencies.

Recommendations made by the Post-TR committee, department chair, dean, and others are added to the candidate's portfolio as they are completed. In each stage of the process, an individual or committee that makes a recommendation must provide a rationale for that recommendation. At each stage of the process, the faculty member can submit updated materials or provide a written rebuttal that will be attached to the final document; however, no action is required in response.

The faculty member has ten (10) business days from receiving the recommendation of the dean and department chair to request a second Post-TR committee review. Upon request to review the recommended action by the faculty member, further due process comprises the following:

1. The second Post-TR committee will review the candidate's portfolio, the performance improvement plan, and the recommendation(s) of the department chair and dean. The Post-TR committee may exercise its judgment as to whether an in-person hearing is necessary. The recommendation of the Post-TR committee may be based solely on a review of the record. The Post-TR committee will issue its recommendation to the Provost and the faculty member within twenty (20) business days of the request for review by the faculty member.
2. Within five (5) business days of receiving the portfolio, the performance improvement plan, and recommendation(s) from the Post-TR committee, the Provost shall send an official letter to the faculty member notifying them of the decision.

3. The faculty member may appeal to the President of the institution within five (5) business days of receiving the decision from the Provost. The President's final decision shall be made within ten (10) business days and should notify the faculty member of their decision and the process for discretionary review application as provided for in Board of Regents' Policy.
4. If the remedial action taken is dismissal by the President, the faculty member may complete their faculty assignment for the current semester at the discretion of the institution; however, the semester during which a final decision is issued will be the last semester of employment in their current role.
5. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution's final decision pursuant to Board policy on [Applications for Discretionary Review \(6.26\)](#).

Corrective Post Tenure Review

A faculty member evaluated as deficient (**1 or a 2 on the [common Likert Scale](#)**) in any one of the elements of teaching, student success activities, research/scholarship, and/or service for two consecutive annual evaluations will participate in a corrective Post-TR. Note that the deficiency does not have to be in the same area; but could be a different area from one year to the next. This review will be initiated prior to the normally scheduled five-year review. The faculty member will follow GC's guidelines and procedures for post tenure review. If the outcome of the Corrective Post-TR is successful, the faculty member will reset the Post-TR clock. If the outcome of a corrective Post-TR does not meet expectations or needs improvement, the same process for an unsuccessful Post-TR will be followed. The institution should follow appropriate due-process mechanisms for a faculty member to appeal a corrective Post-TR as outlined above.

Forms/Materials

[MyGCSU Academic Affairs Evaluative Forms](#)

- Post-Tenure Review form 1A (positive report)
- Post-Tenure Review form 1B (negative report)
- Post-Tenure Review form 3 (notification to CAO)
- Post-Tenure Review form 2 (Optional Supplement to the Summary Report)

Five Year Review of Academic Administrators

GEORGIA COLLEGE POLICIES

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA POLICIES

BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY MANUAL: 3.2 Faculties (3.2.1 Faculty Membership: 3.2.1.2 Administrative Officers); 8.3.5 Evaluation of Personnel (8.3.5.3 Academic Administrative Officers; 8.3.5.4 Post-Tenure Review)

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS HANDBOOK: 4.7 Post-Tenure Review

Academic administrators who hold faculty rank and are tenured at the institution aligned with an academic unit will receive an annual review by their appropriate supervisor and will undergo a comprehensive evaluation, including a 360° feedback assessment every five years. Each institution should specify the process and procedures for a comprehensive evaluation of academic administrators. It is intended that an academic administrator's annual and comprehensive evaluation include a review of traditional faculty activities (teaching, research, student success, and service) that align with the responsibilities of the administrator.

Procedures

All university constituents have the opportunity to participate in the evaluation of the academic administrators. At their discretion they may complete evaluations on department chairs, deans, directors, assistant vice presidents, associate vice presidents and the Provost by using the PART IV Academic Administrators Evaluation Form. Under Georgia state law, all evaluations are considered subject to the open records law. An in-depth review of academic administrators will be conducted every five years by the supervisor.

- The five-year review clock should reset at any point an individual transfers, in either direction, between faculty and administrative roles. As per BOR policy 8.3.5.3, one review (administrator or faculty) may not substitute for another.
- The reset of the review clock makes it such that no individual is completing a five-year review in both categories simultaneously, nor would they be subjected to review in one category while actively serving in another.

The procedures shall address the distinctive nature of the administrator's work and leadership roles, include constituent feedback, and reflect that tenure is held in faculty positions, not administrative positions. (BOR 8.3.5.4) Student success can best be integrated into the Five Year Administrative Review Form in item #6 Success at Meeting Goals and Objectives - Develops plans and strategies for achieving the goals of administrative unit.

Interruptions to the Post-Tenure Review (Post-TR) Timeline

Institutions should follow existing processes to allow faculty the opportunity to pause the Post-TR timeline as are already in place at the institution.

The interim role is a unique form of service to the university, thereby necessitating specific consideration in the Post-TR process. Hence:

- Those serving in interim administrative positions should, by default, be granted a pause in the five-year Post-TR timeline.

- All interim administrators will continue with annual evaluations. However, they will not resume their five-year Post-TR cycle until back in a faculty role, unless they explicitly elect to do so.
- For interim administrators who later fully transfer into regular administrative roles, it should be at their discretion as to whether or not time served in their capacity as interim administrators will count towards their five-year administrative review.

Forms/Materials

[MyGCSU Academic Affairs Evaluative Forms](#)

- Part IV--Administrator Evaluation Form
- Five-Year Academic Administrator Review Process
- Five Year Administrator Review Team Signature Sheet
- Academic Administrator Evaluation Calendar
- Academic Administrator Five Year Review Timetable

COMMON LIKERT FORM

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

Criteria	Exemplary	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Does Not Meet Expectations
1. Teaching and effectiveness in instruction					
Evidentiary Sources					
2. Research, scholarship, creative activity, or academic achievement					
Evidentiary Sources					
3. Professional service to the institution or the community					
Evidentiary Sources					
<i>Involvement in student success activities</i>					
Evidentiary Sources					
<i>Continuous professional growth and development</i>					

- Evidence of student success and professional development will be duplicated in any appropriate category above.