

Page 19

the individual's annual evaluation. However, the individual must submit to the department head/associate dean an updated Summary of Professional Activity Form in January to document activities during Fall Semester for purposes of annual evaluation. The post-tenure review form is considerably different from that of pre-tenure or tenure or promotion review and consequently a faculty member subject to post-tenure review will also need to submit a complete annual self-evaluation and the accompanying portfolio to his/her department head at the end of the calendar year.

202.02.2 Student Evaluation of Instructor

Students shall be given the opportunity on a regular basis to confidentially rate faculty performance. The purpose of this process is to improve instruction through student feedback. The information derived from the student ratings will be used by the faculty member for self-evaluation and by the administration as part of the faculty evaluation process. The form and procedure of the student rating of faculty shall be established by Faculty Council and approved by the Provost (See Student Evaluation of Instructor.)

202.02.3 Procedures for Department Head/Associate Dean

The department head/associate dean evaluates the portfolio using the Annual Faculty Evaluation Summary Form. The evaluator rates the faculty member's performance using a 1-8 rating scale in the following five areas under the Board of Regents' criteria for faculty evaluation:

Part I—Superior Teaching

A. Instruction of Students

B. Planning, Development, and Evaluation of Programs, Courses, and Materials

Part II—Outstanding Service to the Institution **and Its Community**

A. Committee and Other Service within the University Community

B. Service to the Larger Community

Part III—Scholarly Activities and Professional Development

Based on his or her observations of the faculty member and the evidence in the portfolio, the department head/associate dean evaluates the five areas using the following rating scale:

8 Exceptional

7 Outstanding

6 Very Good

5 Good

4 High Marginal

3 Low Marginal

Page 20

2 Poor

1 Very Poor

The department head/associate dean uses the following procedure for assigning ratings, determining weight factors, and computing the total evaluation score:

1. Assignment of Rating: The department head/associate dean will assign a rating, based on the above scale, for each of the five areas of the criteria.
2. Determination of Weight Factor: The weight of each section of the evaluation will be determined by the department head/associate dean in consultation with the faculty member and with the approval of the dean of the school. The sum of all factors must be 100, within the following ranges:

Part I—Superior Teaching (Weight Factor 60)

A. Instruction of Students (Weight Factor 25 to 40)

B. Planning, Development, and Evaluation of Programs, Courses, and Materials (Weight Factor 20 to 35)

Part II—Outstanding Service to the Institution **and Its Community** (Weight Factor 15 to 30)

A. Committee and Other Service within the University Community (Weight Factor 15 to 30)

B. Service to the Larger Community (Weight Factor 0 to 15)

Part III—Scholarly Activities and Professional Development (Weight Factor 10 to 25.)

As Clayton State becomes more diverse in the types of programs offered and clientele served, it might reasonably have different levels of expectation for faculty in different programs. Departments or schools desiring to adjust the weights of criteria on the Faculty Evaluation Summary Form should apply to do so with justification(s) to the Provost. Schools desiring to establish special standards within the existing criteria may do so with approval of the Provost.

The weight for each section for the next year will be recorded on the Annual Faculty Evaluation Summary Form at the time of the faculty member's evaluation conference with the department head/associate dean. (If circumstances so dictate, the weight factors can be modified during the year by mutual consent of the faculty member and department head/associate dean.)

3. Computation of Total Evaluation Score: The evaluation of each section will be computed by multiplying the evaluation rating (1-8) by the factor assigned to the section. Since the sum of all weight factors must be 100, the total number of points available is 800. The ratings, weight factors, and total will be recorded on the Annual Faculty Evaluation Summary Form.

205 PROMOTION AND TENURE

205.01 General Policies for Promotion and Tenure

~~Each faculty member is expected to contribute to the achievement of the University's mission through effective teaching, service, and scholarly activities and professional development appropriate to the faculty member's discipline. It is the responsibility of the faculty member, with assistance from administrators, to document the quality of his or her contributions by maintaining and presenting clear and adequate records.~~

Clayton State's stated mission emphasizes the university's commitment to "cultivat[ing] an environment of engaged, experienced-based learning, enriched by active community service, that prepares students of diverse ages and backgrounds to succeed in their lives and careers." Each faculty member is expected to contribute to the achievement of that mission through effective teaching, service, and scholarly activities and professional development appropriate to the faculty member's discipline. It is the responsibility of the faculty member, with assistance from administrators, to document the quality of his or her contributions by maintaining and presenting clear and adequate records.

The Annual Faculty Evaluation process is integral to the procedures for faculty to advance in rank or to gain tenure at Clayton State. Annual evaluations and periodic reviews shall be designed to assist faculty, promotion and tenure committee members, and administrators in making decisions relative to personal development, promotion, and tenure.

The promotion and tenure policies and procedures at Clayton State are based on the policies, guidelines, and timelines established by the Board of Regents (BOR) of the University System of Georgia. While BOR policy prescribes minimum standards for promotion and tenure, it allows considerable flexibility to University System institutions in developing appropriate criteria. In the event of any conflict, the policies of the BOR shall prevail. Appeal or grievance may be made in accordance with general University and Board policy and procedures. The President, when justified by extraordinary circumstances, may make exceptions to the requirements set forth in this section.

Because tenure resides at the institutional level rather than system-wide, faculty who have achieved tenure status in one state system institution cannot hereby claim tenure in other institutions of the state system (BOR Policy Manual)

The BOR policy for promotion is available in the BOR Policy Manual. The policy for tenure is available in the BOR Academic Affairs Handbook.

Dates published within this document are considered finite; however, when the stated dates fall on a weekend, the deadline date will be the first business day immediately following the specified date.

205.02 Clayton State Policy on Tenure

205.02.1 Definition of Tenure

Tenure is the practice that entitles a faculty member to continuation of his or her appointment until relinquishment or forfeiture of tenure or until termination of tenure for adequate cause, financial exigency, or academic program discontinuance (BOR Policy Manual). The burden of proof that tenure should be awarded rests with the faculty member. Tenure is acquired only by positive action of the president of the university.

Page 27

Associate Professor: Faculty members must serve a minimum of five years at the rank of assistant professor at Clayton State. (The portfolio may be submitted during August of the beginning of the fifth year.)

Professor: Faculty members must serve a minimum of five years at the rank of associate professor. (The portfolio maybe submitted during August of the beginning of the fifth year.)

Note: "Faculty hired during the academic year (e.g., in January) may opt to have that year counted as a full year for purposes of both promotion and tenure. This decision must be made by the Department Chair or Dean and clearly documented in the contract at the time of hiring."

205.03.1.2 Universal Requirements for Promotion and/or Tenure

The BOR Policy Manual and the Academic Affairs Handbook prescribe the evaluation of four general criteria for promotion, upon which the criteria for promotion and tenure at Clayton State are based:

- a. Academic Achievement: An earned degree appropriate to a specified discipline and rank at Clayton State, or extraordinary recognition and achievement in the area of specialization, is required. For Senior Lecturers, an appropriate master's degree is required. For faculty in tenure-track positions, the appropriate terminal degree is required. (In disciplines where the appropriate terminal degree is the doctorate, the doctorate is the required credential.)
- b. Superior Teaching: Demonstration of effectiveness in teaching. The candidate must show an overall positive assessment in his/her courses as evidenced by the Student Evaluation of Instructor instrument. The candidate must show that syllabi for all of the courses are readily available to the students and departmental offices, and that office hours are provided for each semester the candidate teaches. (Each unit should establish minimum number of hours per week.) Other evidence germane to this category may be included as the candidate deems appropriate for evaluation.
- c. Outstanding Service to the Institution **and Its Community**: Demonstration of effectiveness as shown by areas such as service on committees at the departmental, college/school, and/or university level, advisement, faculty mentorship, student activity engagement, **community engagement**, and other evidence germane to this category may be included as the candidate deems appropriate for evaluation.
- d. Scholarly Activities and Professional Development. Demonstration of effectiveness and participation in the candidate's discipline and other evidence germane to this category may be included as the candidate deems appropriate for evaluation.

Each criterion will be assessed as to whether the candidate has met expectations or has exceeded expectations and to what degree they may have exceeded those expectations by the candidate's department or the candidate's college or school if

c. Outstanding Service to the Institution **and Its Community**:

- Committee service
- Service as a mentor to full-time and/or part-time faculty
- Advisement of students
- Development of advisement materials
- Support to student organizations and/or campus activities
- Management of department, college or university wide budgets
- Coordination of department, school, college or university-wide programs
- Contributions to system or regional accreditation programs
- Contributions to the improvement of campus life
- Contributions to the improvement of community life related to one's discipline
- Participation in community activities and organizations which enhance CSU's image
- Direct participation in K-12 school activities

d. Scholarly Activities and Professional Development:

- Publications
- Artistic performances or creations as appropriate to the discipline
- Membership and/or service in professional societies
- Development of new grant proposals, contracts or fellowship applications
- Receipt of new grants, fellowships or contracts
- Research with undergraduate or graduate students
- Research
- Presentations before learned societies, professional organizations or public institutions
- Consulting or other applications of professional expertise
- Professional licenses or certifications
- Development of professional applications of technology
- Participation in professional development training related to one's discipline, scholarship and/or creative activities
- Honors and awards for research, scholarship or other creative activities

The general criteria of Superior Teaching, Outstanding Service to the Institution **and Its Community**, and Scholarly Activities and Professional Development allow flexibility by permitting other evidentiary sources to be included. Inclusion of other evidentiary sources does not guarantee that the new evidentiary source will be considered to be of comparable importance to those specifically listed, however the candidate is invited to make the case for inclusion.

In addition to the evidentiary sources listed above, specific requirements for promotion and/or tenure are determined by individual academic departments.

206.06 Post-Tenure Review: Policy and Procedures

206.06.1 Post-Tenure Review Policy

The Academic Affairs Handbook of the BOR states that all institutions in the University System of Georgia shall conduct post-tenure reviews of all tenured faculty members, beginning five years after the faculty member's tenure or post-tenure review. The policy and procedures for post-tenure review at Clayton State University are in accordance with BOR requirements.

The primary purpose of post-tenure review is to examine, recognize, and enhance Superior Teaching, Outstanding Service to the Institution **and Its Community**, and Scholarly Activities and Professional Development of all tenured faculty members, consistent with the mission of the University.

...

206.06.2 Post-Tenure Review Criteria

The criteria for evaluating the performance of a faculty member undergoing post-tenure review will be the same as those established for evaluations for promotion and tenure. Two outcomes of the evaluation will be possible:

1. ***“Achieving Expectations in Post-Tenure Performance”*** means that the faculty member has achieved or exceeded expectations in Superior Teaching, Outstanding Service to the Institution **and Its Community**, and Scholarly Activities and Professional Development, and that satisfactory performance has been sustained in annual reviews over the last five years. The individual has continued to grow in his or her development as a faculty member and has maintained a level of professional activity and accomplishment that achieves or exceeds expectations for an individual at this rank, in this faculty position, and with this level of experience. (For definitions of “meets expectations,” see Section 205.03.1.2) The individual has, at most, minor deficiencies in expected faculty performance.
2. ***“Not Achieving Expectations in Post-Tenure Performance”*** means that the faculty member has failed to meet expectations in Superior Teaching, Outstanding Service to the Institution **and Its Community**, and Scholarly Activities and Professional Development, and that satisfactory performance has not been sustained in annual performance reviews over the past five years. The individual has failed to grow significantly in his or her development as a faculty member and has not maintained a level of professional activity and accomplishment that achieves expectations for an individual at this rank, in this faculty position, and with this level of experience. The individual has major deficiencies in expected faculty performance.

2. ***“Not Achieving Expectations in Post-Tenure Performance”*** means that the faculty member has failed to meet expectations in Superior Teaching, Outstanding Service to the Institution **and Its Community**, and Scholarly Activities and Professional Development, and that satisfactory

performance has not been sustained in annual performance reviews over the past five years. The individual has failed to grow significantly in his or her development as a faculty member and has not maintained a level of professional activity and accomplishment that achieves expectations for an individual at this rank, in this faculty position, and with this level of experience. The individual has major deficiencies in expected faculty performance.

206.06.3 Post-Tenure Review: Process and Procedures

Each committee involved in the post-tenure review process will provide a single written recommendation with rationale for each candidate. Minority opinion recommendations and rationale may be included. In cases in which the person undergoing post-tenure review is also applying for promotion, the materials required for promotion will constitute post-tenure review.

The post-tenure review process involves four stages:

1. Preparation of the Post-Tenure Review Portfolio by the Faculty Member
2. Review at the Department Level (Department Chair/Associate Dean & Departmental Review Committee, if one exists)
3. Review at the College or School Level (College or School Promotion and Tenure Review Committee & Dean of the college or school)
4. Review at the University Level of those portfolios not achieving expectations (University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee & Provost)

These stages, as well as the timelines in the process of post-tenure review, are described in the following section. Please refer to the Calendar for Post-Tenure Review.

1. Preparation of the Post-Tenure Review Portfolio by the Faculty Member

- a. By the end of Spring Semester of the fourth year since the faculty member's tenure or post-tenure review (approximately May 1), the faculty member receives notification from the department chair/associate dean that he or she is undergoing post-tenure review. (Copies of this notification will be forwarded to the dean of the school and to the faculty member's personnel file.)
- b. By January 21, each individual undergoing post-tenure review will submit a portfolio to his or her department chair/associate dean for review by that individual and to the departmental review committee if one exists. Superior Teaching, Outstanding Service to the Institution **and Its Community**, and Scholarly Activities and Professional Development are the primary focuses of post-