



***ALLEN E. PAULSON COLLEGE OF SCIENCE
AND TECHNOLOGY***

THE COLLEGE MANUAL:

***PERSONNEL POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND
GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION***

Drafted in part by the Task Force on College Policies and Procedures
Adapted from *GSU Faculty Handbook 2006-2007, Board of Regents Policy Manual*

TABLE OF CONTENTS		PAGE
100	Introduction	4
	Vision Statement	
	Mission Statement	
	History of the College	
200	Administrative Organization	6
	Dean	
	Associate Deans	
	Chairs/Directors	
	Dean's College Council	
	Academic Units	
	Centers and Institutes	
	Faculty	
	Committees and Task Forces	
	Advisory Boards	
300	Academic Programs	8
	Accreditations	
400	Faculty Personnel Policies	9
410	Criteria and Standards for Appointment	
420	Renewal and Non-Renewal of Appointment	
430	Faculty Workload Policies	
440	Faculty Performance Evaluations	
	441. Areas of Evaluation	
	442. Types of Evaluation	
	i. Annual evaluations	
	ii. Tenure	
	iii. Promotion	
	iv. Pre-tenure	
	v. Post-tenure	
450	Tenure: Criteria and Expectations for Faculty Evaluations	
	451 Pre-Tenure Review	
	452 Post-Tenure Review	
460	Promotion: Criteria and Standards for Recommendations	
470	Appeals of Faculty Evaluations	
480	Retirement, Resignation, Termination, and Dismissal	
500	Instructional (Teaching) Guidelines and Practices	23
	Office Hours and Advising	
	Class Scheduling and Attendance Policy	
	Course Requirements	
	Syllabi and Course Descriptions	
	Textbooks	
	Assignments and Evaluations	
	Assignments and Evaluations	

	Final Examinations	
	Opportunities for Making Up Examinations and Assignments	
	Grades and Records	
	Class Records	
	Student Records	
	Reporting and Posting Grades	
	Changing Grades	
	Student Ratings of Instruction	

600	Research/Scholarship Support	24
	Reassigned Time	
	Professional Travel	
	Allocation of Indirect Cost Recovery on Sponsored Grants/Contracts	

APPENDICES

	A: Faculty Annual Review Form	25
	Simplified form with tables	
	Simplified form with no tables	
	B: Preparation of Faculty Dossiers (Portfolio)	37
	C: Sample Letter to External Disciplinary Reviewers	41
	D: Georgia Southern University Intellectual Property Policy	42
	E: Georgia Southern University Policy and Procedures on Scholarly Misconduct	43

100 INTRODUCTION

While this *College Manual* contains much information drawn from the Georgia Southern University 2006-2007 *Faculty Handbook*, it is not intended to serve as substitute for it. Furthermore, this *College Manual* should not be considered an official publication of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, nor should it be construed as the basis of a contract between the faculty member and the institution. In case of any divergence from or conflict with the *Bylaws* for policies of the Board of Regents, the official *Bylaws* and policies of the Board of Regents shall prevail. In the event of any divergence from or conflict with the University policies or *Statutes*, the official policies and *Statutes* shall prevail. The Dean will interpret and enforce these College policies and procedures.

110 VISION STATEMENT

Within this decade, the Allen E. Paulson College of Science and Technology will be recognized as a national leader in the development of innovative curricula and for its dedicated faculty who integrate distinguished scholarship with superior undergraduate and graduate education.

120 MISSION STATEMENT

The Allen E. Paulson College of Science and Technology at Georgia Southern University is a diverse community of teacher-scholars, students, alumni, and friends engaged in the discovery, application, integration, and transformation of scientific and technological knowledge. Reflecting the best practices of our disciplines, the College provides undergraduate and graduate students with a challenging education that is research-based and technology-infused, and promotes life-long learning and stewardship for the benefit of the human, natural, and technological resources of Georgia, the nation, and the world.

130 HISTORY

The Allen E. Paulson College of Science and Technology was established in July 1994. The college was formed from a reorganization in which the Departments of Biology, Chemistry, Geology & Geography, Mathematics & Computer Sciences, and Physics, formerly of the College of Arts and Sciences, were merged with units in the College of Technology (the Departments of Engineering Technology, Industrial Technology, and Military Science, and the Engineering Studies Office). Dr. Leo G. Parrish, Jr. served as Acting Dean of the newly formed College during the 1994-95 year. The appointments of Dr. Denise A. Battles as Acting Assistant to the Dean and Ms. Joanne Dannacher as Secretary to the Dean, completed the staffing of the Dean's Office. A search for the College's founding Dean resulted in the 1995 hiring of Dr. Jimmy L. Solomon. That year also saw the opening of the Technology Building, an 80,000 square foot academic building that housed the Department of Engineering Technology, the Printing Management program of the Department of Industrial Technology, as well as the Dean's Office of the College of Science and Technology. Shortly after the Dean Solomon's arrival, a search for the College's Assistant Dean was conducted and resulted in the appointment of then-Acting Assistant Dean Denise Battles into the permanent position.

A July 1997 reorganization resulted in the establishment of the School of Technology, created by a merger of the former Departments of Engineering Technology and Industrial Technology and Engineering Studies program. Accompanying this change was the establishment of the position of Director of the School of Technology. July 1997 also saw a restructuring of the Dean's Office, in which the position of Assistant Dean was distributed into two positions, one an Assistant Dean for Student and Curriculum Services and the other an Assistant Dean for Research and Budget. Dr. S.

Todd Deal was appointed to serve as Assistant Dean for Student and Curriculum Services, while Denise Battles assumed the role of Assistant Dean for Research and Budget.

A major expansion of the Department of Mathematics & Computer Sciences' physical facilities was realized with the completion of the addition to the Mathematics and Physics Building in fall of 2000. The College's facilities were augmented once more in summer 2003, when the new Nursing and Chemistry Building was completed and occupied. This new structure provided 47,000 square feet of new academic space to the Department of Chemistry. The departure of Chemistry from the Herty Building yielded much-needed space for the Departments of Biology and Geology & Geography.

The period of 2002-05 saw a number of changes to the Dean's Office staff. Dean Jimmy Solomon announced in spring 2002 his intention to return to the faculty following the 2002-03 year, resulting in a search for his replacement. Dr. Anny Morrobel-Sosa was chosen as the College's new Dean, assuming that role in July 2003. Dr. S. Todd Deal also announced in spring 2002 his decision to return to the faculty, a move that was accomplished in summer of that year. Upon his departure, Dr. Dan Hagan provided assistance in the areas of curriculum and student services, working on a part-time basis in the Dean's Office during 2002-03 and as Acting Associate Dean of Student and Academic Programs in fall 2003. As of January 1, 2004, Dan Hagan took on an assignment in the College of Education, and Dr. Donna Saye assumed the role of Acting Associate Dean. A search for the permanent Associate Dean of Student and Academic Programs was conducted during the 2003-04 academic year, resulting in the August 2004 appointment of Dr. Bret Danilowicz. Searches for the Chairs of the Department of Chemistry and the Department of Physics were conducted during 2004-05 resulting in the July 2005 appointment of Dr. Mary K. Boyd and Dr. Mark Edwards, respectively. Dr. Danilowicz assumed the position of Associate Dean for Faculty and Research Programs after the departure of Dr. Denise Battles.

A search for the permanent Associate Dean of Student and Academic Programs was conducted during the 2005-06 academic year; during which period Dr. Shahnam Navaee assumed the role of Acting Associate Dean. This same time period also saw a change to the College's component academic programs. With the establishment of the College of Information Technology in July 2003, computer science faculty moved to that new unit. This change yielded the Department of Mathematical Sciences, which, along with the Departments of Biology, Chemistry, Geology & Geography, Military Science, and Physics and School of Technology. The search for the Associate Dean of Students and Academic Programs resulted in the July 2006 appointment of Dr. Shahnam Navaee.

In summer 2006, the School of Technology divided into the Department of Mechanical Engineering and Electrical Engineering Technology and the Department of Construction Management and Civil Engineering Technology. These two departments, along with the Departments of Biology, Chemistry, Geology & Geography, Mathematical Sciences, Military Science, and Physics, currently comprise the Allen E. Paulson College of Science and Technology. A number of changes took place in the Dean's office staff during the summer. Dean Anny Morrobel-Sosa resigned as Dean of COST and Dr. Bret Danilowicz assumed the position of Interim Dean. Dr. Pranoti Asher, Associate Professor of Geology, assumed the position of Acting Associate Dean of Faculty and Research Programs for the academic year 2006-2007. In April, Bret Danilowicz was chosen as the Dean of the College and in July Dr. Clayton Heller, Associate Professor of Physics, assumed the position of Acting Associate Dean of Faculty and Research Programs for the year 2007-2008. In 2008, Dr. John Pascarella, Professor of Biology, was named Associate Dean of Faculty and Research Programs.

200 ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

DEAN – Please see section 105.01 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook.

ASSOCIATE DEANS – The Associate Deans assist the dean and serve as the dean's representative on a as needed basis. The two Associate Deans report directly to the Dean.

The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research Programs is primarily responsible for advancing a culture of academic excellence where distinction in teaching, scholarship and other creative works and service is expected and rewarded; and for providing leadership for research programs, scholarly efforts, and strategic multidisciplinary research initiatives that further the College's strategic plan.

The Associate Dean of Student and Academic Programs is primarily responsible for providing leadership in the coordination and administration of graduate and undergraduate enrollment management and student services of the College; monitoring the student academic policies and procedures of the College; and providing leadership in curriculum development, implementation, and assessment.

CHAIRS - Please see section 105.01 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook.

DEAN'S COLLEGE COUNCIL - The Dean's College Council is an advisory committee that consists of Department Chairs and Directors within the College of Science and Technology. The major function of the committee is to serve as a liaison between the department and the office of the dean.

ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS - Please see section 106.08 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook.

The College of Science and Technology currently has the following departments: Biology, Chemistry, Construction Management and Civil Engineering Technology, Geology and Geography, Mathematical Sciences, Mechanical Engineering Technology and Electrical Engineering Technology, Military Science, and Physics.

CENTERS AND INSTITUTES - Please see sections 106.08 and 107.01 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook.

The College of Science and Technology currently has the following centers and institutes: Applied Coastal Research Laboratory, College Office of Undergraduate Research, Center for Printability and Runability, Institute of Arthropodology and Parasitology, Research Interest Groups, and Science and Technology Applied Research Services Center.

FACULTY - Please see section 105.04 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook.

COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES – There are ten standing committees of the College of Science and Technology. The Academic Excellence Committee exists to aid faculty and students in efforts to pursue educational excellence at Georgia Southern University. The three College Award Committees recognize and reward outstanding contributions of COST faculty members in areas of teaching, research, and service. The College's Course and Curriculum committee recommends procedures concerning programs and curricula, reviews and approves all changes in courses, major and minor programs, emphases, and degrees, and maintains continuous review of all academic programs within the College. The College Office of Undergraduate Research (COUR) committee is charged with the responsibility to support and enhance existing faculty-undergraduate research, facilitate the creation and support of new faculty-undergraduate research initiatives and showcase faculty-undergraduate research. The Medical/Dental Admissions Review Board is a committee of faculty members appointed

by the Dean of the College of Science and Technology to oversee the pre-medical/pre-dental program. The COST Elections Committee is charged with conducting proper and open determination of annual elections of officers to carry out the responsibility of representation on the faculty senate and its standing committees. The College Post-Tenure Review Committee serves as an advisory body to the Dean. The College Tenure and Promotion Committee annually review all criteria, policies, and procedures followed by the departments, to insure that they are equitable and effective. The committee also reviews all recommendations transmitted from academic departments and make recommendations and provide justification for those recommendations to the dean. The Dean appoints College faculty to a Task Force that addresses critical needs of the College.

ADVISORY BOARDS - The College of Science and Technology's Advisory Board is consultative to the College's Dean providing advice, guidance and support for the development of high quality programs in the College. The Board also assists in promoting a professional image and good relations with the larger community and development of effective collaboration with that community. Potential new members are invited by the President to serve a three-year term as an Advisory Board member, with the possibility of renewal.

300 ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The Allen E. Paulson College of Science and Technology prepares students in baccalaureate majors and the Master of Science and Master of Technology programs. Approximately 180 faculty serve over 2500 undergraduate and graduate students in the following departments: Biology, Chemistry, Construction Management and Civil Engineering Technology, Geology and Geography, Mathematical Sciences, Mechanical and Electrical Engineering Technology, Military Science, and Physics.

Faculty in the College teach courses in civil and electrical engineering through the Georgia Tech Regional Engineering Program which enables students to complete baccalaureate degrees in engineering on the Georgia Southern campus. Engineering programs are also available to students through the Regents Engineering Transfer Program. The College also supports the University's general education program through extensive offerings in the Core Curriculum.

Academic Programs are also described in section 106.08 of the 2006-2007 faculty handbook.

310 ACCREDITATIONS

The Chemistry Department offers a modern chemistry program leading to a B.S. certified by the American Chemical Society (ACS). With over 270 chemistry majors, the Department ranks in the top 25 producers of ACS-certified B.S. chemistry majors nation-wide.

The Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering Technology, Electrical Engineering Technology, and Mechanical Engineering Technology degree programs are accredited by the Technology Accreditation Commission of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (TAC/ABET). The Bachelor of Science in Construction Management program is accredited by the American Council for Construction Education (ACCE) and the Bachelor of Science in Manufacturing and Graphic Communications Management programs are accredited by the National Association of Industrial Technology (NAIT).

As a federation of professional technical societies, ABET and NAIT are recognized by US Department of Higher Education and internationally accepted by colleges, universities, and industry.

400 FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES

The accomplishments and recognition of the College depend on the quality of its faculty and the record of engagement and active participation in advancing the pursuit of knowledge through teaching, learning and creative research/scholarship. Georgia Southern adheres to the teacher-scholar model for all faculty as reflected in the *Desired Attributes of Georgia Southern Faculty* (stated in Section 204 of the Faculty Handbook 2006-2007). Thus, the recruitment and retention of an outstanding faculty requires that the College demand rigorous standards for tenure and promotion.

410 CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR APPOINTMENT

All faculty members with teaching responsibilities are expected to be effective teachers, to demonstrate a level of teaching performance commensurate with their rank and experience, remain up to date in their disciplines, be continuously involved in improving their teaching pedagogy and to make substantive contributions to the overall instructional effectiveness of the academic programs in which they have assigned duties.

All tenured or tenure-track faculty members having the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor are expected to engage in an ongoing program of research, publication, creative activity, and scholarly effort that is appropriate to their appointment, discipline, and fields of specialization.

All faculty members are expected to engage in responsible outreach/academic citizenship activities appropriate to their appointment, rank, length of service and discipline. Flexibility in meeting the outreach and academic citizenship requirements of each department and division is critical, and consequently, individual responsibilities may vary from time to time. Outreach activities are those which extend the influence and expertise of the faculty to areas and populations external to the College. These activities may include but are not limited to: education beyond the classroom; research partnerships and collaboration; professional leadership; and public/community leadership and consultation.

420 RENEWAL AND NON-RENEWAL OF FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

The College follows the guidelines stated in Section 211 of the Faculty Handbook 2006-2007

430 FACULTY WORKLOAD POLICIES

Faculty teaching load and workload assignments are made by the unit head, with the approval of the dean. The standard teaching load for regular full-time faculty is 12 workload hours per semester, within the standard, full workload of 15 hours per semester. The difference reflects the non-teaching duties of the faculty member in the areas of scholarship and service. It is expected that full-time regular faculty will contribute in the three areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and/or administration each academic year. Adjustments to the standard workload distribution may be made through consultation with the faculty member, recommendation of the unit head, and approval of the dean. The standard teaching load for full-time temporary faculty is 15 workload hours per semester. It is incumbent upon every faculty member to demonstrate performance consistent with his/her particular workload distribution. Overload assignments agreed to by faculty shall be made according to the Extra Compensation Policy of the Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by Dean and the Provost.

440 FACULTY PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

441 Areas of Evaluation and Ratings

The predominant bases for evaluation of faculty are identified in the *Desired Attributes of Georgia Southern Faculty* in the areas of evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service. Administration will be considered as a fourth category in the evaluation of faculty with administrative assignments. The ratings assigned in each of the evaluation areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and/or administration are to be determined on a scale from 0.0 – 10.0 in increments of tenths, enabling a clear differentiation within and between ratings.

➤ **Teaching** - Represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and the development of critical thinking skills. Such activity typically involves teaching in the classroom or laboratory, direction of research, field activity, and student mentoring. Teaching activities also include the development of new courses, programs, new pedagogical techniques and/or approaches, and other curricular materials.

- Excellent (8.0-10.0) Through continuous growth of knowledge in the subject field and innovative pedagogy, the faculty member's performance indicators consistently approach the highest levels of accomplishment in instruction.
- Good (6.0-7.9) The faculty member teaches with imagination and enthusiasm, introduces new developments into his/her courses. If appropriate, the faculty member engages in individualized instruction and student mentoring, and demonstrates effective performance. The faculty member's performance indicators are consistently satisfactory.
- Fair (4.0–5.9) Quality of teaching approaches but does not consistently meet the unit, college and university standards. The faculty member regularly meets classes, conducts office hours, and generally receives satisfactory student ratings of instruction and peer evaluations.
- Poor (0.0–3.9) Quality of teaching and teaching performance frequently fall short of Unit, College, and University standards. *Corrective action is required.*
- **Scholarship** – Scholarship shall be defined as scholarly activity in the discovery, integration, development, application, and extension of knowledge as evidenced through public dissemination in disciplinary/academic peer-reviewed venues such as articles, scholarly books, texts and software, conference presentations to professional audiences, externally funded grants and contracts, and other professional accomplishments characteristic of external validation of contributions to scholarship. Candidates for advancement must provide clear evidence of the same. The significance of scholarship and scholarly accomplishments shall be judged rigorously within the context of the discipline. The faculty member is expected to engage in a program of sustained scholarly activity consistent with the discipline of their designated employment. Adjustments to the disciplinary area of scholarship may be made with the recommendation of the chairs and the approval of the dean.
 - Excellent (8.0-10.0) The faculty member demonstrates a sustained record of scholarly activity that results in peer-reviewed or other externally validated scholarly products that are recognized and valued at the national and/or international levels. The faculty member's performance indicators consistently approach the highest levels of accomplishment in scholarship.
 - Good (6.0-7.9) The faculty member keeps current in his/her field through attendance and presentation of papers at professional meetings, and carries out scholarly activities that regularly yield peer-reviewed or other externally validated scholarly products appropriate to his/her discipline. The faculty member's performance indicators are consistently satisfactory.

- Fair (4.0–5.9) Quality of scholarship approaches but does not consistently meet unit, college and university standards. Faculty member keeps current in his/her field through attending professional meetings, reading relevant literature and engaging in scholarly activity that has the potential to yield peer-reviewed or other externally validated scholarly products.
- Poor (0.0–3.9) Scholarly engagement falls short of Unit, College, and University standards and appears insufficient to maintain currency in the field or yield peer-reviewed or other externally validated scholarly products. *Corrective action is required.*

➤ **Service** – Faculty are expected to make service contributions to their professions and to the institution. Service at the department/school, college, and university levels is essential to the well-being of the University. Service includes the application of one’s expertise in the discipline for the benefit of a professional organization, the community, or the institution. Service also includes the academic advisement of Georgia Southern University students. Additionally, service may include work in schools, businesses, museums, social agencies, government, or the like, as well as activities undertaken on behalf of the University that do not entail systematic instruction. Consulting shall be designated as paid or unpaid.

- Excellent (8.0-10.0) Through assuming leadership roles the faculty member demonstrates a sustained record of meaningful contributions to the profession, institution, and/or community. The faculty member’s performance indicators consistently approach the highest levels of accomplishments in service.
- Good (6.0-7.9) The faculty member actively contributes to the profession, institution, and/or community. The faculty member’s performance indicators are consistently satisfactory.
- Fair (4.0 – 5.9) Quality of service approaches but does not consistently meet Unit, College and University standards. Faculty member occasionally contributes to the profession, institution, and/or community but does not do so consistently.
- Poor (0.0 – 3.9) Quality of service falls short of Unit, College, and University standards. Engagement of Service is minimal. *Corrective action is required.*

Collegiality consists of good academic citizenship, professionalism, contributions to a positive working environment, collaboration, and constructive cooperation, and is an expectation of all faculty members. Collegiality may be defined as faculty member's conduct when it is performed in a manner that promotes, as effectively as possible, the primary functions of the University. It is appropriate for collegiality or a faculty member's contributions to a positive working environment to be taken into account when making personnel and merit raise decisions. While the familiar "academic triad" of teaching, scholarship/research/creative activity, and services does not specifically refer to collegiality, the College of Science and Technology acknowledges that the presence or absence of collegiality is an appropriate factor in each of those areas. In those cases where collegiality is an issue in a personnel review, that discussion should occur in whichever area is a concern: -- teaching, scholarship/research/creative activity, service, or overall. The results of the lack of collegiality should be addressed in those venues in which faculty members have full and sufficient opportunities to respond, clarify, and appeal.

442 Types of evaluations**i. Annual evaluations**

Annual evaluations (summative and formative) allow for the development and assessment of faculty performance and are documented through the use of the Annual Faculty Review instrument (see Appendix A), the vehicle through which each faculty member documents performance expectations and achievements. It is required that all faculty discuss their goals, objectives, responsibilities and expectations for each of the areas of teaching, scholarship, service and administration (if applicable), the resources needed to achieve those goals, and the specific products to be produced when the goals are achieved, commensurate with the faculty member's rank and experience, in meetings with the Chair/Director or Dean specifically dedicated for this purpose. This meeting will also result in the allocation of evaluation percentages to be divided among teaching (40-80%), scholarship (10-40%) and service (10-40%), always totaling to 100%, as outlined in the report from the University's Task Force on Faculty Roles and Rewards. Any deviations from these percentages will need to be approved by the Department Chair, Dean, and the Provost. Evaluation percentages should exclude any overload assignments agreed to by the faculty member. (Where a faculty member has administrative obligations, these ranges will need to be modified to account for the evaluation of their administrative roles.) Though the listed goals may change during an academic year, such changes must be discussed and agreed explicitly with their supervisor by the Chair/Director or Dean.

Annual faculty evaluations are performed by the Chair/Director or Dean through the information provided by the faculty member in Section III of the Annual Faculty Review document, which includes statements of their accomplishments and the sources of evidence which support their statement. The Chair/Director or Dean will provide a written evaluation of the accomplishments and a score between 0-10 for each category of teaching, scholarship, and service (and administration if applicable), and an overall evaluation of the faculty member for the year. Evaluative statements of specific accomplishments for the previous year should reflect the faculty member's performance and effectiveness as per the stated goals and workload allocation for the period under review, and should be documented by supporting evidence. It is required that the Chair/Director or Dean discuss with each faculty member their accomplishments and overall evaluation and documented with the signatures of both the faculty member and the supervisor. At the conclusion of this meeting, the faculty member may respond in writing to the annual evaluation document, and such response shall be attached to the evaluation. The supervisor will acknowledge receipt of a response in writing, noting changes, if any, in the annual evaluation document made as a result of either the conference of the faculty member's written response. This acknowledgement shall also become part of the permanent record.

Copies of each annual evaluation will be maintained by the supervisor and provided to the Dean for additional review. These evaluations will be considered as part of the faculty member's dossier during all periodic reviews, including pre-tenure, tenure, post-tenure and promotion. In addition, the overall evaluation of the faculty member will be used for the assignment of raises for each faculty member.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to present clear evidence and documentation of her/his qualifications for advancement (tenure, promotion, etc.). Evaluators (whether internal or external to the institution) of faculty shall seek evidence of sustained effort, involvement, and record of achievement. While the entire body of work submitted by candidates shall be considered, the work dated since the last personnel action (hiring, tenure or promotion; whichever was most recent) shall be afforded greater consideration by the deliberating bodies at each level of evaluation. Under no circumstance shall any member of the faculty participate in more than one level of review for a single candidate. While the College criteria that follow address teaching, scholarship, and service, they do not supplant other University requirements.

ii. Pre-Tenure

In addition to the annual review of non-tenured faculty, the College conducts a comprehensive review of achievements and performance in the third year of the probationary period as a basis for recommending renewal or non-renewal of the contract beyond the following year, in accordance with University policy (Section 212 of the Faculty Handbook 2006-2007). Because pre-tenure review looks ahead to tenure and, in many cases, promotion, pre-tenure criteria at the unit level must mirror the unit's tenure and promotion criteria. The pre-tenure review must assess progress toward tenure and promotion and provide written feedback to the faculty member with specific suggestions for continued progress (See Appendix B). The pre-tenure review may lead to a decision of non-renewal in those cases where tenure is not possible. Subsequent annual reviews should assess continued achievement and provide feedback regarding acceptable progress toward tenure and/or promotion. External letters of reference are NOT required for pre-tenure.

iii. Tenure

The institution recommends faculty for tenure in accordance with *Section 803.09, Board of Regents Policy Manual*, which includes a comprehensive statement of tenure policies in the University System. Tenure ensures academic freedom for faculty and protection against improper restrictions of the freedom of inquiry in teaching, scholarship, and service. Tenured faculty have the responsibility to engage in continuous professional growth, to remain vital and contributing members of the faculty, to present accurate information in teaching, and to facilitate, support, defend, and preserve an environment of academic integrity. Tenure applications are considered and recommendations made at the department/school, college, and Provost's levels, culminating in an institutional recommendation to the Board of Regents at the President's level (See Appendix B).

Tenure at Georgia Southern University may be awarded after five or six years of full-time service at Georgia Southern at the rank of assistant professor or higher. Probationary credit, which can only be granted at the time of initial appointment and is based on years of full-time service at another institution, may be used to reduce this time requirement. Meeting the minimum time requirement does not guarantee the award of tenure. A faculty member initially appointed at the rank of instructor may be awarded tenure after six years, provided that the individual has served at least three years at the rank of assistant professor at the institution. Faculty who apply and are not recommended for tenure in minimum time or who use probationary credit and are not recommended may apply for tenure only once more.

Individuals who seek the award of early tenure, that is, persons who will have accumulated only the minimum of five years of probationary credit by the date on which the tenure action would be effective, must be outstanding in all areas of evaluation, justifying a compelling reason to award tenure early. Faculty considering an early tenure application should notify their unit head by May 1 preceding the fall semester in which they will apply for tenure and shall seek the unit head's consultation on their candidacy. Tenure recommendations in the Allen E. Paulson College of Science and Technology require ratings of at least *Good* in all three areas of evaluation, as defined in this document. Faculty members with adjunct appointments shall not acquire tenure, nor does tenure apply to honorific appointments. If faculty who apply during their fifth year are not granted tenure, they may reapply during their sixth year.

iv. Promotion

Promotion to Assistant Professor requires at least fair performance in all areas of evaluation, with noteworthy accomplishment in teaching and one of the other two areas. Aspirants to the rank of Associate or Full Professor are expected to demonstrate progressively more advanced levels of

professional maturity, accomplishment, and recognition beyond the University (See Appendix B). At Georgia Southern the terminal degree or its equivalent is normally required for promotion to associate or full professor. Strong justification should be provided in support of any recommendation for promotion to the ranks of associate or full professor without the terminal degree in the discipline. Early promotions are rare, requiring clearly outstanding performance in all three areas of evaluation. Faculty are encouraged to discuss with their chair the timing of their application for tenure and/or promotion prior to application. According to the Board of Regents, a promotion is considered early if the individual has served less than the number of years in rank at Georgia Southern as listed below: To Assistant Professor - 3 years; To Associate Professor - 4 years; To Professor 5 years

Assistant Professor - Promotion recommendations to the rank of Assistant Professor in the Allen E. Paulson College of Science and Technology require ratings of at least *Good* in Teaching and Scholarship and at least *Fair* in Service. Typical time requirements: 6 years of service at rank of; at least 4 of those years at Georgia Southern.

Associate Professor - Promotion recommendations to the rank of Associate Professor in the Allen E. Paulson College of Science and Technology require ratings of at least *Good* in all three areas of evaluation. Typical time requirements: 5 or 6 years of service at rank of Assistant Professor; at least 4 of those years at Georgia Southern. As the requirements for promotion to Associate Professor are the same requirements for receiving tenure, promotion to Associate Professor and tenure will typically be considered and awarded/denied at the same time.

Professor - Effective AY 2006-07 through AY 2008-09, promotion to Professor will require a rating of *Excellent* in two areas, one of which must be Teaching, and at least *Good* in the third area. Effective AY 2009-10 and beyond, promotion recommendations to the rank of Professor will require a rating of *Excellent* in Teaching and Scholarship and at least *Good* in Service. These criteria will be operational in accordance with the schedule listed below. If promotion to Professor is not successful, applicants may reapply in subsequent years.

v. Post-Tenure

Post-tenure review, the systematic, periodic, cumulative review of all tenured faculty, is an extension of the evaluation system already in place (See Appendix B). Coupled with any evaluation process is the obligation to provide faculty development opportunities for tenured faculty that mutually benefit the individual and the institution. Post-tenure review not only concentrates on the period under review, but also considers the cumulative contributions of faculty. For this reason, judgments regarding post-tenure review should be based on contributions over one's career and at five-year intervals and not only on the contributions that are applied to promotion. A satisfactory post-tenure review indicates that the individual continues to make contributions that benefit the University, its students, and its other constituents. The ultimate purposes of post-tenure review are to:

1. recognize and reward tenured faculty who have made and continue to make significant contributions to the mission of their Unit, College and the University.
2. provide faculty development opportunities for tenured faculty for the primary purpose of enhancing teaching, but also scholarship and/or service, in a way that is mutually beneficial to the individual and the University.
3. provide a systematic faculty development plan to remedy instances where a tenured faculty member's contributions in teaching, scholarship, and/or service are found to be deficient with respect to the mission of the department, college, or University.

Reviews are initiated five years after the most recent promotion or personnel action continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a promotion, a written declaration to retire within five years

(submitted to the Dean), or a leave of absence. In the case of a leave-of-absence, the faculty member will be reviewed upon his/her return. At Georgia Southern, "five years after" is interpreted as requiring review in the faculty member's sixth year to allow for five full years of activity. Tenured faculty whose primary responsibilities are in administration will be reviewed five years after returning to a full-time faculty position. Faculty members undergoing post-tenure review will submit their materials for evaluation to the Chair/Director by mid-January. External letters of reference are NOT required for post-tenure review.

450 CRITERIA AND EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY EVALUATIONS

CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IN THE AREA OF TEACHING

Teaching represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and the development of critical thinking skills. Such activity typically involves teaching in the classroom or laboratory, direction of research, field activity, and student mentoring. Teaching activities also include the development of new courses, programs, new pedagogical techniques and/or approaches, and other curricular materials.

Faculty Expectations

The faculty member is expected to organize and teach courses consistent with disciplinary standards, the level of the course, the nature of the subject matter, and defined learning outcomes. Faculty must remain up to date in their disciplines and be continuously involved in improving their teaching pedagogy. In addition, faculty are expected to engage in some or all of the following activities:

- Organizes and conducts courses consistently.
- Uses effective techniques and pedagogical approaches in the learning environment.
- Engages students in current practices within the discipline.
- Enables students to articulate issues, solve problems, and relate understandings to knowledge bases in other disciplines.
- Provides and supervises appropriate undergraduate and /or graduate field-based experiences.
- Makes appropriate use of technology to facilitate student learning.
- Demonstrates the ability to work effectively with a diverse student population in a learning environment.
- Is available for supplemental instruction outside the classroom.
- Develops innovative course/curriculum materials.
- Seeks funding for development and improvement of instruction.

Typical Sources of Evidence	Performance Indicators
Self-evaluation	Strength and coherence of narrative and philosophy of teaching.
Course Syllabi and Curricular Materials, Teaching Portfolio, Course Assessment Methods/Instruments and Analysis	Development of courses and course materials that maximize student learning consistent with defined learning outcomes. Encourages student responsibility for their own learning. Clear and fair grading instructions and policies.
Annual Faculty Evaluations	Quality and consistency of Unit Head ratings, improvement in target areas.
Peer Reviews	Quality and consistency of overall ratings, improvement in target areas.
Teaching Awards or Honors	Honors or recognition for teaching excellence or innovation.
Scholarship of teaching	Publications or presentations at conferences related to pedagogy.
Work with teachers in schools and development of school curricula	Development of materials that maximize student learning using the Georgia Performance Standards in primary or secondary education. Frequency and quality of interactions with school teachers.
Documents Attesting to Student Success	Performance by students in subsequent coursework, employment, admission to graduate schools or professional programs, professional licensing rates, and other such indicators of success.
Student Ratings of Instruction	Quality and consistency of overall ratings, improvement in target areas.

Evaluation Ratings

Excellent (8.0-10.0) Through continuous growth of knowledge in the subject field and innovative pedagogy, the faculty member's performance indicators consistently approach the highest levels of accomplishment in instruction.

Good (6.0-7.9) The faculty member teaches with imagination and enthusiasm, introduces new developments into his/her courses. If appropriate, the faculty member engages in individualized instruction and student mentoring, and demonstrates effective performance. The faculty member's performance indicators are consistently satisfactory.

Fair (4.0-5.9) Quality of teaching approaches but does not consistently meet the unit, college and university standards. The faculty member regularly meets classes, conducts office hours, and generally receives satisfactory student ratings of instruction and peer evaluations.

Poor (0.0-3.9) Quality of teaching and teaching performance frequently fall short of Unit, College, and University standards. *Corrective action is required.*

CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IN THE AREA OF SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship shall be defined as the public culmination of scholarly activity in the discovery, integration, development, application, and extension of knowledge as evidenced through public dissemination in disciplinary/academic peer-reviewed venues such as articles, scholarly books, texts and software, conference presentations to professional audiences, externally funded grants and contracts, and other professional accomplishments characteristic of external validation of contributions to scholarship. Candidates for advancement must provide clear evidence of the same. The significance of scholarship and scholarly accomplishments shall be judged rigorously within the context of the discipline.

Faculty Expectations

The faculty member is expected to engage in a program of sustained scholarly activity consistent with the best in the discipline of their designated employment. Adjustments to the disciplinary area of scholarship may be made only with the recommendation of the chairs and the approval of the dean. Scholarly activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Produces peer-reviewed publications or other externally validated scholarly products.
- Curates registered research collections.
- Seeks extramural funding in support of scholarship.
- Demonstrates productivity on funded projects.
- Regularly presents the results of their scholarship in academic and professional fora.

Typical Sources of Evidence	Performance Indicators
Self-evaluation	Strength and coherence of narrative on engagement in scholarship.
Peer-reviewed publications in scholarly journals, conference proceedings/symposia volumes, electronic publications, book manuscripts, book chapters, texts, media, etc.	Performs scholarly activities that yield peer-reviewed products appropriate to his/her discipline.
Non Peer-Reviewed Works: Technical reports, maps, patents, etc	Performs scholarly activities that yield products appropriate to his/her discipline.
Grant Proposals submitted and awarded: peer-reviewed extramural funding, corporate sponsorship, and/or fellowships for scholarly activity.	Attempted and successful proposals, level of competitiveness of funding source and granting agency evaluation, quality and consistency of grant-related materials.
External letters of review	Solicited evaluations from experts in the field, collaborators in research interest groups, national/regional research laboratories, etc.(See Appendix C)
Professional presentations	Record of presentations: invited presentations, contributed presentations, published abstracts or conference proceedings paper, poster presentations or exhibits.
External validation of curated collections	Improved collection catalogue, acquired and then catalogued important items into collection, maintained collection, sought external funding to make collections improvements, provided access to collections as indicated by visitor's log.

Evaluation Ratings

Excellent (8.0-10.0) The faculty member demonstrates a sustained record of scholarly activity that results in peer-reviewed or other externally validated scholarly products that are recognized and valued at the national and/or international levels. The faculty member's performance indicators consistently approach the highest levels of accomplishment in scholarship.

Good (6.0-7.9) The faculty member keeps current in his/her field through attendance and presentation of papers at professional meetings, and carries out scholarly activities that regularly yield peer-reviewed or other externally validated scholarly products appropriate to his/her discipline. The faculty member's performance indicators are consistently satisfactory.

Fair (4.0–5.9) Quality of scholarship approaches but does not consistently meet unit, college and university standards. Faculty member keeps current in his/her field through attending professional meetings, reading relevant literature and engaging in scholarly activity that has the potential to yield peer-reviewed or other externally validated scholarly products.

Poor (0.0–3.9) Scholarly engagement falls short of Unit, College, and University standards and appears insufficient to maintain currency in the field or yield peer-reviewed or other externally validated scholarly products. *Corrective action is required.*

CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IN THE AREA OF SERVICE

Service - Faculty are expected to make service contributions to their professions and to the institution. Service at the department/school, college, and university levels is essential to the well-being of the University. Service includes the application of one's expertise in the discipline for the benefit of a professional organization, the community, or the institution. Service also includes the academic advisement of Georgia Southern University students. Additionally, service may include work in schools, businesses, museums, social agencies, government, or the like, as well as activities undertaken on behalf of the University that do not entail systematic instruction. Consulting shall be designated as paid or unpaid.

Faculty Expectations

The faculty member is expected to share in the governance, operational responsibilities, and service/outreach obligations of the unit, college and/or university, and engage in some or all of the following activities:

- Service to benefit students, including career and academic advising, faculty advisor to student organizations.
- Conduct peer reviews of: manuscripts, grant proposals, faculty evaluation dossiers, etc.
- Professional Editorial duties (i.e., journals, technical magazines).
- Service to professional societies or organizations appropriate to one's discipline.
- Service to the community: lectures, demonstrations, workshops, etc.
- Application of expertise to governmental and non-governmental agencies.
- Application of expertise to address local, regional, national, and/or international issues.
- Participation in faculty governance.

Typical Sources of Evidence	Performance Indicators
Self-evaluation	Strength and coherence of narrative regarding service.
Peer reviews of service contributions	Positive evaluations by peers.
List of materials reviewed.	Frequency and quality of the requesting organization.
Documentation of involvement in professional societies and organizations.	Elected positions, editorial duties, evaluator for discipline- or regional-based accrediting agencies, organization of professional meetings.
Record of students advised.	Appropriate and timely guidance of students toward educational and career objectives.
List of community lectures, demonstrations, workshops, etc.	Frequency and quality of community involvement.
Documentation of professional consultation (i.e., industry, governmental and non-governmental organizations)	Technical reports and presentations, public hearing records, expert witness testimony, briefing and position papers.
Documentation of governance related activities	Frequency and quality of involvement.

Evaluation Ratings

Excellent (8.0-10.0) Through assuming leadership roles the faculty member demonstrates a sustained record of meaningful contributions to the profession, institution, and/or community. The faculty member's performance indicators consistently approach the highest levels of accomplishments in service.

Good (6.0-7.9) The faculty member actively contributes to the profession, institution, and/or community. The faculty member's performance indicators are consistently satisfactory.

Fair (4.0-5.9) Quality of service approaches but does not consistently meet Unit, College and University standards. Faculty member occasionally contributes to the profession, institution, and/or community but does not do so consistently.

Poor (0.0-3.9) Quality of service falls short of Unit, College, and University standards. Engagement of Service is minimal. *Corrective action is required.*

CRITERIA FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IN THE AREA OF ADMINISTRATION

Administration represents the professional activity directed towards efficiently organizing people and resources to direct activities toward the specific goals and objectives of the unit under consideration. Such activity typically involves leadership qualities, management style, planning and organizational capacities, effective communication skills, accountability for diversity efforts and results, and success at meeting goals and objectives, to include: advancing a culture of academic excellence and distinction in teaching, scholarship, and service, providing leadership for curriculum development and implementation, and the assessment of student learning; promoting research initiatives and scholarly efforts, and providing visionary leadership for strategic initiatives that further the Department/School and College strategic plans.

Faculty Expectations

The faculty member is expected to be a leader in the governance, operational responsibilities, and outreach obligations of the unit, college and/or university, and participate in some or all of the following activities:

- Provide strong communication skills
- Provide cohesive support of faculty efforts in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship
- Inspire faculty members within the unit, college, and/or university
- Encourage collaboration amongst faculty and faculty and students
- Provide expertise in support of faculty committees
- Promote cooperation and consensus to achieve institutional goals/plans
- Develop a well-integrated plan for development of knowledge and expertise appropriate to the service area

Typical Sources of Evidence	Performance Indicators
Self evaluation	Strength and coherence of narrative regarding administration.
Documentation of governance related activities	Reports, program review, awards, etc.
Document regarding membership and leadership in committees	Strength and coherence of narrative, documented evaluations of participation, reports, meeting minutes, frequency and quality of activities and involvement, awards, other indicators.
List of outreach programs	Frequency and quality of activities and community involvement, reports, evaluations, etc.
Report of activities and initiatives undertaken	Frequency and quality of activities and involvement, reports, evaluations, etc.
Documents attesting planning, success, or completion of task	Awards, program review, evaluations, schedules, other documents, etc.
Peer evaluations	Quality and consistency of overall ratings, improvement in target areas.

Evaluation Ratings

Excellent (8.0-10.0) Goals and objectives of Unit, College, or University are consistently met or exceeded and routinely result in external recognition. The faculty member's performance indicators consistently approach the highest levels of accomplishments in administration.

Good (6.0-7.9) The faculty member actively contributes to meet the goals and objectives of the Unit, College, University, and/or community. The faculty member's performance indicators are consistently satisfactory.

Fair (4.0 – 5.9) Tasks are completed but quality does not meet the desired standards. Quality of accomplishments in the area of administration approaches but does not consistently meet Unit, College and University standards.

Poor (0.0 – 3.9) Quality of accomplishments in the area of administration falls short of Unit, College, and University standards. Engagement in the area of administration is minimal. *Corrective action is required.*

451 Pre-Tenure Review: See section 212 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook

452 Post-Tenure Review: See section 213 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook

460 PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY NOTIFICATION OF TENURE AND PROMOTION RECOMMENDATIONS

Applicants for promotion and/or tenure shall be notified of their unit's (department's or school's) recommendation(s) according to a schedule announced annually. (In the event the established date falls on a weekend or academic holiday, the date will be extended to the Monday immediately following that date.) Notification shall be restricted to:

- A statement of the recommendations (positive or negative) of the unit head and any unit-level committees or bodies involved in the review of the application materials.
- A copy of the applicant's promotion and/or tenure recommendation form. Page two (2) of the recommendation form shall contain a narrative only in cases where the unit head's recommendation is positive.

In the event of a negative recommendation, the unit head shall provide to the faculty member a copy of the College Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Appeals and relevant dates.

Applicants for promotion and/or tenure shall be notified of the college's recommendation(s) according to a schedule announced annually. Notification shall be restricted to:

- A statement of the recommendations (positive or negative) of the Dean and the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.
- A copy of the applicant's promotion and/or tenure recommendation form. Page three (3) of the recommendation form shall contain a narrative only in cases where the Dean's recommendation is positive.

In the event of a negative recommendation, the Dean shall provide to the faculty member a copy of the College Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Appeals and relevant dates.

470 APPEALS OF FACULTY EVALUATIONS

Candidates for post-tenure, promotion and/or tenure who receive a negative recommendation at any level (department, school, or college) may appeal that recommendation. All appeals must be based on the perception of significant omissions or commissions of facts in the review process, impermissible bias in the review, or procedural errors of sufficient moment to have precluded an objective and fair review. Written appeals shall be submitted by the applicant to the next level of review specified in the table below and the appropriate administrative officer (Dean or Provost), with copies to each prior level of review, according to a schedule announced annually. (In the event the established date falls on a weekend or academic holiday, the date will be extended to the Monday immediately following that date.) The written appeal shall be appended to the applicant's promotion and/or tenure packet and shall be among the materials considered by the next level of review.

Recommending level	Level to which the appeal is made	Administrative office who acts on the appeal
Unit (department or school)	College	Dean
College, initial recommendation*	College	Dean
College, final recommendation	Academic Affairs	Provost

- * Barring a successful appeal at this level, the initial College recommendation shall become the final College recommendation

480 RETIREMENT, RESIGNATION, TERMINATION, AND DISMISSAL

For information about retirement, see section 218.10 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook. For information about resignations, see section 218.13 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook. For information about terminations and dismissals, see section 211, 211.01, and 211.02 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook.

500 INSTRUCTIONAL (TEACHING) GUIDELINES AND PRACTICES

510 OFFICE HOURS AND ADVISING

Faculty are expected to keep office hours each week during the semesters in which they teach. See section 303 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook for information about academic advising.

520 CLASS SCHEDULING AND ATTENDANCE POLICY

See sections 307 and 309 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook.

530 COURSE REQUIREMENTS

See section 311 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook.

540 ASSIGNMENTS AND EVALUATIONS

See sections 307 and 312 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook.

550 GRADES AND RECORDS

See section 313 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook

560 STUDENT RATINGS OF INSTRUCTION

See section 205.07 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook for a complete description of Student Ratings of Instruction

600 RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP SUPPORT

610 REASSIGNED TIME

For faculty who have obtained grant monies, reassigned time (i.e. buy-out) can be determined in consultation with the Department Chair, Dean, and the Provost's Office.

620 PROFESSIONAL TRAVEL

See section 219 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook.

630 ALLOCATION OF INDIRECT COST RECOVERY ON SPONSORED GRANTS/CONTRACTS

The federally negotiated rates for on-campus is 57% of salaries and wages, while the off-campus rate is 25%. The University distribution of F & A is listed below:

PI – 10%

Chair/Unit Director – 25%

College Dean - 15%

Others - 50%

Total – 100% *

(*Of the 57% or 25% rate)

See section 401 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook for more information about the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs and Appendices D and E for information about University policies on Intellectual Property and Scholarly Misconduct.

APPENDIX A
Annual Review Form – Simplified, with tables

ALLEN E. PAULSON COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEW

For the Period
 January 1, _____ to December 31, _____

Name: _____ Title & Rank: _____

Department/Unit: _____

All faculty are urged to read the appropriate portions of section 400 of the COST Faculty Manual for details about Annual Review prior to using this form.

I. ALLOCATION OF EVALUATION PERCENTAGES

Agreed percentages by the faculty member and chair/ unit head at the goal setting meeting.

Teaching: #% Scholarship: #% Service: #% Administration: #%

II. TEACHING

SUMMARY OF TEACHING (if you need to report "Resources Needed" please add a column between "Goals" and "Accomplishments")	
GOALS	ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND SOURCES OF EVIDENCE
1. 2.	1. 2.

Revision of Teaching Goals (optional):

Narrative on Teaching Accomplishments (optional):

This section to be completed by Chair/Director

COMMENTS ON TEACHING GOALS
Assessment of the faculty member's goals and expectations to be included here.

For your rank and experience, your teaching goals are:

above expectations

at expectations
 below expectations

COMMENTS ON TEACHING ACCOMPLISHMENTS
Assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments to be included here.

For your rank and experience, your teaching accomplishments rating is: _____
Excellent (8.0-10.0), Good (6.0-7.9), Fair (4.0-5.9), Poor (0.0-3.9)

III. SCHOLARSHIP

SUMMARY OF SCHOLARSHIP (if you need to report “Resources Needed” please add a column between “Goals” and “Accomplishments”)	
GOALS	ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND SOURCES OF EVIDENCE
1. 2.	1. 2.

Revision of Scholarship Goals (optional):

Narrative on Scholarship Accomplishments (optional):

This section to be completed by Chair/Director

COMMENTS ON SCHOLARSHIP GOALS
Assessment of the faculty member's goals and expectations to be included here.

For your rank and experience, your scholarship goals are:

- above expectations
- at expectations
- below expectations

COMMENTS ON SCHOLARSHIP ACCOMPLISHMENTS
Assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments to be included here.

For your rank and experience, your scholarship accomplishments rating is: _____
 Excellent (8.0-10.0), Good (6.0-7.9), Fair (4.0-5.9), Poor (0.0-3.9)

IV. SERVICE

SUMMARY OF SERVICE (if you need to report "Resources Needed" please add a column between "Goals" and "Accomplishments")	
GOALS	ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND SOURCES OF EVIDENCE
1. 2.	1. 2.

Revision of Service Goals (optional):

Narrative on Service Accomplishments (optional):

This section to be completed by Chair/Director

COMMENTS ON SERVICE GOALS
Assessment of the faculty member's goals and expectations to be included here.

For your rank and experience, your service goals are:

- above expectations
- at expectations
- below expectations

COMMENTS ON SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS
Assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments to be included here.

For your rank and experience, your service accomplishments rating is: _____
 Excellent (8.0-10.0), Good (6.0-7.9), Fair (4.0-5.9), Poor (0.0-3.9)

V. ADMINISTRATION

SUMMARY OF ADMINISTRATION (if you need to report “Resources Needed” please add a column between “Goals” and “Accomplishments”)	
GOALS	ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND SOURCES OF EVIDENCE
1. 2.	1. 2.

Revision of Administration Goals (optional):

Narrative on Administration Accomplishments (optional):

This section to be completed by Chair/Director

COMMENTS ON ADMINISTRATION GOALS
Assessment of the faculty member's goals and expectations to be included here.

For your rank and experience, your administration goals are:

- above expectations
- at expectations
- below expectations

COMMENTS ON ADMINISTRATION ACCOMPLISHMENTS
Assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments to be included here.

For your rank and experience, your service accomplishments rating is: _____
 Excellent (8.0-10.0), Good (6.0-7.9), Fair (4.0-5.9), Poor (0.0-3.9)

VI. SUMMARY EVALUATION (TO BE COMPLETED BY CHAIR/DIRECTOR OR DEAN)

SUMMARY EVALUATION AND RATING ON ACCOMPLISHMENTS
To be completed by Chair/Director or Dean
A summary assessment of the faculty member's overall accomplishments as per previously stated goals to be included here.

Given your previously stated goals, workload allocation, and your rank and experience, your overall accomplishment rating is: _____; and you are or are not making satisfactory progress toward tenure and/or promotion

Excellent (8.0-10.0), Good (6.0-7.9), Fair (4.0-5.9), Poor (0.0-3.9)

This is to acknowledge that faculty member has been apprised of the content of the written evaluation for the annual *Summary of Accomplishments*.

Chair/Director or Dean's Signature	Date	Faculty member's signature	Date
---	-------------	-----------------------------------	-------------

The faculty member may respond in writing to the annual evaluation document. Such response shall be attached to the evaluation. The Chair/Director or Dean will acknowledge receipt of a response in writing, noting changes, if any, in the annual evaluation document made as a result of either the conference of the faculty member's written response. This acknowledgement shall also become part of the permanent record.

COMMENTS OF FACULTY MEMBER BEING EVALUATED
Assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments to be included here.

This section to be completed by Chair/Director or Dean

CHANGES (IF ANY) TO SUMMARY EVALUATION & RATING
Any changes to the summary assessment of the faculty member's overall accomplishments as per previously stated goals to be included here.

Given your previously stated goals, workload allocation, and your rank and experience, your overall accomplishment rating is: _____; and you are or are not making satisfactory progress toward tenure and/or promotion

Excellent (8.0-10.0), Good (6.0-7.9), Fair (4.0-5.9), Poor (0.0-3.9)

Chair/Director or Dean's Signature	Date
---	-------------

Annual Review Form – Simplified, with no tables
ALLEN E. PAULSON COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEW

For the Period
 January 1, _____ to December 31, _____

Name: _____ Title & Rank: _____

Department/Unit: _____

All faculty are urged to read the appropriate portions of section 400 of the COST Faculty Manual for details about Annual Review prior to using this form.

I. ALLOCATION OF EVALUATION PERCENTAGES

Agreed percentages by the faculty member and chair/ unit head at the goal setting meeting.

Teaching: #% Scholarship: #% Service: #% Administration: #%

II. TEACHING

SUMMARY OF TEACHING

(if you need to report “Resources Needed” please add a section between “Goals” and “Accomplishments”)

GOALS

- 1.
- 2.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

- 1.
- 2.

Revision of Teaching Goals (optional):

Narrative on Teaching Accomplishments (optional):

This section to be completed by Chair/Director

COMMENTS ON TEACHING GOALS

Assessment of the faculty member's goals and expectations to be included here.

For your rank and experience, your teaching goals are:

<input type="checkbox"/>	above expectations
<input type="checkbox"/>	at expectations
<input type="checkbox"/>	below expectations

COMMENTS ON TEACHING ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments to be included here.

For your rank and experience, your teaching accomplishments rating is: _____

Excellent (8.0-10.0), Good (6.0-7.9), Fair (4.0-5.9), Poor (0.0-3.9)

III. SCHOLARSHIP**SUMMARY OF SCHOLARSHIP**

(if you need to report “Resources Needed” please add a section between “Goals” and “Accomplishments”)

GOALS

- 1.
- 2.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

- 1.
- 2.

Revision of Scholarship Goals (optional):

Narrative on Scholarship Accomplishments (optional):

This section to be completed by Chair/Director

COMMENTS ON SCHOLARSHIP GOALS

Assessment of the faculty member's goals and expectations to be included here.

For your rank and experience, your scholarship goals are:

- | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | above expectations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | at expectations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | below expectations |

COMMENTS ON SCHOLARSHIP ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments to be included here.

For your rank and experience, your scholarship accomplishments rating is: _____
 Excellent (8.0-10.0), Good (6.0-7.9), Fair (4.0-5.9), Poor (0.0-3.9)

IV. SERVICE**SUMMARY OF SERVICE**

(if you need to report “Resources Needed” please add a section between “Goals” and “Accomplishments”)

GOALS

- 1.
- 2.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

- 1.
- 2.

Revision of Service Goals (optional):

Narrative on Service Accomplishments (optional):

This section to be completed by Chair/Director

COMMENTS ON SERVICE GOALS

Assessment of the faculty member's goals and expectations to be included here.

For your rank and experience, your service goals are:

- | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | above expectations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | at expectations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | below expectations |

COMMENTS ON SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments to be included here.

For your rank and experience, your service accomplishments rating is: _____
 Excellent (8.0-10.0), Good (6.0-7.9), Fair (4.0-5.9), Poor (0.0-3.9)

V. ADMINISTRATION**SUMMARY OF ADMINISTRATION**

(if you need to report “Resources Needed” please add a section between “Goals” and “Accomplishments”)

GOALS

- 1.
- 2.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

- 1.
- 2.

Revision of Administration Goals (optional):

Narrative on Administration Accomplishments (optional):

This section to be completed by Chair/Director

COMMENTS ON ADMINISTRATION GOALS

Assessment of the faculty member's goals and expectations to be included here.

For your rank and experience, your administration goals are:

- | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | above expectations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | at expectations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | below expectations |

COMMENTS ON ADMINISTRATION ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments to be included here.

For your rank and experience, your service accomplishments rating is: _____
 Excellent (8.0-10.0), Good (6.0-7.9), Fair (4.0-5.9), Poor (0.0-3.9)

VI. SUMMARY EVALUATION (TO BE COMPLETED BY CHAIR/DIRECTOR OR DEAN)

SUMMARY EVALUATION AND RATING ON ACCOMPLISHMENTS
To be completed by Chair/Director or Dean
A summary assessment of the faculty member's overall accomplishments as per previously stated goals to be included here.

Given your previously stated goals, workload allocation, and your rank and experience, your overall accomplishment rating is: _____; and you are or are not making satisfactory progress toward tenure and/or promotion

Excellent (8.0-10.0), Good (6.0-7.9), Fair (4.0-5.9), Poor (0.0-3.9)

This is to acknowledge that faculty member has been apprised of the content of the written evaluation for the annual *Summary of Accomplishments*.

Chair/Director or Dean's Signature	Date	Faculty member's signature	Date
---	-------------	-----------------------------------	-------------

The faculty member may respond in writing to the annual evaluation document. Such response shall be attached to the evaluation. The Chair/Director or Dean will acknowledge receipt of a response in writing, noting changes, if any, in the annual evaluation document made as a result of either the conference of the faculty member's written response. This acknowledgement shall also become part of the permanent record.

COMMENTS OF FACULTY MEMBER BEING EVALUATED
Assessment of the faculty member's accomplishments to be included here.

This section to be completed by Chair/Director or Dean

CHANGES (IF ANY) TO SUMMARY EVALUATION & RATING
Any changes to the summary assessment of the faculty member's overall accomplishments as per previously stated goals to be included here.

Given your previously stated goals, workload allocation, and your rank and experience, your overall accomplishment rating is: _____; and you are or are not making satisfactory progress toward tenure and/or promotion

Excellent (8.0-10.0), Good (6.0-7.9), Fair (4.0-5.9), Poor (0.0-3.9)

Chair/Director or Dean's Signature	Date
---	-------------

APPENDIX B

Guidelines for Creating a Dossier for Pre-Tenure, Tenure, Promotion or Post-Tenure

Dossier:

The performance and activities of the faculty member in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service should be documented in the dossier as listed below. Note that the external evaluators will only review the material submitted in the dossier and that all internal reviewers will also only be required to review this dossier. "Supporting documents" are added optional components that may be submitted in support of faculty activities, and the reviewers may choose not to examine this component. Therefore, the dossier alone must provide the strongest body of evidence for faculty advancement. A candidate, who finds that a given accomplishment is relevant in more than one category, is advised to present that work in whichever category seems most appropriate and to cross-reference that work in the other relevant category.

Part 1 - Core Documents

1. Application letter from the candidate.
2. Brief narrative from the candidate addressing his/her accomplishments and future plans in teaching, scholarship, and service. This should include statements of the candidate's philosophy of teaching and of scholarship, and may include a statement about the candidate's philosophy of service.
3. External letters of review (NOT REQUIRED FOR PRE-TENURE OR POST-TENURE)– Letters of recommendation will be sought from at least three external reviewers from a list provided to the Department Chairs/Directors by the faculty member in the summer prior to their application. The reviewers may be individuals acquainted with the faculty member; however, they should not have co-authored a publication or conducted research with the faculty member in the past five years, nor can they be their graduate or post-doctoral supervisors. The Department Chairs/Directors in consultation with the Dean, selects the three external reviewers suggested by the faculty being evaluated. Only the main dossier should be submitted to the external reviewers by the Department Chairs/Directors, but note that annual reviews, pre-tenure and post-tenure reviews should not be sent to external reviewers. Once the external letters of review are received, they are inserted by the Department Chair/Director into this position in the dossier.
4. *Optional.* Letters of recommendation from professional colleagues (not to include those serving on committees that will evaluate the candidate), students, and others. A maximum of five optional recommendation letters addressed to the Department Chair can be included in the dossier.

Part 2 - Current curriculum vita

- Board of Regents Requirements:
 1. Your promotion or tenure packet must be accompanied by an updated *vita* submitted as a Word document.
 2. *Vitae* submitted for promotion or tenure is read by non-experts as well as specialists in your discipline. For clarity, please show all authors on multiple-authored works, full titles of journals, full pagination of articles, and full names of all authors.
 3. Do not submit a first-person narrative in lieu of a standard *vita*.
 4. Include a complete professional employment history, identification and dates of all degrees earned, and public service information.
 5. Peer-reviewed or juried work should be clearly identified as work completed since the last promotion or since appointment at Georgia Southern.

6. Works in press may be listed if accompanied by a letter from the journal or publisher; submitted works or works in progress may be listed separately.
- Other General Requirements:
1. Avoid informal, personal designations such as local abbreviations, first and second-person pronouns, and first-name references.
 2. List degrees earned from highest to lowest.
 3. List all teaching, scholarship, and service activities in the reverse chronological order. In regards to the teaching activities, include the names of undergraduate and graduate students and the titles of their projects when applicable.

Part 3 - Evaluations

1. Annual evaluations (Complete set of annual evaluations in the reverse chronological order for every year since the start of employment at Georgia Southern)
2. Tabulated numerical summary of student evaluations (for all courses taught during the period under review, semester by semester, in the reverse chronological order)
3. Peer teaching evaluation results

Part 4 – Publications

1. Include up to five refereed (peer-reviewed) publications that are representative of your work from the time period under review.

Part 5 – Grants and Contracts

1. List of grant/contract proposals submitted, funded, and not funded (identify proposal title, candidate's role, agency, project period, and total amount requested)

Part 6 – Fellowships and Honors

1. List of fellowships and honors

Part 7 – Documents appended by Department Chair/Director

1. Summary of candidate's workload assignment.
2. Evaluation narrative from Chairs/Directors
3. Evaluation narrative from department's/programs'/school's Tenure & Promotion committee

Supporting Documents (optional)

Candidates undergoing review may also submit supporting documentation to further illustrate their activities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. However, the reviewers will not be required to examine this material.

Section A: Teaching

The following types of teaching related activities may be included in this section of the package.

- Chronological list of courses taught
- Syllabi of courses taught
- Exams
- Developed instructional material & student handouts
- List of courses developed or substantially revised (consistent with departmental mission)
- Other teaching related activities (i.e. teaching related conferences attended, etc.)
- Written comments from student evaluations

Section B: Scholarship

The following types of scholarship related activities may be included in this section of the package.

- Conference and journal publications
- Textbook chapters
- Other publications and articles
- Conference/colloquium presentations
- Other related professional presentations
- Editorship of journals and other scholarly work
- Developed (or under construction) research related material
- Grant proposals and contracts (indicate internal / external and amount awarded)
- Developed workshop related material
- Developed course related material
- Other scholarly performances

Section C: Service

Any supporting documentation of the applicant, establishing his/her activities related to involvement in the following types of services, may be included in this section.

- Service to the profession
- Service to the university
- Service to the program/program/school
- Service to the students
- Service to the community

Dossier Checklist for Pre-Tenure, Tenure, Promotion or Post-Tenure

Dossier (required):

Part 1: Core Documents

- _____ Letter of submittal from the candidate
- _____ Candidate's narrative, to include statements on teaching, and on research/scholarship, and service, that places the body of work in perspective and outlines future goals
- _____ Letters from no more than 3 external reviewers (See Appendix C, to be inserted by Department Chair/Director; not applicable for pre- and post-tenure reviews)
- _____ (Optional) Letters of recommendation from colleagues internal or external to the university (excluding faculty serving on evaluative committees), students, and others (maximum of 5)

Part 2: Current curriculum vita

- _____ Current curriculum vita (following BOR format and specifications)

Part 3: Evaluations

- _____ Annual evaluations, including pre-tenure or post-tenure reviews as appropriate
- _____ Numerical summary of student evaluations (i.e., University's student ratings of instruction)
- _____ Peer teaching evaluation narrative(s)

Part 4: Publications

- _____ Representative refereed (peer-reviewed) publications (maximum of 5)

Part 5: Grants and Contracts

- _____ List of grant/contract proposals submitted, funded, and not funded (identify proposal title, candidate's role, agency, project period, and total amount requested)

Part 6: Fellowships and Honors

- _____ List of fellowships and honors

Part 7 – Documents appended by Department Chair/Director

- _____ External letters of review (NOT REQUIRED FOR PRE-TENURE OR POST-TENURE).
- _____ Summary of candidate's workload assignment
- _____ Evaluation narrative from Chair/Director
- _____ Evaluation narrative from unit's Tenure & Promotion Committee

Supporting Documents (optional):

Section A: Teaching

- _____ Course syllabi and curricular materials, or teaching portfolio
- _____ Sample of student work (i.e., exams, laboratory Performance Evaluations, poster presentations, etc.)
- _____ Selected (non-comprehensive) written comments from student evaluations from the last 2 years

Section B: Scholarship

- _____ Peer-reviewed (refereed) publications (scholarly journal, conference proceedings/symposia volumes, electronic publications, book manuscripts, book chapters, texts, media, etc.)
- _____ Professional presentations and scholarly performances
- _____ Editorship of journals and other scholarly work
- _____ Developed works (and works in progress)

Section C: Service

- _____ Service to profession
- _____ Service to unit/college/university
- _____ Service to students
- _____ Service to community

APPENDIX C

SOLICITATION LETTER TEMPLATE

ENTER DATE

NAME

ADDRESS 1

ADDRESS 2

ADDRESS 3

Dear Professor NAME:

On behalf of the Department of DEPT. NAME in the Allen E. Paulson College of Science and Technology, I am requesting your assistance as an external disciplinary expert in a candid assessment of the academic portfolio of Dr. FACULTY NAME who has requested consideration for ENTER tenure, promotion to Associate Professor, or promotion to Professor.

I have enclosed a copy of Dr. FACULTY NAME's portfolio and the Department/College tenure and promotion criteria. We request that you address the following issues in your evaluation:

1. Provide a brief statement regarding your acquaintance with the candidate.
2. Evaluate the candidate's scholarship with respect to the quality of their contributions and impact on the field in relation to other teacher-scholars in the field who are at the same point in their careers in comprehensive institutions such as ours.
3. Evaluate the suitability of the candidate for ENTER tenure, promotion to Associate Professor, or promotion to Professor based on the enclosed criteria of our Department/College.
4. Based on your professional knowledge of Dr. FACULTY NAME's portfolio, provide a summary recommendation as to your support for ENTER tenure, promotion to Associate Professor, or promotion to Professor.

Your letter of evaluation will become part of Dr. FACULTY NAME's portfolio and will be made available to all college and university levels of review.

Please return your letter and a short biographical sketch or copy of your curriculum vitae no later than _____. If you have any further questions or if you need additional information, please feel free to contact me via phone (phone number) or email (e-mail address).

We very much value your candid and professional evaluation and your assistance in this most important task.

Sincerely,

CHAIR NAME

Professor and Chair, Department of DEPT. NAME

Enclosures

APPENDIX D: Georgia Southern University Intellectual Property Policy

See section 402 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook.

Chair/Director or Dean's Signature **Date**

**APPENDIX E: GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY POLICY AND PROCEDURES ON
SCHOLARLY MISCONDUCT**

See section 404 of the 2006-2007 Faculty Handbook for information about Georgia Southern University Policy and Procedures on Scholarly Misconduct.