

Augusta University

Policy Library

Annual Evaluation of Faculty Policy

Policy Manager: Office of Faculty Affairs

POLICY STATEMENT

Each faculty member at Augusta University, regardless of rank or responsibilities, must receive a written annual evaluation of performance by the department chairperson or other immediate supervisor as defined by the institution against the minimum criteria listed in [BOR POLICY 8.3.5.1 FACULTY](#) and [ASA4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems](#). Through the required annual performance evaluation process, Augusta University provides an annual record of performance which encompasses faculty-assigned work effort in the following areas, where appropriate:

- Scholarship/ research/ creative activity,
- Teaching,
- Service as appropriate to assigned work effort,
- Professional Development,
- Student Success activities,
- Clinical activity,
- Administration

Augusta University is committed to ensuring that community engagement is recognized and rewarded within the institution's tenure, promotion, pre/post tenure, and annual evaluation processes. To that end, community engagement activities shall be recognized as appropriate to each of the following evaluation categories: Scholarship, Teaching, Service, Professional Development and Student Success. Community engagement activities should be reported within the category that best fits the nature of the individual activity.

Through the annual evaluation process, faculty will have the ability to show continuous professional growth appropriate to the institution's sector and mission, and in alignment with expectations at each college, school, and department. The Provost (or designee) will ensure that workload percentages for faculty roles and responsibilities are factored into the performance evaluation model consistently. The annual performance evaluation process supports the University's goal of securing, retaining, and developing faculty of the highest quality.

AFFECTED STAKEHOLDERS

Indicate all entities and persons within the Enterprise that are affected by this policy:

- Alumni Faculty Graduate Students Health Professional Students
 Staff Undergraduate Students Vendors/Contractors Visitors
 Other:

Office of Legal Affairs Use Only

Executive Sponsor: Executive VP for Faculty Affairs and Provost

Next Review: 3/2028

DEFINITIONS

Annual Evaluation – Mandated, annual review of faculty members under the University’s established guidelines for such a review. The evaluation will be based on the calendar year.

Administrator – An administrator is defined as a Chair, Associate Dean, Dean, Vice Presidents, Associate/Vice Provosts, and others that have assigned effort in the administration category. Program directors and regular faculty are not considered as administrators. Administrators are required to be evaluated annually according to [Evaluation of Academic Administrators Policy](#). Faculty administrators who have less than 1.0 FTE assigned effort in the administration category, should be reviewed using the Annual Evaluation of Faculty Policy.

Evaluator – The immediate supervisor in the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member has been appointed. Evaluators may include the Dean, Department Chairperson, Section Chief, supervisor, or any other administrator who fulfills the function.

Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) – A plan developed by the Evaluator and the faculty member to set goals to address deficiencies found during the annual evaluation. The PIP goals or outcomes must be specific, reasonable, measurable, achievable within the time frame, and reflect relevant and essential duties of the faculty member.

Post-Tenure Review – All faculty will undergo an annual evaluation of performance and may be required to participate in a PIP or PRP for the subsequent review period if deemed appropriate by the evaluator during the annual evaluation per this policy. A more formal post tenure review will be conducted for all tenured faculty as provided for in the Post Tenure Review Policy, which is separate and apart from the annual evaluation process for all faculty as set forth in this policy. Any PIP or PRP plan(s) developed by the evaluator and the evaluated faculty member in the annual evaluation process should set goals to address deficiencies found during the annual evaluation. The plan should indicate activities for achieving those goals, set timelines for meeting the goals, and set criteria for measuring the faculty member’s success in meeting those goals during the review period. The post-tenure review process, and any plans developed pursuant to that process, shall be governed solely and exclusively by the Post Tenure Review policy.

Professional Development – For the purposes of the AU Faculty Evaluation System professional development includes any activity that adds to the faculty members professional knowledge, career credentials or skills. This could include, but is not limited to, participation in university sponsored training, attendance of professional workshops, or working with professional organizations.

Student Success Activities (SSA) – For the purpose of the AU Faculty Evaluation System, student success activities (SSA) is a comprehensive term for those faculty activities whose purpose is to 1) enhance student learning and engagement for the learner through continuous improvement of the learning environment, and/or 2) position the learner to be successful in achieving their short- term and long-term academic, career, and personal growth goals. Faculty support student success through in and out of class efforts. Involvement in SSA may be included within the faculty member’s allocation of effort in the workload

categories of teaching, research / scholarship / creative work, service, and administration, as applicable or assessed in independent categories with assigned work effort. The inclusion of SSA is appropriate for learners at all levels (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, and professional students and trainees).

PROCESS & PROCEDURES

General Guidelines for Annual Review and Updates

Each faculty member at Augusta University, regardless of rank or responsibilities will be evaluated annually based upon clear, transparent, and academic discipline-specific assessment criteria and rubrics.

All changes to performance criteria or expectations will be updated in AU faculty policies in a timely fashion. These updates are to be completed in advance of the next review cycle and will allow time for faculty to incorporate those expectations into the preparation of their review documents. Written Annual Evaluation policies, processes, and stated criteria will incorporate appropriate due process mechanisms and support the principles of academic freedom.

Department Level Review Process

1. All faculty members will be evaluated annually by the head of the appropriate academic unit. The faculty member is responsible for providing any additional documentation and materials required or allowed by the discipline-specific annual evaluation criteria and process. This performance evaluation will be scheduled to accommodate time requirements for decision-making and portfolio preparation of faculty who meet time-in-rank or time-in-service eligibility requirements, and who may wish to initiate the promotion or tenure process.
2. Each evaluation will address known metrics as appropriate per school/college and encompass continuous professional growth appropriate to the institution's sector and mission, school, college, and department. Evaluators may use their own department/division specific metrics within the annual evaluation which may differ between colleges, departments, and programs. Evaluators will work directly with their dean for approval of any adjustments and to ensure that all faculty members in their units are fully informed of all required metrics. Unit level annual evaluation instruments and metrics are required to be approved by the appropriate shared governance body and Provost (or designee) and published on the Office of Faculty Affairs Webpage prior to being used.
3. All faculty evaluations should include evidence of student success activities and involvement of the faculty member in activities that deepen student learning and engagement. Please see the [Faculty Effort Definitions](#) for a more detailed presentation of AU's student success definition and examples.

4. The annual evaluation will encompass all workload categories where the faculty member has assigned effort as well as the category of student success and professional development activities. In all areas of the evaluation, including the assignment of the overall evaluation, the evaluator shall appropriately assess performance considering the allocated effort in the workload categories.
5. Workloads are assigned so that each faculty member can realize individual goals related to scholarly, teaching, service, student/learner success, patient care, or other academic initiatives. The division of a faculty member's obligations between scholarship, teaching, service, professional development, student success, patient care and administration (as appropriate) should be determined through the collaborative efforts of the evaluator and the faculty member.
6. The evaluator will discuss with the faculty member, in a scheduled conference meeting, the content of that faculty member's annual written evaluation and the progression toward the next level of review appropriate to their rank, tenure status, and career stage. By signing the evaluation form, the faculty member acknowledges they have been apprised of the content of their evaluation and have met with the evaluator; signing the form does not imply agreement with the evaluation. Faculty will receive a signed copy of their written evaluation each year. Annual evaluations are not subject to discretionary review or appeal by the faculty except for clear due process violations.
 - a. A due process violation occurs when the established evaluation process, as set forth in Augusta University policies has not been followed and that deviation from established procedures has a negative impact on the faculty member. Due process appeals should not be made to challenge an evaluator's assessment of the faculty members performance in a given area unless the evaluator has inappropriately modified the evaluation process to exclude or include faculty activities that should have been a part of the overall process.
 - b. Due Process appeals should be made in writing within 5 business days of receiving the evaluator's final assessment. The appeal should outline the nature of the due process violation and include any evidentiary documentation available to support the assertion of a violation. The appeal should be made directly to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs.
7. Although there is no formal appeal process, a faculty member who disagrees with any part of their annual evaluation may provide a written response to their evaluator within 10 working days. Any such response will be attached to the annual written evaluation and become part of the official personnel records. Within 10 working days of the faculty member's response, the evaluator will acknowledge in writing the receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made because of the faculty member's written response. This acknowledgement will also become part of the official personnel records.

8. Annual Reviews are required ([BOR 8.3.5](#)). Failure to submit materials for an annual review could result in dismissal ([BOR 8.3.9](#)).

All USG annual faculty evaluations must utilize the following 5-point Likert scale:

- 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations
- 2 – Needs Improvement
- 3 – Meets Expectations
- 4 – Exceeds Expectations
- 5 – Exemplary

Using the 5-point scale illustrated below, the evaluator will assign a rating for each category, as well as provide an overall qualitative annual evaluation rating. The overall evaluation will indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward the next level of review appropriate to rank, tenure status, and career stage. *Noteworthy achievement* as referenced in [ASA 4.4](#) is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the 5- point Likert scale. *Deficient and unsatisfactory performance* is reflective of a 1 or 2 on the 5-point Likert scale. *Meets Expectations* is satisfactory progress reflective of a 3 on the 5-point Likert scale.

Performance Evaluation Scale				
Exemplary	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Does Not Meet Expectations
5	4	3	2	1
Performance far exceeds expectations and standards for the evaluation category at the current rank	Performance consistently exceeds expectations and standards for the evaluation category at the current rank	Performance meets expectations and standards for the evaluation category at the current rank	Performance intermittently falls below expectations and standards for the evaluation category at the current rank	Performance consistently falls below expectations and standards for the evaluation category at the current rank

Annual evaluation outcomes are considered as a part of the pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure decisions, as well as in retention and merit pay decisions.

DIFFERENTIATING STANDARDS ACROSS RANKS

Each AU school/college and departmental promotion and tenure unit is in charge of developing detailed policies specific to disciplines, as appropriate, to include scholarship/ research/, teaching, service, professional development, student success activities, clinical and, administrative activity as appropriate, as related to each academic rank. These policies, processes, and stated criteria must incorporate due process mechanisms and support the principles of academic freedom. At each level of evaluation, the performance criteria must be in writing and posted on the OFA website.

PERFORMANCE REMEDIATION PLAN

If the performance overall, or in any of the assigned areas of effort, is judged to be a 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations or a 2 – Needs Improvement, the faculty member must be provided with a PIP to remediate their performance during the next year; however, remediation cannot be required of a faculty member outside of their contract period.

The evaluator will develop the PIP in consultation with the faculty member. The PIP will include the following components:

1. Specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound (SMART) goals that clarify how the faculty member may make acceptable improvement in any identified areas of concern prior to the next annual evaluation.
2. An outline of relevant activities and milestones to guide and monitor the faculty member's progress toward fulfillment of these goals.
3. A timetable for completion, including scheduled meetings to discuss and monitor the faculty member's progress at reasonable intervals, not less than once per term.
4. Available resources and financial support for professional development, research, scholarship, or creative activity.

The PIP will be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of the Provost (or designee). The dean shall collaborate with the appropriate Human Resources consultant before finalizing the PIP. The PIP will become part of the official personnel records.

The evaluator shall schedule at least one meeting per term; one in the fall, one in the spring, and one in the summer (only if the faculty member is on contract) to review the faculty member's progress, document additional needs/resources, and consider planned accomplishments for the upcoming semester. After each meeting, the evaluator will summarize the meeting in writing and indicate whether the faculty member is, or is not, on track to complete the PIP. Consequences for failing to meet the expectations of the PIP will be stated at the conclusion of each meeting and in writing. If a faculty member successfully fulfills the expectations of the PIP, the faculty member will, at a minimum, receive a rating of 3 – Meets Expectations.

IMPACT ON CORRECTIVE POST TENURE REVIEW

If for two consecutive annual evaluations, a tenured faculty member is evaluated as a 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations or 2 – Needs Improvement in any area for which the assigned allocation of effort exceeds 10%, the faculty member will be required to participate in a corrective post-tenure review, as described in the [Post Tenure Review Policy](#). Note that the deficiency does not have to be in the same area but could be in a different area from one year to the next.

TRAINING

The Office of the Provost (or designee) will ensure that academic administrators are trained for all levels of evaluation as outlined in the Board of Regents Policy Manual and procedures disseminated by the USG Chief Academic Officer.

POLICY CONFLICT:

In the case of any divergence from our conflict with the official policies of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia found in these Statutes, the official policies of the Board of Regents shall prevail.

REFERENCES & SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

[BOR 8.3.5: Evaluation of Personnel:](#)

https://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8/C245/#p8.3.5_evaluation_of_personnel

[BOR 8.3.9: Discipline and Removal of Faculty Members:](#)

https://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8/C245/#p8.3.9_discipline_and_removal_of_faculty_members

[University System of Georgia Academic & Student Affairs Handbook 4.4:](#)

https://www.usg.edu/academic_affairs_handbook/section4/C2845/#p4.4_faculty_evaluation_systems

[Georgia Board of Regents Policy Manual: 6.5 Freedom of Expression and Academic Freedom:](#)

<https://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section6/C2653>

[Augusta State University Post Tenure Review Policy:](#)

<https://www.augusta.edu/services/legal/policyinfo/policy/post-tenure-review-policy.pdf>

RELATED POLICIES

Intentionally left blank.

APPROVED BY:

Interim Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, Augusta University

Date: 9/18/2024

President, Augusta University

Date: 9/23/2024