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Brief History of Evaluation at Georgia Perimeter College
**Brief History of Evaluation at Georgia Perimeter College**

Prior to July 1986, Georgia Perimeter College (then called DeKalb College) was governed by the DeKalb County Board of Education.

On July 1, 1986, DeKalb College became a unit under the governance of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia.

For FY88, faculty members were evaluated at the end of calendar year 1986 on a form with three categories: satisfactory, needs improvement, and warning.

For FY89, faculty members were evaluated at the end of calendar year 1987 on a form with three categories: satisfactory, needs improvement, and warning.

For FY90, faculty members were evaluated at the end of calendar year 1988 on a form with three categories: satisfactory, needs improvement, and warning.

For FY91, faculty members were evaluated at the end of calendar year 1989 under a new evaluation system that arrayed faculty members on a scale of one to nine points.

For FY92, faculty members were evaluated at the end of calendar year 1990 on a revised form, essentially the same system currently in use. This revised system evaluated faculty members as outstanding, exceeds requirements, meets requirements, needs improvement, or unacceptable in each of three areas--teaching, professional growth and development, and service.

For FY93, faculty members were evaluated at the end of calendar year 1991 as outstanding, exceeds requirements, meets requirements, needs improvement, or unacceptable in each of three areas--teaching, professional growth and development, and service.

For FY94, faculty members were evaluated at the end of calendar year 1992 as outstanding, exceeds requirements, meets requirements, needs improvement, or unacceptable in each of three areas--teaching, professional growth and development, and service.

For FY95, faculty members were evaluated at the end of calendar year 1993 as outstanding, exceeds requirements, meets requirements, needs improvement, or unacceptable in each of three areas--teaching, professional growth and development, and service.

For FY96, faculty members were evaluated at the end of calendar year 1994 as outstanding, exceeds requirements, meets requirements, needs improvement, or unacceptable in each of three areas--teaching, professional growth and development, and service.
For FY97, On May 8, 1996, the Board of Regents approved the request of DeKalb College President Jacquelyn M. Belcher to implement a new organizational structure to be effective July 1, 1996. The Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Handbook (For Interim Year 1995-96) reflects recommended provisions for the interim year 1995-96 in an adaptation of the proposed process for annual faculty evaluation. The recommended provisions were made by the Faculty Evaluation Committee based on a six-month, first-phase study conducted by the Process Renewal Team on Faculty Evaluation. The Administrative Team approved the report of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, including revisions, on May 21, 1996. Further study and complete revision of the evaluation process were made during a second-phase, in-depth study by the Process Renewal Team on Evaluation and reported to the Faculty Evaluation Committee during Fall Quarter 1996.

For FY98, the Process Renewal Team on Faculty Evaluation presented Phase II (March 13, 1997) and Phase III (April 14, 1997) of their recommendations to the Faculty Evaluation Committee for approval. The recommendations, with minor revisions, were accepted and presented to the Academic Affairs Policy Council for approval on April 17, 1997. The College Advisory Board approved the recommendations as presented on April 24, 1997.

Phase II of the recommendations was implemented in FY98 (1996-97 evaluation period). Phase III of the recommendations was implemented in FY99 (1997-98 evaluation period).
Timetables for Implementation of Reviews
Implementation Timetable for Faculty Not Seeking Promotion and/or Tenure


August 19, 2005  Course Materials Review Panel Training

October 7, 2005  
  - Faculty Portfolio (For July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005)
  - Declaration of Weights Part II (evaluation period 2004-2005).

October 10 – November 4, 2005  Course Materials Peer Review

November 7 - December 2, 2005  Student Evaluation of full semester courses (For short classes, evaluations will take place during the last week of the term.)

November 21, 2005 – March 1, 2006  Department chair evaluation of faculty

November 28, 2005  Faculty Evaluation of Department Chair due to Dean of Academic Services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 28, 2006</td>
<td>Annual Performance Review of Faculty due to Dean of Academic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31, 2006</td>
<td>Dean of Academic Services submits Annual Performance Review of Faculty to the Campus Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10, 2006</td>
<td>Campus Provost submits Annual Performance Review of Faculty to Human Resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14, 2006</td>
<td>Declaration of Weights Part I and Goals for 2006-07 due to Department Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Timetable for New Full-Time Tenure-track Faculty
and
Full-Time Temporary (semester-to-semester) Faculty

October 3, 2005
Professional Growth & Development Plan (Goals) for 2005-2006 Academic Year-

**New tenure-track faculty ONLY**

Fall Semester
Classroom observation by department chair

January 9, 2006
Faculty Portfolio (Fall Semester) due.

January 31, 2006
GPC first Term Progress Report New Faculty due to Dean of Academic Services

Spring Semester
Classroom observation by department chair.

April 14, 2006
Declaration of Weights Part I 2006-2007 and Goals for 2006-2007 due to department chair *(for tenure-track only)*

*New faculty and full-time temporary faculty will be evaluated on activities completed during their first term of employment.*
Implementation Timetable for Faculty Seeking Promotion and/or Tenure

April 14, 2005  Declaration of Weights and Goals due to departmental chair.

May 5, 2005  Election of representatives for Promotion and Tenure Panels.

May 10, 2005  Faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure file Letter of Intent with department chair (notify Office of Educational Affairs).

August 26, 2005  
- Faculty Portfolio (for 2004-2005) for faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure due to department chair.
- Formal request for Promotion and/or Tenure due to department chair.
- Declaration Weights – Part II (evaluation period 2004-2005)

August 30 - September 9, 2005  Peer Review of Course Materials.

August 29 - September 15, 2005  Department chair evaluation of faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure.

September 15, 2005  Department chair submits original of Annual Performance Review to Dean of Academic Services for signature.

September 16, 2005  All Promotion/Tenure Panels meet with Assistant Vice President for Educational Affairs for Promotion and Tenure criteria review.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 19</td>
<td>Dean of Academic Services submits files to Office of the Assistant Vice President for Educational Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 22</td>
<td>Final date for receipt of faculty rebuttal of Annual Performance Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 21 – October 5, 2005</td>
<td>Promotion/Tenure Panels review applications of faculty requesting promotion and/or tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 6, 2005</td>
<td>Promotion/Tenure Panels recommendations due to Educational Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 13, 2005</td>
<td>Recommendations on promotion and/or tenure from Promotion/Tenure Panels to Dean of Academic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2005</td>
<td>Dean of Academic Services notifies faculty of intent to recommend or not recommend for promotion and/or tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4, 2005</td>
<td>Written appeal of promotion and/or tenure denial by faculty due to the Dean of Academic Services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 10, 2005</td>
<td>Dean of Academic Services forwards recommendations to Educational Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 28, 2005</td>
<td>Faculty Evaluation of Department Chair due to Dean of Academic Services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2, 2005</td>
<td>Vice President for Educational Affairs recommendations on promotion and tenure due to President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice President for Educational Affairs notifies faculty member in writing of recommendation to President for promotion and/or tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9, 2005</td>
<td>President notifies faculty members in writing of any recommendations, which differ from those of the Vice President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 3, 2006</td>
<td>Written appeal from non-recommended faculty requesting a review due to President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 9, 2006</td>
<td>President notifies all parties of scheduled reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10-13, 2006</td>
<td>Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27, 2006</td>
<td>President notifies faculty in writing of recommendations to the Board for promotion and/or tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 7, 2006</td>
<td>President forwards recommendations for promotion and tenure to Chancellor’s Office and notifies appealing faculty of recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2006</td>
<td>Board of Regents’ approval of promotion/tenure recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 7, 2006</td>
<td>Campus Provost submits Faculty Performance Review to Human Resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14, 2006</td>
<td>Declaration of Weights Part I and Goals for 2006-07 due to Department Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Implementation Timetable for Faculty Undergoing Pre-Tenure or Post-Tenure Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 27, 2006</td>
<td>Pre-Tenure and Post-Tenure Review Packets are due to department chairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 30, 2006</td>
<td>Department chair deliver packets to Dean of Academic Services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 31, 2006</td>
<td>Deans of Academic Services deliver packets to the AVP of Educational Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3 – February 24, 2006</td>
<td>Promotion/Tenure Panels review packets and prepare reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2, 2006</td>
<td>Chair of Promotion/Tenure Panel submits reports to the AVP for Educational Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13 – March 17, 2006</td>
<td>Department chair will review the contents of the report with faculty member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24, 2006</td>
<td>Last day for faculty member to submit a written response to Pre-Tenure Report (optional) Appeal of a finding of Unsatisfactory Performance in a Post-Tenure Report due to appeals panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 30, 2006</td>
<td>Department chair sends the report and all supporting documentation to Dean of Academic Services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 3 – April 24, 2006</td>
<td>In the event of a finding of Unsatisfactory Progress, faculty member and his/her department chair will prepare a pre/post tenure development plan to correct deficiencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 3, 2006  Appeal Panel submits report of Unsatisfactory Performance Review for Post-Tenure to Vice President for Educational Affairs.

April 7, 2006  Dean of Academic Services returns all review packets to Educational Affairs.

April 14, 2006  Vice President for Educational Affairs forwards all documentation and his/her recommendation to the President.

April 21, 2006  The President will make the final decision.

April 24, 2006  Department chair submits pre/post-tenure development plan to Dean of Academic Services.

ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY: GENERAL INFORMATION
Georgia Perimeter College’s Policy on Faculty Evaluation

In keeping with Board of Regents’ Policy, GPC has adopted the Annual Performance Review of Faculty described herein. The primary purpose of faculty evaluation at GPC is to promote individual and institutional self-improvement. To ensure that faculty are aware of the expectations of their supervisor and are informed of their progress as members of GPC faculty, evaluations are completed on an annual basis. This evaluation, which serves as an evaluation of progress and a discussion of expectations for the future, focuses on the objectives and goals of the individual and of the College. Because the results of this evaluation will be the sole determiner of the annual merit pay award made to each faculty member as well as the bases for promotion, tenure, pre-tenure, and post-tenure decisions made by the institution, the College recognizes the need for a consistent system for evaluating its faculty.* However, the College also recognizes the diversity among its faculty and has, therefore, adopted a system of evaluation that values that diversity, asserts that progress may occur in many directions, and recognizes that many types of activities make valuable contributions to the College’s success and growth.

All faculty members with teaching responsibilities will be evaluated annually on three components of their performance: teaching effectiveness, service, and professional activities. Faculty members at different points in their academic careers often find that they want or need to direct more effort to one component or another of their responsibilities. The Annual Performance Review allows each faculty member to determine the emphasis that he or she will place on each component of the evaluation and to select, within prescribed ranges, the weight of each component in the overall evaluation.

Because of the great diversity in possible approaches to the act of teaching, the Annual Performance Review, while maintaining a consistent process of evaluation, allows some flexibility to the faculty member. The process supports a multi-source faculty evaluation system which includes self-evaluation, peer evaluation, student evaluation and department chair evaluation. The system allows the faculty member to determine, within established ranges, the weights of these evaluations in determining the faculty member’s teaching effectiveness rating.

This need for flexibility is also reflected in the Evaluation of Service and the Evaluation of Professional Activities. Faculty members may select from a wide range of activities in which to participate each year. The department chair is responsible for assembling the various parts of the evaluation system and calculating the Faculty Member’s Performance Review Summary. The evaluation should be submitted to the Dean of Academic Services and then to the Provost on the appropriate campus.

---

*Any academic year in which a leave is taken cannot count as a year’s service for purposes of promotion and/or tenure. Merit pay will not be awarded for time on leave..
Faculty Evaluation Process

PROVOST

DEAN OF ACADEMIC SERVICES

DEPARTMENT CHAIR

FACULTY MEMBER’S PERFORMANCE REVIEW SUMMARY

- FACULTY PORTFOLIO
- STUDENT RATING SUMMARY
- PEER REVIEW OF COURSE MATERIALS
- DEPARTMENT CHAIR’S EVALUATION OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE
Faculty Evaluation Committee

PURPOSE: The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) reviews and revises the evaluation system and promotion and tenure system and recommends improvements, in both content and procedure. The committee’s recommendations are submitted by the Vice President for Educational Affairs to the Academic Affairs Policy Council (AAPC), which advises and makes recommendations for changes to the College Advisory Board (CAB), which advises and makes recommendations to the President. The President may accept or reject the recommendations and must approve all changes.

MEMBERSHIPS: Membership consists of faculty from each campus and is representative of the various disciplines. The members are appointed to three-year terms on a rotating basis. At least one-third of the membership changes each year.

Membership consists of:
One campus Provost
One campus Academic Dean
One Department Chair
12 faculty
In the spring, the Vice President for Educational Affairs will submit to the Faculty Senate the listing of vacancies on the FEC for the upcoming year along with a list of faculty members who will continue to serve on the FEC. The Faculty Senate will determine the nomination, selection, and election process for one half of the vacancies on the FEC. By April 1, the Faculty Senate chair will submit the names of those individuals who have been chosen to serve on the FEC for the upcoming academic year to the chair of the FEC. Additionally, the Faculty Senate is welcome to submit names of all individuals considered and any recommendations. The FEC will review the names submitted by the Faculty Senate and will also consider other faculty members. At least one-half of the faculty members appointed to the FEC will have been nominated, recommended, and elected by the process determined by the Faculty Senate. The other half of the vacancies will be appointed by the Vice President for Educational Affairs to assure campus and discipline representation, considering recommendations from the FEC. One of the twelve faculty members should be a librarian.

MEETINGS: Meetings may be held at any time during the year as need is determined by the chairperson.

CHAIRPERSON: The Vice President for Educational Affairs appoints the chairperson.
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF FACULTY

EXPLANATION AND PROCESS
I. Faculty Portfolio for Annual Evaluation

The Faculty Portfolio for Annual Evaluation requires each faculty member to provide documentation for the Annual Performance Review in the areas of Teaching Effectiveness, Service, and Professional Activities. It also allows the faculty member to select the weights of the three components of the overall evaluation as well as the weights of the sources in the Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness. In addition, the guidelines define and limit the types and quantities of information that should be submitted by the faculty member. Faculty members who have committed to retirement July 1 will not be subject to evaluation in their final year; therefore, they do not have to submit a Faculty Portfolio.

(The Faculty Portfolio should include the items listed below. Detailed instructions and forms for submission of these items appear on pages 30-41). If faculty members who are on leave and wish to be considered for merit pay considerations for the evaluation year, i.e., the previous year, they are expected to submit their annual reports at the appropriate time.

It is the faculty member's responsibility, in collaboration with the department chair, to assure that the annual evaluation is complete. Faculty should be encouraged to submit materials for evaluation in a timely manner. Once the packet has been submitted to the campus academic dean, the faculty member will not be allowed to submit additional materials for consideration.

A. Faculty Members Report on Teaching Effectiveness/Professional Performance

1. Declaration of Weights

In the fall term of the previous academic year, each faculty member must submit to his/her department chair the Declaration of Weights - Part I: Overall Evaluation (for the next evaluation period) (page 31). In conference with the department chair, each faculty member will choose the percentage that he/she wants each area to weigh in the overall evaluation, thereby determining how the evaluation in each area will affect his/her merit pay award for the evaluation period. (Each selected percentage must be a multiple of ten, and no area may have a weight of zero percent.) The department chair will provide the Declaration of Weights form. The faculty member should return both copies to the department chair by the announced deadline. The department chair will sign the form, keep the original, and return the copy to the faculty member.

As part of the Faculty Portfolio submitted in the fall term each year, each faculty member must include the Declaration of Weights – Part II: Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (for the current evaluation period) (page 32). Each faculty member will choose the percentage that he/she wants each source to weigh in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. (Each selected percentage must be a multiple of ten, and no area may have a weight of zero percent.) The faculty member should include the original form in the Faculty Portfolio and keep a copy for his/her records.
2. A Focused Narrative: Faculty Member’s Report on Teaching Effectiveness/Professional Performance

The Focused Narrative should present evidence of successful practices the faculty member has used during this evaluation period, which characterize his/her teaching effectiveness. This narrative should include a discussion of the faculty member’s knowledge, course organization and planning, communication and delivery, and policy/procedure practices. The guidelines for this report appear on page 33.

Only if it is essential that the evaluator see the materials described, faculty members may choose to attach an Addendum to the Focused Narrative including labeled materials to which they have made direct reference in the narrative. The purpose of the addendum is to provide documentation for the narrative. It is separate from the Course Materials Review and will not be reviewed by the Peer Review Panel.

3. Self-Evaluation

In keeping with the Board of Regents’ policy that requires that evaluation “provide an opportunity to assess strengths and weaknesses of faculty performance,” the self-evaluation offers the opportunity for personal assessment of one’s own teaching effectiveness. Based on the information provided in the Focused Narrative, each faculty member must use the form on page 34 to rate his or her own performance in the area of teaching.

4. Review of Goals

Each faculty member should submit a Review of Goals from the Previous Year using the form on page 35 and establish Goals for the Coming Year using the form on page 36. All faculty must indicate a plan in the area of Teaching Effectiveness and in at least one of the other areas.

B. Faculty Member’s Course Materials

The Course Materials Packet should include materials used by the faculty member during the evaluation period. If course materials are submitted from a summer term, the ending date of the term should be used to determine under which evaluation year they should be included. For example, course materials submitted for courses taught under May Minimester, Summer 2003, should be submitted as part of the annual report covering July 1, 2002-June 30, 2003. These materials may have been created by the faculty member, selected from other sources, or created in collaboration with others, but materials not developed by an instructor should acknowledge the original source or the collaborator. The guidelines for submission of the packet appear on page 37, and the criteria for its evaluation appear on page 38. While the instructions require all faculty members to submit course syllabi (which adhere to the guidelines in the Faculty Syllabus Checklist, pages 49-50) and assessment tools, they also allow instructors to choose to submit materials that best reflect their teaching ability from the following areas: innovative instruction, writing activities, revision of course materials, grading/feedback to students, instructional support
C. Service Report

In the Service Report, faculty will list their activities completed during the evaluation period in the following areas: service to the campus, discipline, and department and service to the College and community. The guidelines for this report appear on page 39. Faculty members should list their activities under the appropriate item in each category. If a service activity does not fit one of the items listed, it may be listed under Other Activities. All activities listed under other require information describing the service activity. The Other Category is not intended to be used for activities that are under an already described area. The department chair will award points for each activity using the Evaluation of Service form on page 58. The Service Rating will be determined using the point scale at the end of that document.

D. Professional and Scholarly Activities Report

In the Professional Activities Report, faculty will list their activities completed during the evaluation period in the following areas: professional organizations; further education and degrees; scholarly and/or creative activities; awards, grants, artistic commissions, and/or fellowships. The guidelines for this report appear on page 40. Faculty members should list their activities under the appropriate item in each category. If a professional activity does not fit one of the items listed, it may be listed under Other Activities. All activities listed under other require information describing the professional and scholarly/or scholarly activity. The Other Category is not intended to be used for activities that are under an already described area. Some specific documentation may be requested by the department chair. The department chair will award points for each activity using the Evaluation of Professional Activities form on page 60. The Professional Activities Rating will be determined using the point scale at the end of that document.

II. Annual Performance Review and Evaluation

A. Self Evaluation Form

B. Peer Review of Course Materials

The Board of Regents requires that his or her peers evaluate a faculty member’s teaching performance. Each faculty member has submitted, as part of the Faculty Portfolio for Annual Evaluation, a packet of course materials used during the evaluation period. The instructions for the submission of this packet appear on page 37. These materials will be reviewed and evaluated by a panel of faculty peers elected according to the following procedures:
**Course Materials Review Panel**

The Course Materials Review Panels will be composed of three department members, elected annually, who have, at the time of the election, at least one complete year of teaching experience at GPC. No faculty member serving on a Promotion and Tenure Panel will be eligible for membership.

The election of the faculty to these panels will be carried out by the appropriate department chair mid-spring term, by secret ballot, from a list of all faculty members in the department with at least one-year of teaching experience at GPC. Each faculty member will vote for three candidates. The department chair will vote, but his or her name will not appear on the ballot. The three faculty members with the highest vote totals within the department will be elected. Each department will create at least one panel. Departments with more than twenty faculty members may create two panels using the same process.

Following discussion of each packet, each panel member will complete an individual review of the course materials of every department member. The other two panel members will do course materials review for a faculty member serving on a panel. Each panel member will forward the completed Peer Review of Course Materials forms to the panel chair. The panel chair will list the comments and ratings from each panel member for every department member. The panel chair will then calculate the appropriate mean rating for each faculty member’s course materials and report it on the Peer Course Materials Evaluation Summary. The Department Chair will list comments and ratings from each panel member for the chair of the panel and calculate the appropriate mean rating. (See overall rating form.) The mean will be used for annual evaluation.

The panel in his/her department will complete the course materials review for a department chair. The Dean of Academic Services will calculate the appropriate mean rating for each department chair’s course materials and report it on the Peer Course Materials Evaluation Summary.

**Chairperson**

1) The Chairperson will be elected from the faculty membership of the panel.

2) Duties of the chairperson
   a) To ensure that all reviews are conducted within the time frame outlined in the Implementation Timetables
   b) To ensure the integrity and confidentiality of the process
   c) To ensure the security of the Course Materials Review files at all times
   d) To submit the documents to the department chair
   e) To serve as the representative of the panel if a faculty member
requests further information about the ratings

f) To aggregate all panel comments and ratings on one form to be given to the department chair.

**Course Materials Packet**

The items reviewed in the Course Materials Packet are described on page 37. The department chair and the Peer Review Panel review the Course Materials Packet.

C. Faculty Rating by Students

The Student Instructional Report II (SIR II), published by Educational Testing Service, is used to elicit student input concerning each faculty member’s teaching performance. The report requires students to rate instructors on items organized into ten areas. Six of these areas --Course Organization and Planning; Communication; Faculty/Student Interaction; Assignments, Exams, and Grading; Course Outcomes; and Overall Evaluation --will provide mean ratings used to calculate the Composite Student Rating, a part of the overall evaluation. The other areas --Supplementary Instructional Methods; Student Effort and Involvement; Course Difficulty, Workload, and Pace, and Student Information--will provide information to instructors which may help them to improve their teaching effectiveness. The SIR II will be administered annually in the fall term. In some unique circumstances, a spring administration may be necessary. Both the faculty member and the department chair will receive a copy of the results of this evaluation.

D. Department Chair’s Evaluation of Faculty Performance

Each year, the department chair will evaluate each faculty member in his/her department in three areas of performance: teaching effectiveness, service, and professional activities. Using the information provided in the Faculty Portfolio for Annual Evaluation, the Peer Evaluation of Course Materials Summary, the Faculty Rating by Students, and other pertinent information, the department chair will evaluate the faculty member’s teaching effectiveness. Using the information provided in the Service Report and the Professional and Scholarly Activities Report, the department chair will assign points as indicated in the Evaluation of Service and Evaluation of Professional Activities instruments.

E. Faculty Member Performance Review Summary

To complete the Faculty Member Performance Review Summary (p. 63), the department chair will calculate the Overall Teaching Effectiveness Rating of each faculty member using the Declaration of Weights and the ratings of teaching effectiveness from the Self-Evaluation, Student Rating Summary, Peer Review of Course Materials, and Department Chair’s Evaluation of Faculty Performance. After including the Service Rating of Faculty Member and the Professional Activities Rating of Faculty Member, the department chair will calculate the Overall Faculty Evaluation Rating. The department chair will hold a conference with each faculty member to discuss the evaluation. The faculty member will be asked to sign the summary.

F. Evaluation of First-Year Faculty
Because the Faculty Portfolio is submitted in the fall term, reporting activities completed during the previous academic year, faculty joining the institution that fall will not have worked during that evaluation period and, therefore, will have no report. However, the department chair must evaluate the performance of new faculty to support a recommendation for contract renewal. New faculty will be required to turn in a portfolio of activities completed during fall term. The First Term Progress Report will provide evaluative information for the department chair. Additionally, new tenure-track faculty should submit, during the fall term, a set of goals that should guide their professional growth during the first year of employment. These goals should be submitted on the Goals for the Coming Year form from the Faculty Portfolio.

G. Rebuttal of Annual Performance Review of Faculty

The only component of the Annual Performance Review that may be rebutted is the Department Chair’s Evaluation of Faculty Performance, including the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, service, and professional activities.

Faculty evaluations by department chairs must be signed and dated by the faculty member and the department chair at the time of evaluation. The faculty member’s signature indicates review of the evaluation only. (Failure to sign the evaluation by the faculty member could become grounds for disciplinary action.) A faculty member who wishes to rebut an evaluation by a department chair should follow the procedure outlined below.

1. The faculty member should review and discuss the evaluation with the department chair before the evaluation is placed in the personnel file.

2. If the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, the faculty member may write a memorandum of rebuttal or explanation of any parts of the evaluation with which there is disagreement. Within five (5) working days of the evaluation conference, he/she should send the memorandum to the department chair with copies to the Dean of Academic Services and the Campus Provost.

3. Upon receipt of a memorandum of rebuttal from a faculty member, the department chair will acknowledge receipt in writing.

4. Any changes in the annual evaluation made as a result of either the conference or the faculty member’s written rebuttal must be noted in writing by the department chair. This written acknowledgment of change will be appended to the original evaluation, and all copies become a part of the evaluation record along with the memorandum of rebuttal.

5. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the outcome of the rebuttal, then the faculty member may discuss the evaluation, the memorandum of rebuttal, and any changes that have been noted with the Dean of Academic Services.

6. The evaluation, the memorandum of rebuttal, the department chair’s response, and a summary of the conference with the Dean of Academic Services.
Services, if any, and any changes to the evaluation which have been noted will become a part of the faculty member's permanent file.

7. In addition to signing and dating the evaluation form, the faculty member is required to sign and date any attachments and return the signed evaluation and any attachments to the department chair.

8. The department chair will provide the faculty member with a copy of the evaluation, including any changes that have been noted. The department chair will keep a copy of the evaluation and submit the original files through the Dean of Academic Services to the Campus Provost.

9. The Campus Provost will submit all completed annual evaluations of faculty to the Human Resources Department, where they will become a part of the faculty member's permanent file.
FACULTY PORTFOLIO FOR EVALUATION

Instruments
Georgia Perimeter College
Faculty Annual Evaluation

Evaluation Period July 1, 2004 - June 30, 2005

Name of Faculty Member

Department Chair

Department

Campus

Table of Contents

I. Faculty Portfolio for Evaluation
   A. Faculty Members Report on Teaching Effectiveness/Professional Performance
      1. Weights
      2. Focused Narrative/Addendum
      3. Self Evaluation Form
      4. Review of Goals
   B. Faculty Member’s Course Materials Packet
   C. Service Report
   D. Professional Development and Scholarly/Creative Activities Report
   E. Goals for 2003-2004

II. Annual Performance Review and Evaluation
   A. Self Evaluation Form
   B. Peer Review of Course Materials
   C. Student Evaluations
   D. Evaluation of Faculty by Department Chair
      1. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness and Professional Performance
      2. Evaluation of Service
      3. Evaluation of Professional Development and Activities Report
      4. Faculty Member Performance Review Summary

To the best of my knowledge, the information included in my Faculty Portfolio is accurate. (See Board of Regents’ Policy 803.09).

Faculty member’s signature

Date
Declaration Of Weights To Be Used In Faculty Evaluation

Next Evaluation Period:    July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2006

Part I – Overall Evaluation Plan (for evaluation period 2005-2006)

Instructions: Complete Part 1 and submit with the Faculty Portfolio. The faculty member should return two copies to the department chair by the announced deadline. The department chair will sign the form, keep the original, and return the copy to the faculty member. The department chair should include this document in the annual evaluation of the faculty member. All selected percentages should be within the indicated ranges, in multiples of 10 (i.e., 10%, 20%, 30%, etc.), and must total 100%. The overall evaluation weights that a faculty member has chosen may be changed with the approval of the department chair and the dean of academic services.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS  (Choose from 50% - 70%)

                     ___  %

SERVICE  (Choose from 10% - 30%)

                     ___  %

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES  (Choose from 10% - 30%)

                     ___  %

Total                  100  %

SIGNATURES:

Faculty Member Date

Department Chair Date

31
Declaration Of Weights To Be Used In Faculty Evaluation

Evaluation Period: July 1, 2004 - June 30, 2005

Part II – Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness/Professional Performance (for current evaluation period)

Instructions: Complete Part II, and submit with the Faculty Portfolio. All selected percentages should be within the indicated ranges, in multiples of 10 (i.e., 10%, 20%, 30%, etc.), and must total 100%.

SELF (Choose from 10% - 20%) _____ %
PEER (Choose from 10% - 20%) _____ %
STUDENTS (Choose from 10% - 20%) _____ %
DEPARTMENT CHAIR (Choose from 40% - 60%) _____ %

Total 100%
Focused Narrative: Faculty Member’s Report on Teaching Effectiveness/Professional Performance

In no more than two typewritten pages, present evidence of practices you have used in this evaluation period which characterize your teaching effectiveness and professional performance in the areas below. Each area describes criteria to consider. These are not necessarily equal components of teaching effectiveness.

1. Knowledge
   - Faculty member demonstrates knowledge of discipline.
   - Faculty member demonstrates competence with course content that is relevant and thorough.
   - Faculty member increases knowledge of discipline and/or pedagogy.

2. Course organization and planning
   - Faculty member prepares assignments, handouts, exams, and/or activities to promote student interest and enhance learning.
   - Faculty member demonstrates evidence of attention to active learning, writing, and critical thinking skills as appropriate.
   - Faculty member implements course objectives appropriately.

3. Communication and delivery
   - Faculty member uses class time effectively.
   - Faculty member uses effective instructional techniques and tools (including lecture, discussion, audio/visuals, group activities, or technology).
   - Faculty member demonstrates efforts to stimulate student interest and achievement.

4. Policy/procedure practices
   - Faculty member adheres to established college, discipline, and department policies and procedures.
   - Faculty member performs assigned duties for the conduct of business of the department.
   - Faculty member is available to students outside class.
   - Faculty member performs advising responsibilities as assigned.

Optional Addendum to the Faculty Member’s Report

Attach, and label materials to which you make direct reference in your report on teaching effectiveness. Only if it is essential that the evaluator see the materials described, faculty members may choose to attach an Addendum to the Focused Narrative including labeled materials to which they have made direct reference in the narrative. The purpose of the addendum is to provide documentation for the narrative. It is separate from the course materials review and will not be reviewed by the Peer Review Panel.
Faculty Member’s Self-Evaluation
Of Teaching Effectiveness
(From the Faculty Portfolio)

Rating Scale:  

**EP**- Exemplary Professional Performance  
Consistently exceeds accepted standards of professional performance

**HP**- High Professional Performance  
Frequently exceeds accepted standards of professional performance

**SP**- Standard Professional Performance  
Consistently meets accepted standards of professional performance

**MP**- Minimal Performance  
Does not consistently meet accepted standards of professional performance

**UP**- Unsatisfactory Performance  
Does not meet minimal standards of professional performance

1. Knowledge RATING: __________

2. Course organization and planning RATING: __________

3. Communication and delivery RATING: __________

4. Policy/procedure practices RATING: __________

To compute Teaching Effectiveness Self-Rating, assign the following values:

EP = 5    HP=4    SP = 3    MP=2    UP = 1

**Directions:** Add the four values assigned to the ratings, and divide by four to calculate the Teaching Effectiveness Rating by the faculty member. Do not round.

**TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS SELF-RATING:** _________________
Review Of Goals From The Previous Year

Report on your efforts to meet the goals you submitted last year. Please check those areas for which you are supplying a review, and attach a copy of your goals from last year.

X TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

SERVICE

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES
Describe your goals for the coming year. In each area describe the goal you plan to attain, the activities that you will undertake to achieve that goal, the methods you will use to evaluate your efforts, and the resources that you require to achieve the goals. Check the areas for which you are providing a plan. All faculty members must indicate a plan in the area of teaching effectiveness and in at least one of the other areas. Your declaration of weights for faculty evaluation should relate to the goals for the evaluation period.

- [ ] X TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS
- [ ] SERVICE
- [ ] PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES
Course Materials Packet

The following is a list of categories of course materials that may be included in your packet. Keep in mind that your department chair and Peer Review Panel will review these materials. To facilitate their review, clearly identify each component of your materials packet. The faculty evaluation system recognizes that instructors select course materials from a variety of sources; however, materials not developed by an instructor should acknowledge the original source.

Categories A and B must be included in your packet:

A. Syllabus for at least one (1) and not more than three (3) courses for which you have submitted course materials. (Refer to the Faculty Syllabus Checklist for a description of required and suggested components for all GPC syllabi, located on pages 49-50.)

B. At least one (1) and not more than three (3) samples of materials demonstrating how you assess student achievement on expected learning outcomes identified in the common course outlines (These materials may include tests but are not limited to tests.)

Choose exactly three categories from the list below, and submit no more than three items for each selected category. Please label category, course CRN, term, and course name:

1. Sample of materials demonstrating innovative instruction
2. Sample of materials demonstrating the use of writing in a course
3. Sample demonstrating a revision of course materials
4. Sample of materials demonstrating grading techniques and comments to students
5. Sample of instructional support materials from one course designed to help students master concepts and content (i.e., study guides, original problem-solving sets, concept maps, annotated bibliographies, etc.)
6. Sample of materials demonstrating efforts to incorporate technology into course content

Faculty may include a narrative, not to exceed 75 words, to describe any course material items in order to make their purpose clear to the Course Materials Review Panel.
Course Materials Evaluation Criteria

1. Syllabus
   Syllabus follows guidelines identified in the Georgia Perimeter College Faculty Syllabus Checklist.
   Syllabus clearly explains instructor’s expectations (i.e., grading, attendance, assignments, deadlines, and projects).
   Syllabus identifies learning resources for the course and their locations.
   Syllabus is free of grammatical errors and communicates in simple, clear, positive language.

2. Assessment of Achievement of Expected Learning Outcomes
   Assignments, projects, and exams are related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.

3. Innovative Instruction
   Instructional activity is clearly related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.
   Instructional activity is appropriate for the target student population.
   Instructional activity promotes mastery of concept(s) or content of the course.
   Instructional activity involves students’ participation.

4. Writing Activity
   Writing activity is clearly related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.
   Writing activity is appropriate for the target student population.
   Writing activity promotes mastery of concept(s) or content of the course.

5. Revision of Course Materials
   Revision of course materials is clearly related to course outcome(s).
   Revision of course materials are appropriate to target student population.
   Revision of course materials promote mastery of concept(s) and content of the course.

6. Grading/Feedback to Students
   Grading policy agrees with GPC policy.
   Grading techniques are fair and appropriate for course.
   Written feedback to students offers constructive criticism and suggestions for improvement.

7. Instructional Support Materials
   Instructional support materials are clearly related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.
   Instructional support materials are appropriate for the target student population.
   Instructional support materials promote mastery of concept(s) or content of the course.
   Instructional support materials are free of grammatical errors and are written in simple, clear, positive language.

8. Instructional Technology
   Instructional technology use is clearly related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.
   Instructional technology use is appropriate for the target student population.
   Instructional technology use promotes mastery of concept(s) or content of the course.
Service Report

Instructions: Under the appropriate items below, list all service activities completed during the period under evaluation.

A. Service to the Campus, Discipline, and Department

    Membership on campus, discipline, or department committee.
    Chair of campus, discipline, or department committee.
    Leader or presenter of campus, discipline, or department workshop or presentation.
    Guest lecturer for full-time or part-time faculty.
    Participation in campus, discipline, or department sponsored in-house or outreach recruitment and retention initiatives.
    Mentor of new full-time faculty member.
    Mentor of part-time faculty.
    Map Advisor.

B. Service to College and Community

    Membership on collegewide or Board of Regents' councils or committees.
    Chair of collegewide or Board of Regents' council or committee.
    Leader or presenter of collegewide or community workshops, courses, or presentations.
    Organizer of lecture series.
    Advisor to student organization recognized by SGA.
    Advisor/editor of college publication.
    Application of your recognized area of expertise in the community without pay.
    Participation in college-sponsored in-house or outreach activities.

C. Other activities: List those activities, that do not fit into the categories noted above, but directly contributed to either the academic or administrative functioning of the college.

   Documentation: Describe the activity and dates of activities. DO NOT LIST activities that belong in Area A or Area B.
Professional/Scholarly Activities Report

Instructions: Under the appropriate items below, list all professional/scholarly activities completed during the period under evaluation.

A. Professional Organizations.
   - Held current membership in professional organization
   - Served on a committee of a professional organization
   - Held an elective or appointive office or chaired a committee of a state or local professional organization
   - Held an elective or appointive office or chaired a committee of a regional or national professional organization
   - Service to a professional organization

B. Further Education and Degrees
   - Received credit for a graduate course (other than dissertation or thesis hours).
   - Participated in scholarly, pedagogical, or technological workshops or presentations by others at GPC (excluding those that were required).
   - Participated in workshops, summer institutes, short courses, audited a graduate level course, etc. (excluding GPC Activities).
   - Completed a graduate degree from an accredited institution.

C. Scholarly and/or Creative Activities
   - Attended a professional conference.
   - Gave a presentation at a professional conference (indicate national/regional or state/local conference).
   - Served on a discussion roundtable/panel.
   - Published an article, short story, or poem in a scholarly publication.
   - Published a book.
   - Published a new edition of a book.
   - Published a book review in an appropriate scholarly publication.
Served as an editor of a scholarly publication.

Served as a referee for a scholarly publication.

Reviewed a manuscript for publication.

Published a comment, note, or letter to the editor in a scholarly publication.

Published an article, short story, or poem in a non-scholarly publication.

D. Awards, Grants, Artistic Commissions, and/or Fellowships

Received an award, grant, artistic commission, or fellowship (excluding tuition grants for graduate study

Served on a grant review panel.

E. Other activities: List those activities, that do not fit into the categories noted above, but directly contributed to the professional growth of the faculty member. Documentation: Describe the activity and dates of activities. DO NOT LIST activities that belong in Area A-D above.

F. Fine Arts and Humanities Faculty only.

Performed in a musical, dramatic, or media production

Created a musical, dramatic, or media work which was performed, published, exhibited, and/or broadcast

Directed or produced a musical, dramatic, or media event/performance/broadcast recording/exhibition

Designed and/or implemented the technical work (scene, costume, lighting, sound, etc.) for a musical, dramatic, or media production
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW
AND EVALUATION
OF FACULTY MEMBER
INSERT COPY OF FACULTY MEMBER’S SELF EVALUATION FORM
Georgia Perimeter College

Peer Review of Course Materials

Evaluation Period: July 1, 2004 - June 30, 2005

Table of Contents

I. Peer Evaluation of Course Materials
II. Course Materials Evaluation Criteria
Peer Evaluation of Course Materials by Individual Panel Members
(Not to be forwarded to Department Chair)

Faculty Member

For purposes of peer evaluation of course materials, professional performance is defined as the faculty member’s ability to select, create, and use course materials. JUSTIFICATION MUST BE GIVEN FOR ALL RATINGS.

Rating Scale:

**EP-** Exemplary Professional Performance
Consistently exceeds accepted standards of professional performance

**HP-** High Professional Performance
Frequently exceeds accepted standards of professional performance

**SP-** Standard Professional Performance
Consistently meets accepted standards of professional performance

**MP-** Minimal Performance
Does not consistently meet accepted standards of professional performance

**UP-** Unsatisfactory Performance
Does not meet minimal standards of professional performance

Using the criteria identified for each category as a guideline, assign a rating to each applicable category using the rating scale above.

I. **Faculty member was required to include items from categories one and two below.**

   A. Syllabus (Comments only from Course Materials Review Panel)

   B. Assessment of Achievement of Learning Outcomes Rating __________

II. **Faculty member selected three of the following categories. For those categories not chosen, write “NS” (Not selected) in the rating blank. Rate other categories**

   1. Innovative Instruction Rating __________
   2. Writing Activity Rating __________
   3. Revision of Course Materials Rating __________
   4. Grading/Feedback Rating __________
   5. Instructional Support Materials Rating __________
   6. Instructional Technology Rating __________

To compute the Course Materials Rating, assign the following values:

\[ EP = 5 \quad HP = 4 \quad SP = 3 \quad MP = 2 \quad UP = 1 \]

**Directions:** Add the four values assigned to the ratings, and divide by four to calculate the Course Materials Rating. Do not round.

**Course Materials Rating:** __________ Panel Member Completing Form: __________
Faculty member

Justification must be given for all ratings.
Panel members must make comments in complete sentences for each area submitted.
Include suggestions for improvement if applicable

1. Syllabus

2. Assessment of Achievement of Learning Outcomes

3. Innovative Instruction

4. Writing Activity

5. Revision of Course Materials

6. Grading/Feedback

7. Instructional Support Materials

8. Instructional Technology
Peer Evaluation Of Course Materials Overall Rating

(To be calculated by Panel chair)

Record the course materials rating from each of the Peer Evaluation of Course Materials for the indicated faculty member.

Faculty Member ___________________________ Date ________________

1. Peer Reviewer # 1 Rating ________________

2. Peer Reviewer # 2 Rating ________________

3. Peer Reviewer #3 Rating ________________

For faculty members who are not members of the Course Materials Review Panel, compute the Peer Rating of Course Materials as follows: add the ratings, and divide by three. Round to two decimals.

Faculty members who are members of the Course Materials Review Panel will not rate their own materials. To compute the Peer Rating of Course Materials for members of the Course Materials Peer Review Panel, add the ratings; and divide by two. Round to two decimals.

The chair of the Course Materials Review Panel will list all panel comments on one form to be given to the department chair. The department chair will list the comments about the course materials evaluation of the chair of the panel.

Peer Rating of Course Materials: ______________

Panel Chair Completing Form: ______________
Course Materials Panel Chair Summary Form

Faculty member

A list of ratings from each panel member for each area submitted must be included. A list of **ALL** panel comments for each area submitted must be included.

1. Syllabus: Comments

2. Assessment of Achievement of Learning Outcomes:
   Panel Member Rating 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

**Faculty member selected three of the following categories. For those categories not chosen, write “NS” (Not selected) in the rating blank. Rate other categories**

3. Innovative Instruction:
   Panel Member Rating 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

4. Writing Activity:
   Panel Member Rating 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

5. Revision of Course Materials:
   Panel Member Rating 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

6. Grading/Feedback:
   Panel Member Rating 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

7. Instructional Support Materials:
   Panel Member Rating 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

8. Instructional Technology:
   Panel Member Rating 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____
Syllabus Checklist

This checklist includes required and suggested components of syllabi at GPC as indicated in the Georgia Perimeter College Policy Manual. Faculty at the college as a convenience in composing syllabi may use it.

REQUIRED COMPONENTS:

Information about the Instructor

_____ Name  _____ Office number  _____ Office hours

_____ Times when students may contact you  _____ Office phone number

_____ E-mail address, if available

Course Information

_____ Heading (college name)  _____ Course ID - e.g., PADL 101 400

_____ Course title and location

_____ Required texts - titles, authors, editions

_____ Course description

_____ Course objectives reflecting Expected Educational Results

_____ Attendance Policy

_____ Dates of major assignments, papers, field trips, projects, etc.

_____ Dates of midterm and/or other important tests.

_____ Disclaimer stating dates may change

_____ Date and time of final exam

Schedule Information

_____ Course requirements: exams, quizzes, classroom participation, projects, and papers, including the percentage each counts toward the final grade

_____ Policies on missed exams and late work. _____ Grading scale and standards

Grading Information

Other*

_____ Americans with Disabilities Act  _____ Academic Honesty

_____ Equal Opportunity  _____ Affirmative Action

*This information may be included in departmental handouts distributed with the syllabus.
SUGGESTED COMPONENTS:

- Recommended supplemental course materials
- Schedule of class meetings, including subject matter and topics to be covered as well as pre-class readings and other assignments
- Unique class procedure/structures, such as cooperative learning, peer review, panel presentations, portfolios, case studies, journals or learning logs, and others
- Special components: science and computer labs, tutorials, computer classroom, Instructional Support Services Lab, and others

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT STATEMENT

If you are a student who is disabled as defined under the Americans with Disabilities Act and requires assistance or support services, please seek assistance through the Center for Disability Services. A CDS Counselor will coordinate those services.

ACADEMIC HONESTY STATEMENT

Each faculty member will use the Academic Honesty Statement developed by his or her discipline unit.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY STATEMENT

No person shall, on the grounds of race, color, sex, religion, creed, national origin, age, or disability, be excluded from employment or participation in, be denied the benefits of, or otherwise be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity conducted by GPC.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION STATEMENT

Georgia Perimeter College adheres to affirmative action policies to promote diversity and equal opportunity for all faculty and students.
Georgia Perimeter College
Annual Performance Review of Faculty Member
July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005
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I. Evaluation/Rating Forms
   A. Student Rating Summary
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Faculty Member’s Acknowledgement: I have reviewed the attached evaluations with my department chair. If I wish to submit a written response, I will do so within five working days of the evaluation conference. The response must be signed, dated, attached to the original evaluation form, and submitted to the Campus Academic Dean.

SIGNATURES:

Faculty Member

Department Chair

Campus Academic Dean
Student Rating Summary

1. Identify each class by name a section number, e.g., ECON 2105-201.

   Class 1________________________  Class 5________________________
   Class 2________________________  Class 6________________________
   Class 3________________________  Class 7________________________
   Class 4________________________  Class 8________________________

2. For areas A, B, C, D, F, and I, record the mean from the SIR II report for each class. Calculate a mean for each area by adding the means for each class in that area and dividing by the number of classes reported. Round to two decimals.

A. Course Organization and Planning

   Class 1 Class 2 Class 3 Class 4
   Class 5 Class 6 Class 7 Class 8
   Area Mean _________

B. Communication

   Class 1 Class 2 Class 3 Class 4
   Class 5 Class 6 Class 7 Class 8
   Area Mean _________

C. Faculty/Student Interaction

   Class 1 Class 2 Class 3 Class 4
   Class 5 Class 6 Class 7 Class 8
   Area Mean _________

D. Assignments, Exams, and Grading

   Class 1 Class 2 Class 3 Class 4
   Class 5 Class 6 Class 7 Class 8
   Area Mean _________

F. Course Outcomes

   Class 1 Class 2 Class 3 Class 4
   Class 5 Class 6 Class 7 Class 8
   Area Mean _________

I. Overall Evaluation

   Class 1 Class 2 Class 3 Class 4
   Class 5 Class 6 Class 7 Class 8
   Area Mean _________

3. To calculate the Composite Student Rating, add the area means for A, B, C, D, F, and I; and divide by six. Round to two decimals.

   COMPOSITE STUDENT RATING  _________________
Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness/Professional Performance

Of Faculty Member

By Department Chair

Under each area are criteria to consider. These are not necessarily equal components of teaching effectiveness.

1. Knowledge
   - Faculty member demonstrates knowledge of discipline.
   - Faculty member demonstrates competence with course content that is relevant and thorough.

2. Course organization and planning
   - Faculty member prepares assignments, handouts, exams, and/or activities to promote student interest and enhance learning.
   - Faculty member demonstrates evidence of attention to active learning, writing, and critical thinking skills as appropriate.
   - Faculty member implements course objectives appropriately.

3. Communication and delivery
   - Faculty member uses class time effectively.
   - Faculty member uses effective instructional techniques and tools (including lecture, discussion, audio/visuals, group activities, or technology).
   - Faculty member demonstrates efforts to stimulate student interest and achievement.

4. Policy/procedure practices
   - Faculty member adheres to established college, discipline, and department policies and procedures.
   - Faculty member performs assigned duties for the conduct of business of the department.
   - Faculty member is available to students outside class.
   - Faculty member performs advising responsibilities as assigned.
Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness/Professional Performance
Of Faculty Member
By Department Chair

Rating Scale:

| EP- | Exemplary Professional Performance |
| HP- | High Professional Performance |
| SP- | Standard Professional Performance |
| MP- | Minimal Performance |
| UP- | Unsatisfactory Performance |

Consistently exceeds accepted standards of professional performance
Frequently exceeds accepted standards of professional performance
Consistently meets accepted standards of professional performance
Does not consistently meet accepted standards of professional performance
Does not meet minimal standards of professional performance

Justification for ratings must appear on the next page.

1. Knowledge RATING: _____________________
2. Course organization and planning RATING: _____________________
3. Communication and delivery RATING: _____________________
4. Policy/procedure practices RATING: _____________________

To compute the Teaching Effectiveness of Faculty Member Rating, assign the following values:

EP = 5  HP = 4  SP = 3  MP = 2  UP = 1

Directions: Add the four values assigned to the ratings, and divide by four to calculate the Teaching Effectiveness Rating of the faculty member. Do not round.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS/ PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE RATING OF FACULTY MEMBER BY DEPARTMENT CHAIR: _____________________

Report the Teaching Effectiveness/Professional Performance Rating on Faculty Member's Performance Review Summary.
Evaluation Of Teaching Effectiveness/Professional Performance
Of Faculty Member
By Department Chair
(Continued)

Justification of ratings from the previous page.

1. Knowledge

2. Course Organization and Planning

3. Communication and Delivery

4. Policy/Procedure Practices
Evaluation of Service

Instructions: After reviewing the Service Report in the Faculty Portfolio for Annual Evaluation, determine points for each of the appropriate items below.

A. Service to the Campus, Discipline, and Department

_____ Membership on campus, discipline, or department committee
(4 points per committee, maximum of 12 points)

_____ Chair of campus, discipline, or department committee
(2 points in addition to membership points, maximum of 4 points)

_____ Leader or presenter of campus, discipline, or department workshop or presentation
(2 - 4 points each, maximum of 8 points)
(4 points for the preparation and original offering of the presentation, 2 points for repeating a previous presentation)

_____ Guest lecturer for full-time or part-time faculty
(1 point each, maximum of 1 point)

_____ Participation in campus, discipline, or department sponsored in-house or outreach recruitment and retention initiatives
(1 point each, maximum of 2 points)

_____ Mentor of new full-time faculty member
(4 points each, maximum of 4 points)

_____ Mentor of part-time faculty
(2 points each, maximum of 4 points)

_____ Map Advisor
(1 point each, maximum of 2 points)

B. Service to College and Community

_____ Membership on collegewide or Board of Regents' councils or committees
(6 points per committee or council, maximum of 12 points)

_____ Chair of collegewide or Board of Regents' council or committee
(4 points in addition to membership points, maximum of 8 points)

_____ Leader or presenter of collegewide or community workshops, courses, or
presentations
(2 - 4 points each, maximum of 8 points)
(4 points for the preparation and original offering of the presentation, 2 points for repeating a previous presentation)

_____ Organizer of lecture series
(2 points each, maximum of 2 points)

_____ Advisor to student organization recognized by SGA
(4 points each, maximum of 4 points)

_____ Advisor/editor of college publication
(4 points each, maximum 4 points)

_____ Application of recognized area of expertise in the community without pay
(2 points per activity, maximum of 4 points)

_____ Participation in college-sponsored in-house or outreach activities
(1 point each, maximum of 2 points)

C. Other activities: Those activities, that do not fit into the categories noted above, but directly contributed to either the academic or administrative functioning of the college

_____ (1 - 6 points each, maximum of 6 points; points should be assigned based upon the significance of the activity and the amount of effort involved and should be in line with other listed activities of comparable scope)

Total Service Points:  ______________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Points</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 and above</td>
<td>Exemplary Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-23</td>
<td>High Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-15</td>
<td>Standard Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>Minimal Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To assign the Service Rating of Faculty Member, use the following values:

EP = 5       HP=4       SP=3       MP=2       UP=1

Service Rating of Faculty Member:  ________________

Report the Service Rating on Faculty Member's Performance Review Summary.
Evaluation of Professional/Scholarly Activities

Instructions: After reviewing the Professional/Scholarly Activities Report in the Faculty Portfolio for Annual Evaluation, determine points for each of the appropriate items below.

A. Professional Organizations

- Held current membership in professional organization
  (2 points each, maximum of 6 points)

- Served on a committee of a professional organization
  (2 points each, maximum of 4 points)

- Held an elective or appointive office or chaired a committee of a state or local professional organization
  (4 points each, maximum of 8 points)

- Held an elective or appointive office or chaired a committee of a regional or national professional organization
  (6 points each, maximum of 12 points)

- Service to a professional organization
  (1 point each, maximum of 2 points)

B. Further Education and Degrees

- Received credit for a graduate course (other than dissertation or thesis hours)
  (4 points per course, maximum of 8 points)

- Participated in scholarly, pedagogical, or technological workshops or presentations at GPC (excluding those that were required)
  (1 - 2 points each, maximum of 6 points)

- Participated in workshops, summer institutes, short courses, audited a graduate level course, etc. (excluding GPC activities)
  (2 points each, maximum of 4 points)

- Completed a graduate degree from an accredited institution
  (6 points each, maximum of 6 points)

C. Scholarly and/or Creative Activities

- Attended a professional conference
  (2 points each, maximum of 6 points)

- Gave a presentation at a professional conference
(4 points per presentation at a state or local conference, 6 points per presentation at a regional or national conference, maximum of 10 points)

_____ Served on a discussion roundtable/panel (2 points each, maximum of 4 points)

_____ Published an article, short story, or poem in a scholarly publication (6 points each, maximum of 12 points)

_____ Published a book (8 points each, maximum of 16 points)

_____ Published a new edition of a book (4 points each, maximum of 8 points)

_____ Published a book review in an appropriate scholarly publication (4 points per review, maximum of 8 points)

_____ Served as an editor of a scholarly publication (4 points each, maximum of 8 points)

_____ Served as a referee for a scholarly publication (1 point per submission refereed, maximum 2 points)

_____ Reviewed a manuscript for publication (1 point per manuscript, maximum 2 points)

_____ Published a comment, note, or letter to the editor in a scholarly publication (1 point each, maximum of 2 points)

_____ Published an article, short story, or poem in a non-scholarly publication (2 points each, maximum of 4 points)

D. Awards, Grants, Artistic Commissions, and/or Fellowships

_____ Received an award, grant, artistic commission, or fellowship (excluding tuition grants for graduate study) (2 points for a local award, grant, commission or fellowship, 4 points for a statewide award, grant, commission, or fellowship, 6 points for a regional award, grant, commission, or fellowship, 8 points for a national or international award, grant, commission, or fellowship.)

_____ Served on a grant review panel (2 points, maximum of 2 points)

E. Other activities: Those activities, that do not fit into the categories noted above, but directly contributed to the professional growth of the faculty member.
(1 - 6 points each, maximum 6 points; points should be assigned based upon the significance of the accomplishment and the amount of effort involved and should be in line with other listed activities of comparable scope)

F. Fine Arts and Humanities Faculty only

___ ______

Performed in a musical, dramatic, or media production
(6 points each, maximum of 12 points)

___ ______

Created a musical, dramatic, or media work which was performed, published, exhibited, and/or broadcast
(8 points each, maximum of 16 points)

___ ______

Directed or produced a musical, dramatic, or media event/performance/broadcast/recording/exhibition
(6 points each, maximum of 12 points)

___ ______

Designed and/or implemented the technical work (scene, costume, lighting, sound, etc.) for a musical, dramatic, or media production
(4 points each, maximum of 8 points)

**Total Professional/Scholarly Activities Points:** _________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional/Scholarly Activities Points</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 and above</td>
<td>Exemplary Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-23</td>
<td>High Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-15</td>
<td>Standard Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>Minimal Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To assign the Professional Activities Rating of Faculty Member, use the following values:

EP = 5    HP=4    SP= 3    MP=2    UP= 1

**Professional/Scholarly Activities Rating of Faculty Member:** __________

Report the Professional/Scholarly Activities Rating on Faculty Member's Performance Review Summary.
Summary of Weights To Be Used In Faculty Evaluation
(From the Faculty Portfolio)

Evaluation Period: July 1, __________ - June 30, __________

PART 1

Instructions: Part I was completed at the end of the academic year prior to the evaluation period. The faculty member should have a copy, and the department chair should include the document in the annual evaluation of the faculty member. All selected percentages should be within the indicated ranges in multiples of 10 (i.e., 10%, 20%, 30%, etc.) and must total 100%. Report weights submitted below.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS
(Choose from 50% - 70%)

_______ %

SERVICE
(Choose from 10% - 30%)

_______ %

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES
(Choose from 10% - 30%)

_______ %

PART II

Instructions: Report weights submitted with the Faculty Portfolio.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

SELF (Choose from 10% - 20%)

_______ %

PEER (Choose from 10% - 20%)

_______ %

STUDENTS (Choose from 10% - 20%)

_______ %

DEPARTMENT CHAIR (Choose from 40% - 60%)

_______ %
INSTRUCTIONS

Step 1. Calculate the Overall Teaching Effectiveness Rating, using the Declaration of Weights and the ratings of Teaching Effectiveness from the Self-Evaluation, Student Rating Summary, and Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness of Faculty Member by Department Chair.

Example:

1. Suppose the percentages from a faculty member's declaration of weights were as follows:

   TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS
   SELF (Choose from 10% - 20%)  20%
   PEER (Choose from 10% - 20%)  20%
   STUDENTS (Choose from 10%-20%)  10%
   DEPARTMENT CHAIR
   (Choose from 40%-60%)  50%
   Total 100%

2. Suppose the faculty members’ ratings were as follows:

   TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS
   SELF-RATING  4.25
   PEER RATING OF COURSE MATERIALS  3.75
   STUDENT RATING  4.00
   DEPARTMENT CHAIR RATING  3.75

   CALCULATE THE OVERALL TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS RATING USING THE FOLLOWING FORMULA.

   \[
   \text{(0.2)(Self)} + \text{(0.2)(Peer)} + \text{(0.1)(Students)} + \text{(0.5)(Department Chair)}
   \]

   \[
   \text{0.2(4.25)+0.2(3.75)+0.1(4)+0.5(3.75)} = 3.875
   \]

   The faculty member's overall Teaching Effectiveness rating is 3.875.

Step 2. Report the Service Rating of Faculty Member.

Step 3. Report the Professional Activities Rating of Faculty Member.

Step 4. Calculate the Overall Faculty Evaluation Rating, using the Declaration of Weights and ratings for Teaching Effectiveness (50%-70%), Service (10%-30%), and Professional Activities (10%-30%).
Faculty Member Performance Review Summary

---------------------------------  ---------------------------------  
Faculty Member                        Department Chair

Department                                Campus

Calculation of the Teaching Effectiveness Rating
Declared Weights:

- **Self** (10% - 20%)
- **Peer** (10% - 20%)
- **Students** (10% - 20%)
- **Department Chair** (40% - 60%)

(Self %)(Self Rating) + (Peer %)(Peer Rating) + (Student %)(Student Rating) + (DC %)(DC Rating)

\[
\text{Round to two decimals.}
\]

1. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS RATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerical rating</th>
<th>Performance standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.50 - 5.00</td>
<td>Exemplary professional performance (formerly Outstanding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.75 - 4.49</td>
<td>High professional performance (formerly Exceeds Requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 - 3.74</td>
<td>Standard professional performance (formerly Meets Requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 - 2.99</td>
<td>Minimal professional performance (formerly Needs Improvement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 1.99</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory professional performance (formerly Unacceptable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. SERVICE RATING

3. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES RATING

4. CALCULATION OF THE OVERALL FACULTY EVALUATION RATING

Declared Weights:

- Teaching Effectiveness (From 50% - 70%)
- Service (From 10% - 30%)
- Professional Activities (From 10% - 30%)

\[
\text{Round to two decimals.}
\]

Overall Faculty Evaluation Rating: _______
Cumulative Reviews:
Promotion, Tenure,
Pre-Tenure, Post-Tenure
Promotion and Tenure Process

1. **Eligibility**
   
a. Eligibility for promotion at GPC is based on the following:
   
   (1) Minimum qualifications are met based on Board of Regents' Criteria for Promotion and Georgia Perimeter College’s Criteria for Promotion.
   
   (2) Faculty members should assume responsibility for keeping track of their progress toward promotion. **The Office of Educational Affairs will clarify any uncertainty regarding status.**
   
b. Eligibility for tenure at GPC is based on the following:
   
   (1) Minimum qualifications are met based on Board of Regents’ Policy on Tenure and Georgia Perimeter College’s Criteria for Tenure.
   
   (2) Faculty members should assume responsibility for keeping track of their progress toward tenure. **The Office of Educational Affairs will clarify any uncertainty regarding status.**

2. **Procedures for Applying for Promotion and/or Tenure**

   All deliberations concerning promotion and tenure will remain confidential to the extent provided by law.

   a. Faculty members who meet eligibility requirements for promotion and/or tenure must file a letter of intent to apply with their respective department chair by the end of spring term for the next academic year if they wish to be considered.

   On the first Friday of class of the fall term of eligibility, a formal request for consideration for promotion and/or tenure must be submitted to the department chair. Requests for consideration must be accompanied by a **complete set** of the following items, placed in the appropriate folder provided by the Dean of Academic Services for review by the Promotion and Tenure Panel and the Dean of Academic Services. It is the faculty member's responsibility, in collaboration with the department chair, to assure that the application for promotion and/or tenure is complete. Faculty should be encouraged to submit materials for evaluation in a timely manner. Once the application has been submitted to the campus academic dean, the faculty member will **not** be allowed to submit additional materials for consideration.
(1) A letter in which the faculty member demonstrates having met the requirements necessary for promotion or tenure (if applying for both, a letter should be written for each).

(2) A complete and up-to-date vitae.

(3) All copies of the faculty member’s Faculty Portfolio for previous years at GPC, not to exceed five years. For all years prior to 1997-98, substitute the Faculty Annual Report. Course materials are evaluated as a part of the Annual Performance Review of Faculty and should not be included in the promotion/tenure application packet. The Faculty Portfolio for the previous year (which does include course materials) will be submitted in a separate packet to the department chair.

c. The department chair completes the application folder for promotion and/or tenure by adding all copies of the Annual Performance Review of Faculty Member for previous years at GPC, not to exceed five years. For all years prior to 1997-98, substitute the Annual Department Chair Evaluation of Faculty.

d. The department chair submits the completed folder for promotion and/or tenure to the Office of Educational Affairs where the promotion/tenure recommendation form is added. Upon completion of the promotion and/or tenure application folder, the Office of Educational Affairs forwards the applicant’s folder directly to the appropriate Promotion and Tenure panel.

3. **Promotion and Tenure Panels**

The Promotion and Tenure Panels will review all applications for promotion, tenure, pre-tenure and post-tenure review. The recommendation of the Promotion and Tenure Panel is forwarded as part of the appropriate application through the review process. If the Promotion and Tenure Panel can not reach consensus, a majority and minority report regarding the recommendation should be submitted.

**Membership:**

The panels will be disciplined-based and composed of an elected group of the applicant’s tenured peers and the appropriate department chair. The panels will be composed of four faculty members, elected annually, from those tenured faculty in their respective disciplines, as well as the department chair of the applicant. (When a department chair applies for tenure/promotion, his or her campus Dean of Academic Service will become the fifth panel member.) No faculty member who is currently being reviewed for promotion, tenure, or post-tenure will be eligible for membership on the panel.
PROCESS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE RECOMMENDATIONS

- BOARD OF REGENTS
- PRESIDENT
  - REVIEW PROCESS
  - VICE PRESIDENT FOR EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS
  - DEAN OF ACADEMIC SERVICES
  - PROMOTION AND TENURE PANEL
    - FACULTY MEMBER
Discipline Groups:
The disciplines included in this selection process are as follows:
- Business
- English/Speech
- Foreign Language/English as a Second Language/Fine Arts/Sign Language Interpreting (SLI) if applicable
- Mathematics/Computer Science/Engineering
- Dental Hygiene/Nursing/Physical Education/Fire Management
- Science
- Social Science
- Librarians

For all discipline groups except Foreign Language/ESL/Fine Arts/SLI and Dental Hygiene/Nursing/PE, the Promotion and Tenure Panels will consist of the following members:

- One faculty member - Clarkston
- One faculty member - Dunwoody
- One faculty member - Lawrenceville/Decatur/Rockdale
- One faculty member - at-large

For Foreign Language/ESL/Fine Arts/SLI, the Promotion and Tenure Panel will consist of four faculty members from each department. If there are no individuals applying for promotion from Sign Language Interpreting, one faculty member-at-large will be chosen.

For Dental Hygiene/Nursing/PE/Fire Management, the Promotion and Tenure Panel will consist of the one faculty from each of the three departments (Dental Hygiene, Nursing, and Physical Education) and one faculty member-at-large.

Election:
Promotion and Tenure Panel members will be elected for a one-year term. Non-tenured faculty may be considered eligible only if an insufficient number of faculty members have received tenure to meet the membership guidelines.

The election of faculty members to these panels will be carried out by the Office of the Vice President for Educational Affairs early in spring term, by secret ballot, from a list of faculty members currently eligible to serve.

For each discipline group except Foreign Language/ESL/Fine Arts/ SLI and Dental Hygiene/Nursing/PE, the ballot will contain the names of all eligible faculty members on all campuses. Using an approval voting system, each faculty member will vote for every individual who is acceptable as a member of the panel. The faculty member will fill the campus-designated positions on each panel with the highest number of votes on each campus. The remaining faculty member with the highest vote will fill the member-at-large position after the campus representatives have been selected.
For Foreign Language/ESL/Fine Arts/SLI and Dental Hygiene/Nursing/PE, the ballot will contain the names of all eligible faculty members in all departments within the discipline group. Using an approval voting system, each faculty member will vote for every acceptable faculty member on the ballot. The faculty member will fill the department-designated position on each panel with the highest number of votes in each department. The remaining faculty member will fill the member-at-large position with the highest number of votes after the department representatives have been selected.

For each position on the panels, if the individual with the greatest number of votes cannot serve, the individual with the next highest number of votes will be elected.

While department chairs are not eligible to serve on these panels, they are allowed to participate in the election.

**Chairperson:**

The chairperson will be elected from the faculty membership of the panel.

**Duties of the chairperson**

1. To ensure that all reviews are conducted within the time frame outlined in the Implementation Timetables for Faculty Seeking Promotion and/or Tenure, and the Implementation Timetable for Faculty Undergoing Pre/Post Tenure Review

2. To ensure the integrity and confidentiality of the process

3. To ensure the security of the Promotion and/or Tenure files at all times

4. To conduct the voting process, to compile and summarize the recommendations, to secure appropriate signatures, and forward the documents to the appropriate person(s)

5. To serve as the Promotion/Tenure Panel representative on the Promotion and Tenure Review Panel.
4. **Dean of Academic Services Review**

a. **Procedure for Recommendation**

(1) After receiving the recommendation from the Promotion and Tenure Panel, in addition to the documents submitted by the faculty member, the Dean of Academic Services signs the Promotion Recommendation Form and/or Tenure Recommendation Form, appending a summary statement which supports the recommendation for promotion and/or tenure of the faculty member (see pp. 85 and 86 for format).

(2) The Dean of Academic Services submits the folder to the Office of Educational Affairs; folder is forwarded to the Vice President for Educational Affairs.

b. **Procedure for Non-recommendation**

(1) The Dean of Academic Services notifies the faculty member of his/her intention not to recommend the faculty member for promotion and/or tenure.

(2) The faculty member may appeal the decision in writing following these guidelines:

(a) Faculty member must submit a written appeal to the Dean of Academic Services as designated in the Implementation Timetable for Faculty Seeking Promotion and/or Tenure for the current academic year.

(b) The written appeal (in the form of a summary statement with supporting evidence) must specifically identify the criteria to be reconsidered: teaching effectiveness**, service*, and/or professional activities*.

*PROMOTION: show professional accomplishments and service, with emphasis on accomplishments and service since last promotion

**TENURE: provide a brief description of the academic accomplishments of the faculty member

(3) In the event of a written appeal, the Dean of Academic Services must, upon receipt, review the appeal.

(a) The Dean of Academic Services writes a letter endorsing the appeal or explaining a denial. The Dean gives one signed original letter, marked confidential, to the faculty member submitting the appeal.

(b) The Dean of Academic Services submits the folder with a copy of the letter of endorsement or denial to the Vice President for Educational Affairs.
In the event of non-recommendation of promotion and/or tenure and of no appeal of the decision by the faculty member, the Dean of Academic Services forwards materials to the Office of Educational Affairs for record.

5. **Vice President for Educational Affairs Review**

a. The Vice President for Educational Affairs will make recommendations on promotion and tenure to the President and will notify faculty members in writing of the recommendation. A negative recommendation from the Vice President for Educational Affairs goes no further, unless the applicant requests a review by the President.

b. If the President does not wish to endorse an affirmative recommendation by the Vice President, then the President will notify the faculty member within four (4) working days of receipt of the Vice President's recommendation.

c. Any faculty member receiving an adverse recommendation on promotion and/or tenure from the Vice President for Educational Affairs has the right to a review by a Promotion and Tenure Review Panel and the President.

d. Faculty members who wish a review of an adverse recommendation on promotion and/or tenure must submit a letter to the President requesting a review. The letter must meet the following guidelines:

   (1) State the basis of the review.

   (2) Include the following:

      (a) Designate a faculty representative (from the same discipline group as the appellant).

      (b) Include a signed statement from the designated faculty member stating his/her acceptance and willingness to serve.

      (c) Indicate whether or not the appellant wishes to appear before the Promotion and Tenure Review Panel.

   (3) Letter must be received by the President according to the **Implementation Timetable for Faculty Seeking Promotion and/or Tenure** (see p. 12).

e. After considering the information presented at the review, the President will make a decision within five (5) working days following the date of the appellant’s review and inform the faculty member, the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Panel, the appropriate Dean of Academic Services, and the Vice President for Educational Affairs.
Georgia Perimeter College’s Criteria for Promotion

Use the following scale to convert the numerical rating of teaching effectiveness on the Annual Performance Review to a performance standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerical rating</th>
<th>Performance standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.50 – 5.00</td>
<td>Exemplary professional performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(formerly Outstanding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.75 – 4.49</td>
<td>High professional performance (formerly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds Requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 – 3.74</td>
<td>Standard professional performance (formerly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meets Requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 – 2.99</td>
<td>Minimal professional performance (formerly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs Improvement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 – 1.99</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory professional performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(formerly Unacceptable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assistant Professor**

I. Standard professional performance or better is required for three consecutive years of evaluations in teaching effectiveness, service, and professional activities. Approved medical leaves, approved leaves of absence without pay, and professional enhancement are not considered to be a break in service for consecutive evaluation purposes.

II. Degree and experience requirements:

- Earned doctorate in an area appropriate to the discipline
- Master’s degree plus 45 quarter hours (or 30 semester hours) appropriate to the discipline and three years’ successful full-time teaching experience at GPC as an Instructor in a full-time permanent, ranked position.
- Master’s degree and five years’ successful full-time teaching experience. At least three years must be at GPC as an Instructor in a full-time permanent, ranked position.

Note: Degree requirement must be met by the date on which formal request for consideration is submitted to the department chair (currently the first Friday of class in fall term). Full-time teaching experience is defined as teaching an entire academic year on a yearly contract.

**When a faculty member receives a doctorate, he/she is immediately considered eligible for promotion to Assistant Professor.

Associate Professor
I. Standard professional performance or better is required for four consecutive years of evaluations in teaching effectiveness, service, and professional activities. Approved medical leaves, approved leaves of absence without pay, and professional enhancement are not considered to be a break in service for consecutive evaluation purposes.

II. High professional performance or exemplary professional performance is required in teaching effectiveness for three out of four years.

III. High professional performance or exemplary professional performance in either service or professional activities is required for three out of four years. (The high or exemplary performance need not be in the same area each year.)

IV. Degree and experience requirements:

   Six years’ successful full-time college teaching experience. At least four years must be at the Assistant Professor rank at GPC.

   and

   Earned doctorate in an area appropriate to the discipline

   or

   Master’s degree plus 45 quarter hours (or 30 semester hours) appropriate to the discipline

   or

   Master’s degree and exemplary professional performance in teaching effectiveness for four out of five years.

Note: Degree requirement must be met by the date on which formal request for consideration is submitted to the department chair (currently the first Friday of class in fall term). Full-time teaching experience is defined as teaching an entire academic year on a yearly contract.

Professor

I. Standard professional performance or better is required for five consecutive years of evaluations in teaching effectiveness, service, and professional activities. Approved medical leaves, approved leaves of absence without pay, and professional enhancement are not considered to be a break in service for consecutive evaluation purposes.

II. Exemplary professional performance is required in teaching effectiveness for three out of five years.

III. High professional performance or exemplary professional performance in either service or professional activities is required for four out of five years. (The high or exemplary performance need not be in the same area each year.)

IV. Degree and experience requirements:
Eight years’ successful full-time college teaching experience. At least five years must be at the Associate Professor rank at GPC.

and

Earned doctorate in an area appropriate to the discipline

Note: Degree requirement must be met by the date on which formal request for consideration is submitted to the department chair (currently the first Friday of class in fall term). Full-time teaching experience is defined as teaching an entire academic year on a yearly contract.
Tenure will be recommended only for faculty with the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Tenure may be recommended upon a faculty member’s completion of five years of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor or higher.

Consideration may be given for any probationary credit earned toward tenure. Up to three years of probationary credit may be awarded when a faculty member at one of the three professorial ranks is hired in accordance with Regent’s policy. Upon recommendation of the President, the Board of Regents may approve tenure upon initial appointment of a person at the rank of associate professor or professor (Board of Regents’ policy 803.09). Starting with the 1993-94 academic year, those who attain the rank of assistant professor may be awarded probationary credit toward tenure. If the faculty member has been at the college for two years, he/she may be awarded one year; if the faculty member has been at the college three years, he/she may be awarded two years; if the faculty member has been at the college four or more years, he/she may be awarded three years.

The maximum time that may be served on tenure track at the rank of assistant professor or above without the award of tenure is seven years. The maximum time that may be served on tenure track in any combination of full-time instructional appointment (instructor or professorial ranks) without the award of tenure is ten years.

The award of tenure is based on the instructional and institutional needs of the college, which include programs, enrollment, and fiscal considerations. When these needs warrant, tenure is awarded if the faculty member meets all the following criteria.

1. **Rank**
   The faculty member must hold the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor.

2. **Length of Service**
   Tenure may be recommended upon a faculty member’s completion of five years of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor and higher including any probationary credit earned toward tenure.

3. **Ratings from Annual Evaluation**
   The award of tenure is based on each of the three areas of annual evaluation rather than the total score derived from annual evaluation. Therefore, individual ratings in the areas of Teaching Effectiveness, Service, and Professional Activities over a period of five years will be used to determine tenure. For four out of five years, the faculty member must have earned a rating of at least standard professional performance in each of the three areas: Teaching Effectiveness, Service, and Professional Activities.
Tenure Guidelines for Academic Administrators

The Academic Affairs area has people in tenure-track positions who serve in the unique capacity of both administrators and faculty members. This condition applies to department chairs, Deans of Academic Services, and Vice Presidents. It is universally recognized that people in administrative positions should not hold tenure in the administrative position. It is also true that people whose primary function is academics and whose background is in academics should be tenured in the academic area.

The College would place people in the position of leading and supervising academic disciplines only if they would be considered for tenure in these disciplines. Academic administrators, by definition, should be among the best and most qualified faculty.

Tenure for administrators in the Academic Affairs area is awarded based upon the following requirements:

1. Administrator’s record of performance, which must include superior teaching

2. Recommendation for tenure by his or her immediate supervisor

3. Guidelines for eligibility are:
   a. Five or more years of continuous service at Georgia Perimeter College or if granted up to two years of probationary credit toward tenure at the time the administrator is hired, which added to service at Georgia Perimeter College, must equal five years and
   b. One of the following:
      (1) Is actively teaching in discipline, or
      (2) Has taught as a full-time faculty member for five consecutive years or taught a reduced load while carrying out administrative responsibilities for five consecutive years

4. Instructional and institutional needs of the College, which include program needs, enrollment, and fiscal considerations

5. Other criteria
   a. Involvement and improvement in one's area of responsibility
   b. Support of other faculty, other departments, other campuses, and institutional goals
   c. Active sharing of professional expertise with the community
1. New faculty members will undergo a pre-tenure review during their third year. Faculty hired with one or two years of probationary credit will undergo a pre-tenure review during their second year. Faculty members who receive three years of probationary credit when hired are not required to undergo a pre-tenure review. Pre-tenure review and promotion applications are separate processes that may occur simultaneously. The promotion application process does not exempt a faculty member from pre-tenure review.

2. The Promotion and Tenure Panel, including the department chair, will conduct the review. In the case of a department chair, the Dean of Academic Services is the fifth panel member.

3. The faculty member will submit by early February a packet containing the following material:
   a. a current vitae
   b. statement (not to exceed three pages) prepared by the faculty member detailing accomplishments in the areas of teaching effectiveness, service, and professional activities since being hired by the College
   c. all faculty portfolios for annual evaluation, except for course materials, and all department chair annual evaluations. The Promotion and Tenure Panel will consider the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching effectiveness, service, and professional activities during the evaluation period. By majority vote, the panel will reach one of the findings outlined in the next paragraph. The report of the panel must be submitted to the appropriate department chair by the date described in the Timeline for Implementation for Faculty Undergoing Pre-Tenure or Post-Tenure Review.

4. Possible findings and criteria:
   - Satisfactory Progress toward Tenure
   - Unsatisfactory Progress toward Tenure

   A favorable result does not bind an institution to recommend the individual for promotion and/or tenure when the requisite years in rank or requisite years of probationary service have been established.

5. After the completion of the pre-tenure review, the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Panel will send a copy of the report of the panel to the faculty member’s department chair. The department chair will then meet with the faculty member to review the contents of the report. After the department chair and the faculty member have signed the report, the department chair will send the report, along with all supporting documentation, to the Dean of Academic Services. The faculty member may submit a written response to the report within ten working days after receipt of the report.

6. In the event of a finding of Unsatisfactory Progress, the faculty member and his/her department chair will prepare a pre-tenure development plan to correct the deficiencies. This plan will be completed by the end of the academic year.
The department chair will prepare a progress report on this plan during early February of each year during which the plan remains in effect. The department chair will submit both the pre-tenure development plan and the progress report to the Dean of Academic Services, the Campus Provost, and the Vice President for Educational Affairs.

7. Pre-tenure review is designed to assist new faculty members in determining their progress toward earning tenure and to help them identify deficiencies that should be addressed prior to applying for tenure. Because of the advisory nature of the review, the findings are not subject to appeal. If the faculty member disagrees with the findings of the pre-tenure review, he/she may prepare a written response that will be attached to the report of the Promotion and Tenure Panel. The report of the Promotion and Tenure Panel and any written response by the faculty member will become a part of the faculty member’s personnel file; however, neither document will be a part of any packet examined by later Promotion and Tenure Panels considering promotion and/or tenure decisions.
Georgia Perimeter College’s Process for Post-Tenure Review

1. Tenured faculty members will undergo a post-tenure review every five years beginning five years after the award of tenure or the most recent promotion. Tenured faculty members, whose primary assignment is administrative, without major teaching responsibilities, will not be subject to post-tenure review. When that person returns to a faculty position, he or she will undergo a post-tenure review five years after returning to faculty status. Faculty members who have committed to retirement by July 1 will not be subject to post-tenure review in the following year. If a faculty member is due for both promotion and post-tenure review in the same year, post-tenure review will be waived. However, if the application for promotion is denied, the faculty member will undergo post-tenure review the following year.

2. The Promotion and Tenure Panel, including the department chair, will conduct the review. In the case of a department chair, the Dean of Academic Services is the fifth panel member.

3. The faculty member will submit by early February (see Timeline for Faculty Undergoing Pre-or Post-Tenure Review, p. 15) a packet containing the following material:
   
   a. A current curriculum vitae

   b. A statement (not to exceed three pages) prepared by the faculty member detailing accomplishments in the areas of teaching effectiveness, service, and professional activities during the previous five years

   c. The five most recent faculty portfolios for annual evaluation, except for course materials, and the five most recent Annual Performance Reviews

   d. Goals for the next five years

4. The Promotion and Tenure Panel will consider and discuss the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching effectiveness, service, and professional activities for the previous five years. By majority vote, the panel will reach one of the findings outlined below. The report of the panel is due on the date stipulated each year in the Timeline for Faculty Undergoing Pre-or Post-Tenure Review.

5. Possible findings and criteria:
   
   Exemplary Performance and Accomplishment
   Good Performance with no deficiencies
   Satisfactory Performance with minor deficiencies
   Unsatisfactory Performance

6. After the completion of the post-tenure review, the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Panel will send a copy of the report of the panel to the faculty member’s department chair. The department chair will then meet with the faculty member to review the contents of the report. After the department chair and the faculty member have signed the report, the department chair will send the report, with all supporting documentation, to the Dean of Academic Services. The faculty member may appeal an unsatisfactory finding within ten working days after the receipt of the report (see #7 below). If a faculty member disagrees with any other
finding, he or she may submit a written response within ten working days after the receipt of the report.

7. In the event of a finding of Unsatisfactory Performance, the faculty member and his/her department chair will prepare a post-tenure development plan to correct the deficiencies. This plan will be completed by the end of the academic year. The department chair will prepare a progress report on this plan during early February of each year during which the plan remains in effect. The department chair will send copies of both the development plan and the progress reports to the Dean of Academic Services, Campus Provost, and Vice President for Educational Affairs.

In three years, the Dean of Academic Services will determine if the deficiencies have been remedied. If the deficiencies have been corrected, then the faculty member will undergo another post-tenure review in two years. If the deficiencies have not been corrected, the faculty member may be subject to dismissal for cause under Board of Regents’ Policy 803.09.

8. A faculty member may appeal a finding of Unsatisfactory Performance to an appeals panel composed of the faculty member’s Dean of Academic Services, a member of the faculty selected by the appellant from the appellant’s discipline group (as defined for the Promotion and Tenure Panels), and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Panel. Such an appeal must be submitted within ten working days of the receipt of the report of the Promotion and Tenure Panel. This Panel will submit a recommendation to the Vice President for Educational Affairs, who will forward this recommendation, along with his or her own recommendation, to the President. The President will make a final determination.
Georgia Perimeter College
Criteria for Pre-Tenure and Post-Tenure Review

Note: For evaluations prior to 1998-1999, the terminology of the former evaluation system was still in use. The following equivalents should be used:

- Exemplary Professional Performance (EP) equals Outstanding
- High Professional Performance (HP) equals Exceeds Requirements
- Standard Professional Performance (SP) equals Meets Requirements

Pre-Tenure:
Satisfactory Progress: The faculty member demonstrates standard professional performance or better in teaching effectiveness, service, and professional activities for two consecutive years.
(Note: A finding of satisfactory progress does not bind the institution to recommend the faculty member for promotion and/or tenure when required years or experience have been established.)

Unsatisfactory Progress: The faculty member received a rating below standard professional performance in one of the three areas during the past two years.

Post-Tenure:
Exemplary Performance:

I. Standard professional performance or better is required for five consecutive years for teaching effectiveness, service, and professional activities.

II. Exemplary professional performance in teaching effectiveness is required for three out of five years.

III. High professional performance or exemplary professional performance in either service or professional activities for four out of five years is required. This rating need not be in the same area each year.

Good Performance:

I. Standard professional performance or better is required for five consecutive years for teaching effectiveness, service, and professional activities.

II. High professional performance or exemplary professional performance in teaching effectiveness, service, or professional activities is required for three out of five years. This rating need not be in the same area each year.

Satisfactory Performance, with minor deficiencies:

Standard professional performance or better is required for four out of five years in teaching effectiveness, service, and professional activities.

Unsatisfactory Performance:

Faculty members who do not meet the criteria for a rating of Satisfactory Performance, with minor deficiencies, i.e., do not demonstrate standard professional performance or better for four out of five years in teaching effectiveness, service, or professional activities, will be rated as Unsatisfactory.

(Change 2/27/03)
**Promotion and Tenure Review Panel**

**PURPOSE:** To provide additional information to the President concerning a faculty member’s appeal to an adverse recommendation by the Vice President for Educational Affairs regarding promotion/tenure

**MEMBERSHIP:** The faculty member’s Dean of Academic Services, a faculty representative (from the same discipline group as the appellant), and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Panel

**PROCEDURE:** After considering the information presented at the review session, the President will make a decision within five (5) working days following the date of the appellant’s review, and inform the faculty member, the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Panel, the Dean of Academic Services, and Vice President for Educational Affairs.
Cumulative Review Instruments
Recommendations For Promotion

2006-07 Academic Year

Name of Institution: Georgia Perimeter College

Name of Individual: ________________________________

Social Security Number: ________________________________

Highest Degree Earned: ________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Total Number of Years’ Teaching Experience: ________________________________

Number of Years Teaching at Georgia Perimeter College: ________________________________

Present Rank and Title: ________________________________

Type of Tenure Track: ________________________________

Years in Present Rank and Title at the Institution: ________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Recommended Rank and Title: ________________________________

Number of Years Probationary Credit Toward Tenure: ________________________________

Recommendations and Summary of Actions

(All documentation supporting recommendations should be attached per instructions in the Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Handbook.)

Chair of Promotion and Tenure Panel: ________________________________ Yes ___ No ___

Dean of Academic Services: ________________________________ Yes ___ No ___

Vice President for Educational Affairs: ________________________________ Yes ___ No ___
Recommendation For Tenure
2006-07 Academic Year

Name of Institution: Georgia Perimeter College

Name of Individual:__________________________________________

Social Security Number:_____________________________________

Highest Degree Earned, Date Earned, and Institution of Highest Degree Earned:
____________________________________________________________________

Number of Years Teaching at Georgia Perimeter College:______________

Present Rank and Title: __________________________________________

Note Recommendation for Promotion (if applicable) to: ________________

Number of Years at Rank of Assistant Professor or Above at GPC: _________

Number of Years Probationary Credit Toward Tenure:______________

Recommendations and Summary of Actions

(All documentation supporting recommendations should be attached per instructions in the Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Handbook.)

Chair of Promotion and Tenure Panel:__________________________ Yes ___ No ___

Dean of Academic Services:_______________________________ Yes ___ No ___

Vice President for Educational Affairs:__________________________ Yes ___ No ___
Report of the Promotion and Tenure Panel
Promotion Review

Faculty member: ________________________________

By majority vote, the panel finds that the faculty member is

_______  Recommended for promotion to ________________

_______  Not recommended for promotion to ________________

Attach a summary of the faculty member’s performance in each of the following areas:

A. Teaching Effectiveness
B. Service
C. Professional Activities

Attach a narrative statement, suggested length of one page, addressing each of the three areas, teaching effectiveness, service, and professional/scholarly activities. Each area should be addressed regarding meeting the criteria for promotion for the rank for which the applicant is applying. A non-recommendation requires a statement describing deficiencies and recommendations for improvement.

Committee Signatures:

______________________________________  ___________________
Date

______________________________________  ___________________
Date

______________________________________  ___________________
Date

Chair of Promotion and Tenure Panel  Date

Department Chair  Date
Report of the Promotion and Tenure Panel  
Tenure Review

Faculty member___________________________________________________________

By majority vote, the panel finds that the faculty member is:

______ Recommended for tenure

______ Not recommended for tenure

Attach a summary of the faculty member’s performance in each of the following areas:

A. Teaching Effectiveness
B. Service
C. Professional Activities

Attach a narrative statement, suggested length of one page, addressing each of the three areas, teaching effectiveness, service, and professional/scholarly activities. Each area should be addressed regarding meeting the criteria for tenure. A summary statement related to the overall recommendation should also be included. A non-recommendation requires a statement describing deficiencies and recommendations for improvement.

Committee Signatures:

______________________________________  ___________________  Date

______________________________________  ___________________  Date

______________________________________  ___________________  Date

______________________________________  ___________________  Date

Chair of Promotion and Tenure Panel  Date

Department Chair  Date
Report of the Promotion and Tenure Panel
Pre-Tenure Review

Faculty member: ________________________________________________________________

By majority vote, the panel finds that the faculty member is making

_____  Satisfactory Progress toward Tenure
_____  Unsatisfactory Progress toward Tenure

Attach a summary of the faculty member’s performance in each of the following areas:

A. Teaching Effectiveness
B. Service
C. Professional Activities

Attach a narrative statement, suggested length of one page, addressing each of the three areas, teaching effectiveness, service, and professional/ scholarly activities. Each area should be addressed regarding meeting the criteria for pre-tenure. A summary statement related to the overall recommendation should also be included. A non-recommendation requires a statement describing deficiencies and recommendations for improvement.

Committee Signatures:

______________________________________  ___________________
Date

______________________________________  ___________________
Date

______________________________________  ___________________
Date

Chair of Promotion and Tenure Panel  Date

Department Chair  Date

Faculty Member’s Acknowledgement:  I have reviewed this report with my supervisor. My signature does not necessarily mean that I agree with this report. I may attach a written response to this report within ten working days. This response must be signed and dated.

______________________________________  ___________________
Faculty Member  Date

Dean of Academic Services  Date
Pre-Tenure Development Plan
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

I. Specific goals of the development plan:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

II. Activities which will be undertaken to achieve the desired goals:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

III. Timeline for achieving the goals of the plan:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

IV. Criteria for determining whether the goals have been achieved:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

V. Resources required to implement the development plan:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Faculty Member’s Acknowledgement: I have received a copy of this development plan from my supervisor. I understand that my supervisor will evaluate my progress on this plan on an annual basis.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Faculty Member  Date

Department Chair  Date

Dean of Academic Services  Date

Copies to Campus Provost and Vice President for Educational Affairs
I. Provide a summary of the activities completed during the previous academic year in the Pre-Tenure Development Plan.

II. Assess the status of each of the goals as achieved, partially achieved, or no progress made.

Faculty Member’s Acknowledgement: I have reviewed this report with my supervisor. My signature does not necessarily mean that I agree with this report. I may attach a written response to this report within ten working days. This response must be signed and dated.

Faculty Member

Date

Department Chair

Date

Dean of Academic Services

Date

Copies to Campus Provost and Vice President for Educational Affairs
Report of the Promotion and Tenure Panel
Post-Tenure Review

Faculty member: ________________________________

By majority vote, the panel finds that the faculty member’s performance is

_______ Exemplary
_______ Good, with no deficiencies
_______ Satisfactory, with minor deficiencies
_______ Unsatisfactory

Attach a summary of the faculty member’s performance in each of the following areas:

A. Teaching Effectiveness
B. Service
C. Professional Activities

Attach a narrative statement, suggested length of one page, addressing each of the three areas, teaching effectiveness, service, and professional/scholarly activities. Each area should be addressed regarding meeting the criteria for post-tenure. A summary statement related to the overall recommendation should also be included. A non-recommendation requires a statement describing deficiencies and recommendations for improvement.

Committee Signatures:

__________________________________________  ____________________
Date
__________________________________________  ____________________
Date
__________________________________________  ____________________
Date

Chair of Promotion and Tenure Panel  Date

Department Chair  Date

**Faculty Member’s Acknowledgement:** I have reviewed this report with my supervisor. My signature does not necessarily mean that I agree with this report. I may attach a written response to this report within ten working days. This response must be signed and dated. I may appeal an unsatisfactory finding within ten days. This appeal must be signed and dated.

__________________________________________  ____________________
Faculty Member  Date

__________________________________________  ____________________
Dean of Academic Services  Date
Post-Tenure Development Plan
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

I. Specific goals of the development plan:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

II. Activities which will be undertaken to achieve the desired goals:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

III. Timeline for achieving the goals of the plan:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

IV. Criteria for determining whether the goals have been achieved:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

V. Resources required to implement the development plan:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Faculty Member’s Acknowledgement: I have received a copy of this development plan from my supervisor. I understand that my supervisor will evaluate my process on this plan on an annual basis.

________________________________________________________________________

Faculty Member ___________________________ Date ___________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Department Chair __________________________ Date __________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Dean of Academic Services __________________________ Date ______________________

Copies to Campus Provost and Vice President for Educational Affairs
Provide a summary of the activities completed during the previous academic year in the Post-Tenure Development Plan.

I. Assess the status of each of the goals as achieved, partially achieved, or no progress made.

Faculty Member’s Acknowledgement: I have reviewed this report with my supervisor. My signature does not necessarily mean that I agree with this report. I may attach a written response to this report within ten working days. This response must be signed and dated.

Faculty Member ____________________ Date ____________________

Dean of Academic Services ____________________ Date ____________________

Copies to Campus Provost and Vice President for Educational Affairs
SAMPLE DOCUMENTS
Faculty Vitae Format
(Sample Document)

Curriculum Vitae
OF
MARY ANN SMITH

Employment History

1987-Present  Associate Professor - Georgia Perimeter College
1980-1987  Associate Professor of Chemistry: LaGrange College
1975-1980  Assistant Professor of Chemistry: Slippery Rock State Teacher College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania

Academic Achievement

A. EDUCATION

June 7, 1977  Doctor of Philosophy
Major: Chemistry  Minor: Geology
University of Pennsylvania

May 31, 1974  Master of Science
Major: Chemistry  Minor: Geology
Rutgers - The State University

June 9, 1969  Bachelor of Science
Major: Chemistry  Minor: Geology
University of Pittsburgh

B. HONORS AND SPECIAL RECOGNITION

1989  Received Teaching Effectiveness Grant from Georgia Perimeter College
1984  American Chemical Society’s Award for Excellence in Teaching
1982  University of Pittsburgh Outstanding Alumni Award
1979  National Science Foundation Traineeship for Post Doctoral Summer Studies
C. PUBLICATIONS


Include military service if appropriate; include only full-time work experience.

Professional Growth and Development

A. PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES AND RELATED ORGANIZATIONS

1969-Present American Chemical Society

1980-Present Georgia Chemical Society (Treasurer, 1982; Vice President, 1988)

1975-Present National Science Teachers Association

B. PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS


“Breakthrough in Computer use for Health Science Chemistry Courses,” American Chemical Society’s Conference on Teaching, Miami, Florida, June 1989.

C. PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES ATTENDED

1976-Present National Conference of the National Science Teacher Association

1980-Present State Conference of the Georgia Chemistry Society


1990 Regional Conference on Critical Thinking Instructional Strategies for Staff and Organizational Development, Miami, Florida

D. OTHER

1983 Special Study Performed for the Chairman, American Chemical Society, on Techniques of Utilizing Computers in Chemical Industry Staff Training

Service to the Institution
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Committee/Committee(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982-87</td>
<td>College Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presidential Search Committee-LaGrange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>Central Campus Adopt-A-School Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-90</td>
<td>Recruitment and Retention Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate, Faculty Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>SACS Committee on Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literary Arts Festival Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service to the Community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Organization/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985-Present</td>
<td>DeKalb County Historical Society (Treasurer 1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-Present</td>
<td>Speaker at several civic clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, and Lions) on AIDS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEAN OF ACADEMIC SERVICES
SUMMARY OF XXXXX XXXXXX’S SERVICE TO GEORGIA PERIMETER COLLEGE
WHICH SUPPORTS A RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

 XXXXXX’s contributions to Georgia Perimeter College are many and varied. His
dedication to learning is quite apparent in his formal academic presentation as well as the
inordinate amount of time he spends working on his classroom presentation.

 XXXXXX’s service to Georgia Perimeter College outside of the classroom includes all
aspects of the college environment. To present examples of his involvement, he has recently
served as the chair of the Textbook Adoption Committee in his area of expertise, chair of his
discipline’s Course-Based Assessment Committee, and as Chair of the West Campus Symposium.
XXXXXX is active outside of his Department. He is chair of the West Campus Faculty Advisory
Council and also serves as collegewide chair of this group.

 XXX.XXXXXX is recommended for promotion to assistant professor.
XX.XXXXXX received a M.P.A. degree from Montana State University. She also holds Certified Public Accountants’ credentials. XX.XXXXXX is actively involved in the development of accounting education; during the past two years, she has been a facilitator at the Annual Conference on Accounting Education.

She has been active in national, state, and local professional organizations throughout her professional career. Examples of her active memberships range from the Georgia Association of Accounting Instructors to the American Accounting Association. She has consistently attended national, state, and local conferences to remain current in the teaching field. She is active presenter at these conferences; this past year she made a presentation at the Montana Assessment Conference and at the Center for Advancement of Teaching and Learning. XX.XXXXXX has also published two articles during the past year in the *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice* and the *Proceedings of the Montana Assessment Conference*.

XX.XXXXXX has worked diligently for the institution serving on College committees; during the past two years, she has chaired five faculty search committees.

XX.XXXXXX is recommended for tenure.
GEORGIA PERIMETER COLLEGE FIRST TERM PROGRESS REPORT/NEW FACULTY AND FULL-TIME TEMPORARY FACULTY (TERM-TO TERM CONTRACTS)

Employee’s Name: ____________________________________________________________
Job Title: ___________________________ Department: ___________________
Evaluator’s Name/Title: ______________________________________________________

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:
A. Outstanding - B. Exceeds Requirements - C. Meets Requirements - D. Needs Improvement -
E. Unacceptable - F. Not Applicable

(Definitions may be found in the Annual Performance Evaluation or in the Faculty Handbook)

PLACE LETTER OF PERFORMANCE STANDARD IN THE SPACE FOLLOWING THE
PERFORMANCE INDICATED. PLEASE INDICATE SPECIFIC AREA OF NEEDED
IMPROVEMENT.

JOB KNOWLEDGE
1. Has knowledge of position responsibilities __________
   Comments:_____________________________________________________________
2. Content knowledge __________
   Comments:_____________________________________________________________
3. Summary of classroom observation: _________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________

PLANNING AND ORGANIZATION
1. Meets objectives and goals on time __________
   Comments:_____________________________________________________________
2. Consults with others __________
   Comments:_____________________________________________________________
3. Accepts and follows directions effectively __________
   Comments:_____________________________________________________________
4. Uses college resources effectively __________
   Comments:_____________________________________________________________
5. Attends to details __________
   Comments:_____________________________________________________________
DECISION MAKING

1. Evaluates problems objectively __________
   Comments:_____________________________________________________________

2. Adapts to changing situations _________
   Comments:_____________________________________________________________

COMMUNICATION SKILLS

1. Listens to subordinates, peers, supervisors, and other college constituencies __________
   Comments:_____________________________________________________________

2. Produces clear, timely reports and correspondence __________
   Comments:_____________________________________________________________

INITIATIVE

1. Performs work with a minimum of direction __________
   Comments:_____________________________________________________________

2. Displays initiative
   Comments:_____________________________________________________________

3. Meets job responsibilities innovatively __________
   Comments:_____________________________________________________________

4. Works willingly beyond ordinary requirements when necessary __________
   Comments:_____________________________________________________________

INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT

1. Maintains regular and punctual attendance __________
   Comments:_____________________________________________________________

2. Feels personal responsibility for work performance __________
   Comments:_____________________________________________________________

3. Recognizes and supports objectives of college __________
   Comments:_____________________________________________________________
OVERALL VALUE TO DEPARTMENT

1. Understands and contributes to the goals of the department __________
   Comments:_________________________________________________________________

2. Participates willingly and effectively in carrying out staff decisions __________
   Comments:_________________________________________________________________

3. At this point, would you recommend the individual for renewal for the upcoming academic year? __________
   Comments:_________________________________________________________________
   Other: ___________________________________________________________________

OVERALL REVIEW    Please check the appropriate box to the left of the rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Exceeds Requirements</th>
<th>Meets Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs improvement</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:_________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

EMPLOYEE’S SIGNATURE ____________________________ DATE ___________
EVALUATOR’S SIGNATURE __________________________ DATE ___________

(Signature does not necessarily mean that I agree with this evaluation)
Georgia Perimeter College
Part-time Faculty Evaluation

Policy:

Part-time Instructors must be evaluated during their first term of teaching and once per year for three years following. After three years, instructors must be evaluated at least once during each three-year period thereafter.

Procedure:

During a term in which a part-time faculty member is to be evaluated:

- The chair should arrange for a classroom observation. This observation can be completed by the chair or a designee, and may be announced in advance.
- The observation should be conducted using the Classroom observation form for notes and comments.
- After the observation is complete, the chair or designee should complete the observation form, including comments to indicate areas of strength or weakness.
- The completed observation form should be given to and discussed with (if possible) the part-time instructor. A plan of action to improve weaknesses may be developed.
- Signed copies of the observation checklist should be retained by the department as well as given to the instructor.
- After the term is complete, the chair (or designee) will complete the Part-Time Faculty Evaluation Form, including comments to support the ratings as well as indications of areas of strength and weakness and any suggestions for improvement. If a plan of action was developed, it should be attached with a timetable for implementation and re-evaluation.
- The completed form should be discussed with and signed by the part-time instructor. One copy should be given to the instructor, one retained by the department and one sent to HR.
- Instructors receiving a rating of “U” on an evaluation must be observed and evaluated during their next term of employment at the college.
# Classroom Observation Form

(to be used for part-time and first-year faculty members)

Date: ____________________  Instructor: ____________________________

Time: ____________________  Number of students present: ______________

Course: ___________________  Number of students enrolled: _____________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Presents material appropriate to course objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Presents material appropriate to student knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Includes examples or illustrations to clarify concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Uses instructional aids where appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Uses instructional time efficiently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Delivers lesson in a logical manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provides up-to-date goals/objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Uses instructional methods effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Communicates the material with a sense of enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Speaks about content with authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Speaks clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Encourages student involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Demonstrates respect for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Clarifies content when students fail to understand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Responds constructively to students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Y = Yes    N = No     NA = Not Applicable

Additional Comments:

Faculty Signature: ____________________________  Date: ______________

Observer Signature: ____________________________  Date: ______________

Supervisor Signature: ____________________________  Date: ______________

Georgia Perimeter College
Part-time Faculty Evaluation

Instructor's Name __________________________    Department and Campus __________________________

Supervisor __________________________    Evaluation Term & Year __________________________

Ratings:
E: Instructor exceeds expectations.
S: Instructor meets expectations
U: Instructor does not meet expectations.

Circle Rating. Comments should be included to explain rating.

E  S  U Course Content

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

E  S  U Course Organization and Planning

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

E  S  U Course Presentation

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

E  S  U Student Interaction
(fosters student interest in class, is available for outside assistance)

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
E  S  U  Course Materials  (syllabus, exams, other)

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

E  S  U  Student Evaluations  (if available)

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

E  S  U  Follows College policies  (meets class punctually, holds class for specified time, submits required documentation)

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

Overall Evaluation:  E       S        U

Comments:
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

________________________________   ________________________
Faculty member's signature                      Date

________________________________   ________________________
Supervisor's signature                           Date

Attach any plan of action developed for improvement. Include a timetable for implementation.
Upon completion, submit original to Human Resources, retain copy for department records and give copy to faculty.

Form submitted to Human Resources on _____________  ______  
Date    Initial

Jan. 2003