

Annual Evaluation of Faculty Policy

POLICY STATEMENT

Each faculty member at Augusta University, regardless of rank or responsibilities, must receive a written annual evaluation of performance by the department chairperson or other immediate supervisor as defined by the institution against the minimum criteria listed in [BoR POLICY 8.3.5.1 FACULTY](#) and [ASA 4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems](#). Through the required annual performance evaluation process, Augusta University provides an annual record of performance. The annual evaluation will encompass faculty-assigned work effort in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, clinical activity, and professional service to the institution and/or community as appropriate. Student success activities are required in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship and professional service as appropriate to assigned work effort.

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

AFFECTED STAKEHOLDERS

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

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

DEFINITIONS

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

Administrator – An administrator is defined as a Chair, Associate Dean, Dean, Vice Presidents, and Associate Provosts and others that have assigned effort in the administration category. Program directors and regular faculty are not considered as administrators. Administrators are required to be evaluated annually by their supervisor.

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

Comprehensive 360 Assessment Feedback – Administrators are required to undergo a comprehensive 360 assessment at least every five years. The evaluation is used to review and to measure administrators' performances.

Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) – A plan developed by the Evaluator and the evaluated faculty member to set goals to address deficiencies found during the annual review. The PRP goals or outcomes

must be specific, reasonable, measurable, achievable within the time frame, and reflect relevant and essential duties of the faculty member.

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

Student Success Activities (SSA) *For the purposes of the AU Faculty Evaluation System, student success activities (SSA) is a comprehensive term for those faculty activities whose purpose is to 1) enhance student learning and engagement for the learner through continuous improvement of the learning environment, and/or 2) position the learner to be successful in achieving their short-term and long-term academic, career, and personal growth goals. Faculty support student success through in and out of class efforts. Involvement in SSA is included within the faculty member's allocation of effort in the workload categories of teaching, research / scholarship / creative work, service, and administration, as applicable. The inclusion of SSA is appropriate for learners at all levels (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, and professional students and trainees). [NOTE: Definitions for the workload categories are found in the [Institutional Framework for Faculty Workload](#)].*

PROCESS AND PROCEDURES

General Guidelines for Annual Review and Updates

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

Academic administrators are required to undergo an annual review by their supervisor and to complete a comprehensive 360 assessment at least every 5 years. The annual evaluation is based on traditional faculty activities that align with the responsibilities of the administrator.

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

Department Level Review Process

1. All faculty members will be evaluated annually by the head of the appropriate academic unit. The faculty member is responsible for providing any additional documentation and materials required or allowed by the discipline-specific annual evaluation criteria and process. This performance evaluation will be scheduled to accommodate time requirements for decision-making and portfolio preparation of faculty who meet time-in-rank or time-in-service eligibility requirements, and who may wish to initiate the promotion or tenure process.
2. Each evaluation will address known metrics as appropriate per school/college and encompass continuous professional growth appropriate to the institution's sector and mission, school, college, and department. Evaluators may use their own department/division specific metrics within the annual evaluation which may differ between colleges, departments, and programs. Evaluators will work directly with their dean for approval of any adjustments and to ensure that all faculty members in their units are fully informed of all required metrics. Unit level annual evaluation instruments and metrics are required to be approved by the appropriate shared governance body and Provost (or designee) prior to being used.
3. For all faculty with teaching workload assignments, annual evaluations should include student success and involvement of the faculty member in activities inside and outside of the classroom that deepen student learning and engagement. Please see the Student Success Activities Guidelines and Student Success Examples for a more detailed presentation of AU's student success definition and examples.
4. The annual evaluation will encompass all workload categories where the faculty member has assigned effort. The evaluator will assign a rating for each category plus an overall annual evaluation rating, using the 5-point scale illustrated below. The overall evaluation will indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward the next level of review appropriate to rank, tenure status, and career stage as noted in the 5-point Likert scale as prescribed by the Board of Regents. In all areas of the evaluation, including the assignment of the overall evaluation, the evaluator shall appropriately assess performance considering the allocated effort in the workload categories.
5. Workloads are assigned so that each faculty member can realize individual goals related to teaching, research/scholarly achievement, student/learner success, patient care, service, or other academic initiatives. The division of a faculty member's obligations between teaching, service, scholarship/research, and patient care is left to the discretion of the evaluator.
6. The evaluator will discuss with the faculty member, in a scheduled conference meeting, the content of that faculty member's annual written evaluation and the progression toward the next level of review appropriate to their rank, tenure status, and career stage. By signing the evaluation form, the faculty member acknowledges they have been appraised of the content of their evaluation and have met with the evaluator. Faculty will receive a signed copy of their written evaluation each year. Annual reviews are not subject to discretionary review or appeal by the faculty.
7. Although there is no formal appeal process, a faculty member who disagrees with any part of their annual evaluation is encouraged to provide a written response to their evaluator within 10 working days. Any such response will be attached to the annual written evaluation and become

part of the official personnel records. Within 10 working days of the faculty member’s response, the evaluator will acknowledge in writing the receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made because of the faculty member’s written response. This acknowledgement will also become part of the official personnel records.

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

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

Noteworthy achievement as referenced in ASA 4.4 is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the 5- point Likert scale. Deficient and unsatisfactory performance is reflective of a 1 or 2 on the 5-point Likert scale. Meets Expectations is satisfactory progress reflective of a 3 on the 5-point Likert scale. Each academic unit (college/department) is responsible for developing more specific performance criteria based upon the 5-point Likert Scale.

Performance Evaluation Scale				
Exemplary	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Does Not Meet Expectations
5	4	3	2	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance far exceeds expectations and standards for the evaluation category at the current rank 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance consistently exceeds expectations and standards for the evaluation category at the current rank 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance meets expectations and standards for the evaluation category at the current rank 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance intermittently falls below expectations and standards for the evaluation category at the current rank 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance consistently falls below expectations and standards for the evaluation category at the current rank

Annual reviews must be part of the pre-tenure and post-tenure processes. In post-tenure reviews, evaluations from the past previous five years for the 5-year span must be included in the review. Faculty member’s annual evaluations will be utilized in retention, merit pay, promotion, and tenure decisions.

DIFFERENTIATING STANDARDS ACROSS RANKS

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

PERFORMANCE REMEDIATION PLAN

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

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

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

The Performance Remediation Plan will be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of the Provost (or designee). The PRP will become part of the official personnel records.

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

IMPACT ON CORRECTIVE POST TENURE REVIEW

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

TRAINING

The Office of the Provost (or designee) will ensure that academic administrators are trained for all levels of evaluation as outlined in the Board of Regents Policy Manual and procedures disseminated by the USG Chief Academic Officer. The Office of the Provost (or designee) will develop a robust annual professional development plan for academic administrators and faculty to ensure adherence to Board Policy procedures outlined in AU faculty policies.

Throughout the training, the Office of the Provost (or designee) will ensure that workload percentages for faculty roles and responsibilities are factored into the performance evaluation model in a consistent manner and that student success, including student evaluations, are properly considered in the evaluation of faculty whose primary responsibility is teaching.