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...An engaged scholar is one who, being wholeheartedly committed to the principles and aspirations of the academy, vigorously participates in the full range of scholarly activities. Over the course of his or her career, perhaps at times with differing phases an engaged scholar is a dedicated and patient teacher, a highly focused and concentrated researcher, a learned resource and mental stimulant for colleagues, an active and public participant in the campus’s intellectual culture, and a valued contributor to the larger success of the community of scholars and the achievement of the faculty’s responsibilities.

---Richard Edwards (1994)
University of Kentucky

Acknowledgements

Mission of committee and tenure and promotion procedures
Criteria, guidelines, and format of pamphlet created for distribution to faculty
The School of Education Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure
Joyce Williams Bergin, Ed.D., Chair
Louis E. Aenchbacher, III, Ed.D
Evelyn B. Dandy, Ph.D.
Pam Harwood, Ed.D.
Michael L. Lariscy, Ed.D.
May 1995

Updated terminology, calendar, and forms based on transition to University status and semester conversion
Patricia Coberly, Ed.D.
May 1999

Updating and editing for clarity by The CoE Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure
Joyce W. Bergin, Ed.D., Chair
Stephen Agyekum, Ed.D.
Donna Brooks, Ph.D.
Ginny Knorr, M.S.
Michelle Sisson, Ed.D.
January 2000

Updated by the CoE Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure
Joyce W. Bergin, Ed.D., chair
Bettye Anne Battiste, Ed.D.
Ginny Knorr, M.S.
Edward Strauser, Ed.D.
November 2003

Reviewed and edited by the CoE Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure
Joyce Bergin, Chair
Pat Ball
Edward Strauser
Ginny Knorr
Robert Loyd
Greg Wimer
June 2008

Reviewed and updated by Joyce Bergin, Ed.D., Assistant Dean, October 2009

Table of Contents
Acknowledgements.........................................................................................................................3
Conceptual Framework....................................................................................................................5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Regents Policy on Faculty Evaluations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Faculty Evaluations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Regents Policy on Work in the Schools</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Professional Activities Report (APAR)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member’s Profile</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Evaluation Form</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula for Determining Evaluation Rating</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula for Determining a Merit Raise</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms Used by Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure and Promotion Procedures</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar for Tenure and Promotion Applications</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Format for Promotions and Tenure</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Procedures Sources</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education Guidelines on Tenure</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education Guidelines on Promotion</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education Pre-Tenure Review</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Review</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-tenure, Promotion, Retention, Tenure Recommendation Form</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education Guidelines on Post-Tenure Review</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Tenure review Peer Review Outcome form (PROF)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoE Special Committee Review of Outcomes of Post-tenure Review Form</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Information Points</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conceptual Framework

Armstrong Atlantic State University’s Professional Education Unit (PEU) supports a program designed to encourage candidates to be prepared and reflective decision-makers who are committed to teaching diverse learners. Candidates will study, learn and grow in an academic setting that integrates and highlight the connections among general studies, content area studies, professional studies, and clinical experiences. Candidates will be immersed in an academic program that values six specific tenets noted by the faculty as essential for the professional development and growth of teachers: respect for diversity, the essentials of professionalism, the importance of collaboration, the value of authentic assessment, the merit of reflection, and the value of technology. Guided by the best practice research, professional standards, and the unit assessment system based on data driven decision-making, the PEU commits itself to the proposition that candidates who integrate knowledge, theory, and practice will function in their professional lives as prepared, reflective decision makers committed to teaching diverse learners.

Faculty Evaluations

803.07 EVALUATION OF FACULTY
Each institution shall establish definite and stated criteria, consistent with Regents' policies and the statutes of the institution, against which the performance of each faculty member will be evaluated. The evaluation shall occur at least annually and shall follow stated procedures as prescribed by each institution. Each institution, as part of its evaluative procedures, will utilize a written system of faculty evaluations by students, with the improvement of teaching effectiveness as the main focus of these student evaluations. The evaluation procedures may also utilize a written system of peer evaluations, with emphasis placed on the faculty member's professional development. In those cases in which a faculty member's primary responsibilities do not include teaching, the evaluation should focus on excellence in those areas (e.g., research, administration) where the individual's major responsibilities lie. Institutional policies and procedures shall ensure that each faculty member will receive a written report of each evaluation and that the results of the evaluation will be reflected in the faculty member's annual salary recommendations. Institutions will ensure that the individuals responsible for conducting performance evaluations are appropriately trained to carry out such evaluations (BR Minutes, 1979-80, p. 50; 1983-84, p. 36; May, 1996, p. 52).

Each institution shall conduct in-depth pre-tenure reviews of all faculty in their third year of progress toward tenure. The criteria established for promotion and tenure, emphasizing excellence in teaching, shall be used as the focus for these reviews. The institution shall develop pre-tenure review policies, as well as any subsequent revisions (BR Minutes, April 1996, p. 39-47; May 1996, p. 52; February 2007, p. 49).

*Policy Manual of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia*

http://www.usg.edu/regents/policymanual/ Retrieved 7/1/08
Annual Faculty Evaluations

Each faculty member receives an annual performance evaluation based upon the Annual Professional Activities Report (APAR). This important document also serves as a key component of the application portfolios that are required for pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. A copy of the APAR form is provided in this document.

The APAR form is a record of annual efforts and achievements in teaching, scholarship, professional growth and development, and service. It is important that faculty members describe their contributions to the department, college, and university as clearly and effectively as possible. Descriptive comments should demonstrate the value of the faculty members’ work and include such things as time commitment and outcomes/products as appropriate.

Faculty members are evaluated on the quality of their teaching functions, service functions, and scholarship functions as defined by departmental or contractual goals. Additionally, faculty members are evaluated for merit on the quality of their teaching, service, and scholarship that exceeds departmental or contractual goals. During the faculty review process, it is important to assess the quantitative and qualitative data reported by faculty. This affords each faculty member an opportunity to validate the number of his/her contributions along with the investment of time and effort in each contribution made to the department, college, and/or university. **Such a shift in focus on the APAR document from merely listing activities to elaborating on each allows faculty members to provide a clearer picture of the time commitment, effort, and ultimate value of their work to the department, college, and/or university.** Narrative descriptions of time commitment, effort, and outcomes support the determination of merit.

It is suggested that faculty members label their reported activities for teaching, service, and scholarship as to which Meet functions and which Exceed functions to expedite the evaluation process. Additionally, it is appropriate to attach support documents such as certificates earned, letters of commendation, descriptions of awards received, and other items that document the faculty member’s work showing how it exceeds those functions typically defined by contract or departmental goals.

Examples of teaching, service, and scholarship functions that meet departmental or contractual goals as well as examples of those that exceed these goals are provided on the pages that follow.
TEACHING

Functions that typically meet departmental or contractual goals

Model instructional strategies for and disseminate knowledge to students in ways that incorporate
• a variety of technologies
• best instructional practices for teaching diverse populations
• the use of distance learning methods
• lecture and interactive teaching formats
• ethical and professional behaviors, attitudes, and dispositions
Assess students’ knowledge, attitudes, skills, dispositions, and habits of mind through a variety of authentic evaluation techniques.

Activities that demonstrate departmental functions include but are not limited to the following examples:

• Update/revise course syllabi
• Teach web-based courses with satisfactory FACE evaluations
• Teach traditional courses with satisfactory FACE evaluations
• Teach continuing education courses with satisfactory FACE evaluations
• Teach by distance learning technologies with satisfactory FACE evaluations
• Serve as an academic advisor for students
• Supervise student teachers
• Supervise interns
• Supervise practicum experiences
• Model technology use for students
• Model best instructional practices
• Demonstrate attitudes, dispositions, and habits of mind expressed in the CoE’s Conceptual Framework
• Other duties and functions required to meet departmental and/or contractual goals
Activities that exceed departmental and/or contractual goals include but are not limited to the following:

- Develop a web based course
- Develop a new course
- Develop a new program of study
- Organize a specialized workshop, seminar, or field trip
- Facilitate a specialized workshop, seminar, or field trip
- Advise the development of exit portfolios or projects
- Develop a continuing education course
- Receive recognition for outstanding advisement service to students
- Receive outstanding teaching evaluations
- Receive awards or recognition for teaching
- Provide evidence of innovative and/or exceptional teaching
- Teach multiple or new preparations honors courses
- Teach in international studies programs/projects
- Demonstrate currency in theories, research, and methods
- Employ the latest research based practices in the classroom
- Other acceptable activities as determined by the department

SERVICE

Functions that typically meet departmental or contractual goals

Participate in university activities
Serve on university committees
Serve on faculty governance committees
Serve on departmental committees
Serve on CoE committees
Participate in community (i.e., public schools, public service organizations, etc.)
Service to Students
  - Model for students the attitudes, perceptions, and dispositions that support professional and public service
  - Provide advising and guidance that enable students to successfully and efficiently matriculate through their academic course of study by
    - suggesting appropriate courses, programs of study, and assessments for students.
    - suggesting appropriate research or projects for students.
    - monitoring student’s progress through their program of study
    - completing the required forms that support programs of study, exit activities and evaluations, and graduation.
Activities that demonstrate departmental functions include but are not limited to the following examples:

- Membership on committees of the university, college, and/or department
- Provide service to a civic or charitable organization
- Coach or facilitate a special community event or activity
- Judge a community contest that is linked to education
- Active membership in a professional organization
- Serve as an official liaison to an organization or agency for the university or the college
- Serve as a sponsor for a student organization on campus
- Other acceptable activities as determined by the department

Activities that exceed departmental and/or contractual goals include but are not limited to the following:

- Organize or facilitate a professional conference
- Provide consultation or serve as on-site liaison to a public school
- Serve on a university system or Board of Regents task force or committee
- Serve on a committee for the State Department of Education
- Serve by invitation on doctoral dissertation committees
- Chair a committee of the department, college or university
- Serve on a special AASU administrative project
- Chair a search committee
- Organize or chair a special event for the university, college, or department
- Judge an academic or community event that is linked to the mission of the university
- Chair a thesis, portfolio, or special projects committee
- Coordinate or direct a program for the university or college
- Serve as a liaison to another academic program or unit within the university
- Serve on a school board
- Serve on a civic organization’s board of directors
- Serve on a community public service task force
- Hold an office in a professional organization in an academic field
- Make a formal presentation to a civic group relative to the mission if the university
- Receive an award or recognition for service
- Chair certification or accreditation self-study teams for learned societies (ex. SACS, NCATE)
- Serve as faculty representative (Senator) to the AASU Faculty Senate
- Serve as an officer of the AASU Faculty Senate (president, vice-president, or secretary)
- Other acceptable activities as determined by the department
SCHOLARSHIP

Functions that typically meet departmental or contractual goals.

Maintain one’s professional knowledge and skills by staying abreast of current theories, research, trends, and issues in one’s academic field
Conduct quantitative or qualitative research
Disseminate new knowledge or research findings via written, oral or technical venues
Disseminate scholarly information in order to contribute to the knowledge of one’s field through printed, oral, technical media

Activities that demonstrate departmental functions include but are not limited to the following examples:

- Participate in faculty development opportunities
- Assist with the development and editing of students’ exit projects
- Maintain professional licensure and credentials as appropriate
- Present papers, poster sessions, or workshops at local, state, or regional conferences
- Conduct workshops or staff development for area public schools
- Other acceptable activities as determined by the department

Activities that exceed departmental and/or contractual goals include but are not limited to the following:

- Develop a new program of study for the department, college, or university
- Serve as editor for a printed or web based professional publication
- Serve on editorial committees for professional journals
- Develop specialized instructional materials
- Develop specialized technology software
- Publish a textbook
- Publish a chapter in a textbook
- Publish a professional paper via a juried journal
- Publish a professional paper or article via a non-juried professional publication
- Publish a monograph, research report, or special report
- Develop a grant proposal
- Write and submit a grant proposal
- Secure a grant
- Administer/coordinate a grant
- Edit a textbook, chapter, or monograph
- Review a textbook
- Review program proposals for a conference
- Review and evaluate grant proposals
- Serve as a technical consultant or resource specialist in the community
- Present a paper, poster session, or workshop at a national or international conference
• Receive recognition or an award from a professional organization
• Develop or implement an international program or project
• Professionally present or publish internationally
• **Other acceptable activities as determined by the department**

**803.17 WORK IN THE SCHOOLS**

Board of Regents' approval of University System of Georgia institutions to prepare teachers includes the expectation that public colleges and universities with a teacher preparation mission will collaborate with the K-12 schools. University System institutions that prepare teachers will support and reward all faculty who participate significantly in approved teacher preparation efforts and in school improvement through decisions in promotion and tenure, pretenure and post tenure review, annual review and merit pay, workload, recognition, allocation of resources, and other rewards. Participation in teacher preparation and in school improvement may include documented efforts of these faculty in:

Improving their own teaching so as to model effective teaching practices in courses taken by prospective teachers;

Contributing scholarship that promotes and improves student learning and achievement in the schools and in the university; and

Collaborating with public schools to strengthen teaching quality and to increase student learning.

The Chancellor shall issue guidelines, to be published in the Academic Affairs Handbook, which serve to encourage formal institutional recognition and reward for all faculty in realizing the expectations embodied in this policy (BR Minutes, October 2006).

Board of Regents Policy Manual, [www.usg.edu/academics/](http://www.usg.edu/academics/), retrieved 7-3-08
Section 4.03.02: Faculty Work in the Schools

SUBJECT: Faculty Work in the Schools: Rewards for Faculty Efforts to Improve K-12 Education

SOURCE: Board Policy Manual 803.17; Memorandum from Vice Chancellor for Academics, Faculty, and Student Affairs to Chief Academic Officers, 10/30/2006

POLICY

*Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 803.17*

GUIDELINES

The Board of Regents values University System faculty engagement with the K-12 schools. Through Policy 803.17, Work in the Schools, the Board expects faculty engagement with the public schools in institutions that prepare teachers. The Board expects presidents, provosts and academic vice presidents, and deans of colleges of education and arts and sciences in institutions that prepare teachers to advocate for, assess, recognize, and reward practices consistent with this policy.

Faculty effort under the provisions of this policy is anticipated in teaching, scholarship, and/or service. The University System of Georgia values all types of faculty scholarship, including the Scholarship of Discovery, the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, and the Scholarship of Engagement. All faculty members are encouraged to enhance their classroom instruction by using scholarly teaching. It also is important for faculty to assist in improving teaching quality and student learning in K-12 classrooms by service to the schools. Definitions and examples of these various activities are provided below for illustrative purposes. See: [Examples of faculty work in each of the three categories: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service](PDF 96k).

TEACHING

**Definition:** Scholarly teaching is teaching that focuses on student learning and is well grounded in the sources and resources appropriate to the field. The aim of scholarly teaching is to make transparent how faculty members have made learning possible (Shulman).

**Evidence of Scholarly Teaching** (under normal conditions, the expectation is that faculty will do all three):
Evidence that the faculty member reads the pedagogical literature, or attends instructional development sessions, in h/her own discipline and then branches out to the broader pedagogical literature.

Evidence that the faculty member tries some of the teaching methods from the literature/instructional development sessions in h/her own classes.

Evidence that the faculty member assesses whether or not h/she has been successful in increasing student learning by doing some formative evaluation with h/her students, adjusting h/her approach, asking a peer to come into the class to review the changes h/she has implemented.

SCHOLARSHIP

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Definition: The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning is the "systematic examination of issues about student learning and instructional conditions which promote the learning (i.e., building on previous scholarship and shared concerns), which is subjected to blind review by peers who represent the judgment of the profession, and, after review, is disseminated to the professional community" (Research Universities Consortium for the Advancement of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning).

Evidence of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning:

• Evidence that the faculty member's scholarship in the schools or in the university classroom is public, peer reviewed and critiqued.

• Evidence that the faculty member's scholarship is exchanged with other members of professional communities through postings on websites, presentations to h/her department or college, presentations at professional conferences, and/or written up and published.

• Evidence that the scholarship builds upon previous scholarship and shared concerns.

• Evidence that the scholarship contributes new questions and knowledge about teaching and learning.

The Scholarship of Engagement

Definition: The Scholarship of Engagement in schools is characterized by the following: 1) it is
to be conducted as an academic engagement with the public schools; 2) it is to involve the responsible application of knowledge, theory and/or conceptual framework to consequential problems; 3) it should test a research question or hypothesis, 4) one must be able to use the results to improve practice and inform further questions, and 5) resulting work should be available for dissemination for peer review of results (Glassick, Huber and Maeroff).

**Evidence of the Scholarship of Engagement:**

- Evidence that the faculty member designs and implements a research agenda in at least one area of need recognized by the public schools.

- Evidence that the faculty member applies relevant knowledge toward resolution of the identified need.

- Evidence that the faculty member assesses the impact of the engagement.

- Evidence that the faculty member disseminates for peer review the results of the outreach.

**The Scholarship of Discovery**

**Definition:** The Scholarship of Discovery is basic research in the disciplines including the creative work of faculty in the literary, visual, and performing arts. It is the "pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, a fierce determination to give free rein to fair and honest inquiry, wherever it may lead" (Glassick, Huber and Maeroff). It contributes to the stock of human knowledge in the academic disciplines.

**Evidence of the Scholarship of Discovery:**

- Evidence that the faculty member's research is innovative (as opposed to routine) as judged by peers at the institution and elsewhere.

- Evidence that the faculty member's research represents quality, rather than mere quantity.

- Evidence of the faculty member's publications in high quality refereed journals and the quality and quantity of citations and reprints of h/her research publications.

If appropriate for the discipline, evidence of the ability to attract extramural funding.
Evidence of invited seminars and presentations (abstracts), if travel funds are provided, are also an indication of the Scholarship of Discovery.

SERVICE

Definition: service is outreach or engagement by higher education faculty for the purpose of contributing to the public good. Contributions to the public good may include faculty work that contributes to solutions to complex societal problems, to the quality of life of Georgia's citizens, and to the advancement of public higher education. In the case of service to the public schools, the intent should be for the improvement of teaching quality and student learning. The following activities might be included in work with the schools: involvement in Learning Communities, workshops given based on need, collaborative development of courses, unit writing for the new Georgia Performance Standards, design of field experiences to support existing courses, engagement in co-observation / vertical alignment, etc.

Evidence of Service:

- Evidence that the faculty member links h/her work in some way to public contemporary issues and/or to improving the quality of life.
- Evidence that the faculty member, either through h/her scholarly work and/or service, applies h/her knowledge toward solutions to complex societal problems and human needs.
- Evidence that the faculty member contributes to the continuous improvement of public higher education.
- Evidence that the faculty member contributes in some way to the public good.

Works Cited:

*Academic Affairs Handbook*, ww.usg.edu/academics/ retrieved 7-3-08

**Special Note:** The College of Education incorporates the tenets of the Chancellor’s policy as well as the guidelines for implementing the policy in its expectations for faculty teaching, service, and scholarship.

Faculty who are engaged in any of the activities described in the guidelines should document these endeavors and their outcomes in the APAR and in documentation required for pre-tenure, tenure, post-tenure, and promotion review processes. Documentation should include a brief description of the project, the name, location (address and county) of the school, the school contact person, a description or sample of the outcome/product of the project, concise summary of the activities conducted, and the number of hours spent actively engaged in the school.
PROFESSOR’S NAME:

DEPARTMENT:

EVALUATION PERIOD

Calendar year January through December ___

GENERAL INFORMATION

This report provides you an opportunity to furnish information regarding your professional activities: your contributions to your department, your school and the College, and your comments about your performance during this evaluation period. Your department head will consult this report in preparing the annual evaluation of your performance for this evaluation period. A copy of this report will be attached to your annual evaluation as an appendix and will become part of your official records.

PART I TEACHING
(Use of expertise to communicate the subject matter to students.)

A. List (by semester, by discipline, number, and name) all of the credit courses you taught. For each course listed, indicate the number of times you taught it that semester, and whether it was a lecture or laboratory assignment, or both. For team-taught courses, specify your proportionate contribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEMESTER</th>
<th>COURSE &amp; NUMBER</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TIMES</th>
<th>LECT/LAB %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. List any non-credit courses you have taught through the Coastal Georgia Center for Continuing Education or their sponsoring agency.

C. SUMMARY OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

It may be helpful to organize your comments around the items in the Student Appraisal of Instruction and Course. You might wish to comment on those activities you consider noteworthy and to identify and describe any of your strengths that should be recognized. Although candor is encouraged, you are not required to comment at all. You may add additional sheets of paper if they are needed to accommodate your comments.

PART II SERVICE
(Use of academic status or professional expertise to benefit college, university, community, or profession.)

A. List those committees of your department, your College, and of the University on which you have served. If you chaired any of these committees, so indicate.

B. List your memberships in professional and honor societies. If you have been an officer during this period, please describe the office.

C. List any professional or related services not previously listed above that you have rendered to your department, your College or University, the University System, the community, or (individually) to students or colleagues.
D. SUMMARY OF PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE IN AREAS OTHER THAN INSTRUCTION.

It may be helpful to make use of the information listed in Part Two of this report and to organize your comments around the following characteristics which are included in the Faculty Peer Evaluation: interest and initiative, compatibility, scholarship, dependability, service to the University and community, student involvement, professional bearing and versatility.

PART III  SCHOLARSHIP
(Use of expertise as a scholar or artist, includes work that adds to subject matter and work that increases expertise.)

A. List by title, date, setting, and audience any talks or addresses you have given.

B. List any papers, books or reviews you have written and any papers you have refereed. Describe any research or other creative professional activity in which you have engaged or participated.

C. List by sponsoring organization, date, location, and content, any seminars, graduate courses, or workshops in which you were a participant. For each activity, indicate what percentage of the cost was supported by University monies.

D. List by organization name, dates, and location any professional meetings you have attended. For each meeting indicate what percentage of the cost of attendance was supported by University monies.
E. SUMMARY OF PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE IN AREAS OTHER THAN INSTRUCTION.

It may be helpful to make use of the information listed in Part Three of this report and to organize your comments around the following characteristics which are included in the Faculty Peer Evaluation: interest and initiative, compatibility, scholarship, dependability, service to University and community, student involvement, professional bearing, and versatility.
ADDENDUM
APAR

You will find this page redundant with pages 3 & 4, but it is important. I will use this material in several reports which must be submitted as well as your annual evaluation. Please do not list more than five (5) items under A and five (5) items under B. It is not expected that you will have five (5) items to list, but please list what you have.

A. List your most significant five (5) service activities. Write a short sentence describing each. These items are probably listed on page 3 also.

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

5. 

B. List your most significant five (5) scholarly activities. Write a short sentence describing each. These items are probably listed on page 4 also.

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

5.
Additional Faculty Evaluation Documents

The documents which appear on the following pages are to be completed and appended to the APAR form. They are as follows:

Faculty Member’s Profile Form
The Overall Evaluation Form
FACULTY MEMBER’S PROFILE FORM
Complete in January of each new year and attach to the APAR

Faculty Member:
Department:
Review Period: January _______ through December ________

Indicate percentages of assigned time:

- teaching %
- service %
- scholarship %
- special project % (describe in space provided below)

TOTAL 100%

Provide a brief description of the special project to which you are assigned.

List annual goals for the new year below. Feel free to attach an additional page.

Teaching:

Service:

Scholarship:
Overall Evaluation Form

Name: _________________________  Department: _________________ Date: ______

Circle the number that is most reflective of performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Teaching</th>
<th>% Scholarship</th>
<th>% Service</th>
<th>% Special Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teaching | 3.0 2.9 2.8 2.7 2.6 2.5 2.4 2.3 2.2 2.1 | 2.0 1.9 1.8 1.7 1.6 1.5 1.4 1.3 1.2 1.1 | 1.0<
|       | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 |
|       | Met all essential functions but also achieved several items that exceed essential functions | Met essential functions | Met some but not all essential functions | Unsatisfactory functions |
| Scholarship | 3.0 2.9 2.8 2.7 2.6 2.5 2.4 2.3 2.2 2.1 | 2.0 1.9 1.8 1.7 1.6 1.5 1.4 1.3 1.2 1.1 | 1.0<
|       | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 |
|       | Met all essential functions but also achieved several items that exceed essential functions | Met essential functions | Met some but not all essential functions | Unsatisfactory functions |
| Service | 3.0 2.9 2.8 2.7 2.6 2.5 2.4 2.3 2.2 2.1 | 2.0 1.9 1.8 1.7 1.6 1.5 1.4 1.3 1.2 1.1 | 1.0<
|       | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 |
|       | Met all essential functions but also achieved several items that exceed essential functions | Met essential functions | Met some but not all essential functions | Unsatisfactory functions |
| Other (Special Projects) | 3.0 2.9 2.8 2.7 2.6 2.5 2.4 2.3 2.2 2.1 | 2.0 1.9 1.8 1.7 1.6 1.5 1.4 1.3 1.2 1.1 | 1.0<
|       | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 |
|       | Met all essential functions but also achieved several items that exceed essential functions | Met essential functions | Met some but not all essential functions | Unsatisfactory functions |
| OVERALL | 3.0 2.9 2.8 2.7 2.6 2.5 2.4 2.3 2.2 2.1 | 2.0 1.9 1.8 1.7 1.6 1.5 1.4 1.3 1.2 1.1 | 1.0<
|       | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 |
|       | Met all essential functions but also achieved several items that exceed essential functions | Met essential functions | Met some but not all essential functions | Unsatisfactory functions |

Comments:

Additional comments may be written on the back of this document.
**FORMULA FOR DETERMINING EVALUATION RATING**

Formula will be used by Department Heads

**EXAMPLES**

10 faculty are in this department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty member #1</th>
<th>Percentage of Assigned Time</th>
<th>Overall Evaluation Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>34 %</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>33 %</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>33 %</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculating final evaluation score

\[
2.0 \times 3.4 = 6.8 \\
2.5 \times 3.3 = 8.25 \\
3.0 \times 3.3 = 9.9 \\
6.8 + 8.25 + 9.99 = 24.95 \\
24.95 \div 10 \text{ (number of faculty in the department) = 2.5}
\]

**Faculty member #2:**

| Teaching          | 50 %                        | 2.0                      |
| Scholarship       | 0 %                         | 0                       |
| Service           | 10 %                        | 3.0                      |
| Other             | 40 %                        | 1.5                      |
| **100%**          | **100%**                    |                          |

\[
2.0 \times 5.0 = 10.0 \\
3.0 \times 1.0 = 3.0 \\
1.5 \times 4.0 = 6.0 \\
19.0 \div 10 = 1.9
\]
Formula for Determining a Merit Raise

Scenario: Due to raise allocations, Department X has received $10,000 to provide merit raises.

Department X has 10 faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Over all Evaluation Rating</th>
<th>Current Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>32,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>39,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>43,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>30,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>33,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>28,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>37,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>43,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>50,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>27,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 20.3

$10,000 divided by the total of the overall evaluation points will equal the monetary value of each evaluation point in determining merit. Each point is worth $482.61.

Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Over all Evaluation Rating</th>
<th>Current Salary</th>
<th>Merit Calculation</th>
<th>New Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>32,534</td>
<td>428.61 x 2.5 = 1231.52</td>
<td>33,765.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>43,011</td>
<td>428.61 x 1.9 = 814.36</td>
<td>43,825.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>50266</td>
<td>428.61 x 1.0 = 428.61</td>
<td>50,694.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College of Education Advisory Committee
The College of Education's Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure serves at the pleasure of the Dean of the College of Education and has as its primary mission the review of applications from faculty who have entered the University's process for promotion and/or tenure. At the request of the Dean, the Committee will review tenure and/or promotion applications and will make recommendations concerning those applications to the Dean. The Committee does not vote nor does it determine whether an applicant should or should not receive promotion or tenure.

The first committee, appointed in October 1994, was assigned the task of recommending criteria and guidelines on promotion and tenure for use by faculty and administrators in the College of Education. Future committees will be assigned the roles of updating guidelines and criteria as necessary as well as reviewing applications in order to make recommendations to the Dean of the College of Education.

The Committee will meet to review applications that have been forwarded to its Chair by the Dean. Each application will be evaluated in order to determine whether it meets the guidelines and criteria for promotion or tenure as established by the College of Education. A written report of each evaluation will be sent to the Dean for his/her review. The Dean will send a copy to the faculty member.

All members of the Committee will be appointed by the Dean of the College of Education with three members being rotated off the committee each year and two remaining to ensure continuity. Only tenured faculty will be eligible to serve on the committee. All departments will be represented.
These forms help expedite the work of the committee and provide a record of deliberations.
Tenure Application review checklist

_____ Has the required five years of full time service at the rank of assistant professor or higher

_____ Has presented a formal, written application for tenure

The letter of application requesting tenure states that all the requirements for such action have been met.

_____ Departmental faculty input has been secured and added to the application

  * The Department Recommendation Form
  * The Peer Review Summary
  * The Department Policy Review Guidelines

_____ Departmental support of the candidate’s tenure is provided

_____ Has provided documentation of superior performance in teaching including

  * SAIC (summaries only) for the past three years.

_____ Has provided documentation of satisfactory performance in service

_____ Has provided documentation of satisfactory performance in scholarship including

  * An up-to-date résumé with complete sections on teaching, research, and scholarly activity.

  * Annual Faculty Evaluations (AFE) for the past three years.

  * Annual Professional Activities Reports (APAR) for the past three years.

_____ Has provided documentation and explanation of professional growth and development. Examples may be drawn from areas such as the following:

  • Courses of study or specialized training
  • Faculty exchange program participation
  • Teaching abroad
  • Workshop(s) participation that improved a particular skill
  • Fulbright Scholarship
  • Special collaborative efforts with public school personnel or university colleagues

Special Note: Must demonstrate noteworthy performance in at least two of the four areas (BOR, policy 803.09, 2007)

Notes/comments: ______________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Evaluator: ________________________________ Date: _______________________
AASU College of Education  
Applicant’s Name: ___________________

PROMOTION  
Application review checklist

_____ Letter of application requesting promotion stating how all requirements have been met

_____ Up-to-date resume following BOR approved format

_____ Annual Faculty Evaluations (AFE) for at least three years

_____ Annual Professional Activities Report (APAR) for the past three years

_____ FACE (Summaries only) for the past three years

_____ The Departmental Recommendation Form

_____ The Peer Summary Report

_____ The Department Policy Review Guidelines

Promotion criteria

To professor

_____ 12 years of college/university level teaching experience or fourteen years total and/or related experiences

_____ Five years at the rank of associate professor at AASU

_____ Terminal degree in an academic specialization (or documented exceptions)

_____ Evidence of excellence in teaching effectiveness that is greater than the level required for both tenure and service at the level of associate professor

_____ Evidence of significant participation in scholarly activities greater than the level required for both tenure and service at the level of associate professor

_____ Evidence of a strong record of service to the department, the university, government, civic or professional organizations

_____ Evidence of significant activities that promoted professional growth and development.

To Associate Professor

_____ Six years of college/university teaching or eight years total teaching or related experience

_____ Five years at the rank of assistant professor (with four years at the rank of assistant professor at AASU)

_____ Terminal degree (doctorate) in an academic area of specialization with exceptions made if lack of degree is balanced by some clearly demonstrable special distinctions.

_____ Evidence of superior teaching effectiveness that is greater than the level required for both tenure and at the level of assistant professor.

_____ Evidence of satisfactory participation in scholarly activities that is greater than the level required for both tenure and service at the level of assistant professor.
Evidence of a satisfactory record of service to the department, the university, government, civic, or professional organizations.

Evidence of satisfactory examples and explanation of professional growth and development

To Assistant Professor

Minimum of four years teaching and/or related experience.

Three years at the rank of instructor at Armstrong

Masters degree minimum, with exception made only if lack of degree is balanced by some clearly demonstrable special distinctions

Satisfactory teaching performance.

Notes/Comments: 
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Evaluator: ________________________________ Date: ________________________
Armstrong Atlantic State University

Report to the Dean of Committee’s Review of Application and Documentation for

____________________, who is applying for ______________________.  

Name of applicant

Signatures of Committee Members:

______________________________, Chair

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

Teaching Component:

Meets minimum criteria:    _____Yes    _____No

Recommendations:

Research/Scholarship Component:

Meets minimum criteria:    _____Yes    _____No

Recommendations:

Service Component:

Meets minimum criteria:    _____Yes    _____No

Recommendations:

Professional Growth and Development Component:

Meets minimum criteria:    _____Yes    _____No

Recommendations:
Report of Review

Overall Format of Application and Documentation:
Meets minimum criteria:  _____Yes  _____No

Recommendations:

_____________________________________________________

Additional Comments:
Tenure and Promotion Procedures

1. Faculty members submit applications to Department Head when they believe they have met all criteria in the College of Education guidelines and in the University regulations as they appear in the Faculty Handbook. Faculty should consult with Department Heads as to readiness before submitting an application.

2. Department Heads will either reject the application or forward it with their recommendation to the Dean. If rejected, the faculty member may appeal and apply directly to the Dean.

3. The Dean will direct the Department Head to send all accepted applications to the Departmental Faculty for their review and vote. Following the vote, the Department Head will forward the applications along with the report of the Faculty vote to the Dean.

4. Applications received by the Dean will be forwarded to the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee will review and return to the Dean a written report of the recommendation regarding each application. The report will be diagnostic and prescriptive.

5. The Chair of the College Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee may be requested to meet with the Council of Deans in an advisory capacity when promotion and tenure are discussed.
Calendar for Promotion and Tenure Applications

The calendar is determined by the *Faculty Handbook* of Armstrong Atlantic State University and the annual academic calendar. Faculty members are advised to contact their department heads to secure the timeline for the Department and for the College of Education as it pertains to tenure or promotion.

Dates are published in the *AASU Faculty Handbook* (Revised 10/06)

Declarations of candidacy for tenure or promotion should be made to the department head in writing no later than **September 15**

Action on the applications for tenure or promotion at the departmental, college, and university levels must be completed by **January 10**.
Application Format for Promotion and Tenure

It is recommended that the applicant meet with the department head to discuss the format of the letter of application and the accompanying documentation. A three-ring binder with tabs indicating a logical arrangement of documentation is preferred. The applicant may view sample formats at the time of the initial conference with the department head. Generally, an applicant’s **primary portfolio** should include and be limited to the following:

- The letter of application requesting either tenure or promotion and stating how all requirements for such action have been met.
- An up-to-date resume with complete sections on teaching, research, scholarly activity, and professional growth and development.
- Annual Faculty Evaluations (AFE) for the past three years.
- Annual Professional Activities Reports (APAR) for the past three years.
- SAIC (summaries only) for the past three years.

The department head will attach to the front of the portfolio the following:

- The Department Recommendation Form
- The Peer Review summary
- The Department Policy Review Guidelines

Additionally, the applicant should prepare a **second portfolio** that will contain select documentation of performance over the past three years such as abstracts of grant proposals, funded and unfunded, an annotated bibliography of publications indicating which journals or databases are **peer reviewed**, abstracts of research projects, abstracts or samples of other projects such as courses created or up-dated, abstracts of papers presented at conferences, and additional samples of materials that will effectively demonstrate performance in teaching, scholarship, and service.

This documentation should be selected to present a range of examples of the individual’s work and **should not be encyclopedic** in coverage. It is strongly recommended that each section of the portfolio (teaching, scholarship, service, professional growth), contain a **narrative** describing the value and significance of the faculty member’s contributions. The portfolio should be arranged so that the reviewer can understand readily the significance of each item the faculty member has included. Avoid large, poorly organized, and unwieldy portfolios that make the review process difficult and unnecessarily time consuming.

**Special Note:** No more than the two portfolios described above will be accepted for review.
Curriculum Vita (Resume) Format

Applicants will use the following format when preparing their curriculum vitae for inclusion in the application packet required for both promotion and tenure evaluations.

Name:
Rank:
Department:
I. Educational/Professional Credentials
II. Teaching Experience (Academic)
III. Administrative Experience
IV. Business and Professional Experience
V. Courses Taught
VI. Intellectual Contributions
   A. Publications—Journals/Articles
   B. Publications—Books/Monographs/Chapters
   C. Proceedings (Refereed)
   D. Professional Presentations
   E. Editorial/Reviewer Projects
   F. Conference Papers/Proceedings
VII. Professional and Honor Organizations Activities
   A. Membership
   B. Offices/Committees/Presentations
VIII. Honors, Awards, Recognitions

Policies and Procedures Sources

The College of Education’s policies and procedures on tenure and promotion are aligned with those of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and those of the university as printed in the Faculty Handbook of Armstrong Atlantic State University (revised 2006). Please refer to Article II Evaluation Policies and Personnel Policies of the Faculty Handbook of Armstrong Atlantic State University

The above referenced documents may be accessed as follows:

Faculty Handbook: www.vpres.armstrong.edu
Board of Regents: www.usg.edu/academics
College of Education Guidelines on Tenure

Tenure is a condition of continuing employment that is extended to a faculty member (applicant) by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, generally following a probationary period, established on the basis of evaluation and affirmative recommendation by the faculty member’s department within the College of Education with concurrence by the applicant’s departmental administrator, the dean of the College of Education, the university’s vice president and dean of the faculty, and the president. Tenure is granted to faculty members who clearly and consistently demonstrate that they make significant contributions to their discipline through their teaching, service, research/scholarship, publication, and performance, or other creative activity as is appropriate and/or required by their position descriptions.

Guidelines presented here apply equally to all eligible faculty members. The following criteria are intended to serve as guidelines and not as specific boundaries for performance criteria. Routes to success in attaining tenure in the College of Education include teaching, research/scholarship, and service. Evaluation tools include a variety of both qualitative and quantitative measures from numerous and varied sources including students, administrators, peers/colleagues, and self-assessments.

I. TEACHING

To be balanced, judgment should be based upon more than one kind of evidence. It is recommended that the basis for documentation in this area be the student surveys of teaching effectiveness conducted routinely in each class offered by the College of Education as well as the Annual Professional Activities Reports (APAR). Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness may be drawn from such areas as formal peer evaluations and peer evaluation of course materials, including syllabi, handouts, tests, and scholarly preparation. Letters or notices of commendations for teaching as well as membership on the graduate faculty provide further documentation of the quality of one’s teaching performance. A list of activities that support teaching was enumerated earlier in this document.

II. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

It is expected that all faculty in the professional ranks will participate in the University’s mission of research and scholarship. The term research does not always include the entire range of scholarly endeavors so the term scholarly activities is employed. Scholarship refers to the creation of new knowledge or the synthesis of existing knowledge. Scholarship can have many forms and is generally evaluated on its impact on the audience for which it is intended. Examples of activities which can be included in this area are articles published in refereed, scholarly and/or non-refereed, semi-professional journals, grant proposals both funded and unfunded, authorship of textbooks or chapters in textbooks, papers read at professional meetings, projects requiring specialized knowledge, including workshops, quantitative or qualitative research projects, reviews of professional publications, and major professional honors. A list of activities that define scholarship was enumerated earlier in this document.
III. SERVICE

Service is an important component of the mission of both the College of Education and Armstrong Atlantic State University. The College of Education views service as an integral component of its research and teaching efforts and a key factor in its credibility to clients and constituents. Service is more than being a member of a committee. It refers to commitment and active participation in a range of endeavors that support the mission of the university.

Evidence of service that is an outgrowth of teaching or research may include

- Providing special services to area schools
- Provision of consultation services
- Development of collaborative educational programs
- Membership on School Boards

Evidence of contributions to the operation of the department, college, and university

- Service on committees, including the nature of the contribution to the committee
- Special responsibilities assigned at the department, college, or university level
- Record of efforts to initiate improvement in department, college, or university programs
- Record of effective service as an advisor to students or student groups

Evidence of contributions to professional, civic, and government organizations outside the university

- Evidence of service as officer, committee member, or via other responsibilities in state, regional, national or international professional organizations
- Consultative or other special assistance to professional organizations, legislative bodies, or other agencies
- Evidence of honors or awards for service

A list of activities that describe service was enumerated earlier in this document.

IV. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

Faculty typically engage in workshops and specialized training to hone their teaching skills and help them grow as professionals. Evidence of professional growth and development activities should be included in the APAR. For tenure and promotion, professional growth and development activities should exceed expectations for departmental or college expectations. The kinds of activities that exceed normal expectations for faculty include but are not limited to participation in the following: faculty exchange programs, study abroad programs, Fulbright scholarships/fellowships, research fellowships, graduate study, leadership training, and other specialized training that adds value to one’s teaching, service, or scholarship. Thorough documentation of these kinds of activities should be part of one’s secondary pre-tenure, tenure, or promotion portfolio.
Overall Considerations Concerning Tenure

For tenure, a faculty member must receive a **satisfactory rating in all three areas**: teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service. While workload and assignments in one area may impact productivity in another, performance in all areas must be at least satisfactory and should be **excellent** in one or more areas.

**Note to Applicant:**

*Review the documentation which you have prepared in each of the areas: teaching, research/scholarship, and service. Evaluate your documentation by considering the following:*

### Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory student, peer and administrative evaluations. Limited or no evidence of involvement in the actions compromising good teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Evidence of involvement in actions that constitute good teaching that typically result in satisfactory student, peer, and administrator ratings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Evidence of leadership in activities that constitute superior teaching. Consistent ratings that are satisfactory or better from students, peers, and administrators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research/Scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Little or no documented evidence of research/scholarly activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>This rating requires active participation in research or other scholarly activities. Evidence of continuing activity should exist. As appropriate, there may be evidence of facilitation or support of research and scholarly work conducted by students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Documented evidence of active involvement and leadership in research/scholarly activities. Active leadership and support of students engaged in research and/or scholarship should be included. Evidence must clearly exceed that required for a rating of satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Limited evidence of service at even the department level. Little or no evidence of service outside the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Clear documentation of service at the department, college, and university levels. May demonstrate service outside the college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Documentation of significant service at all levels: department, university, college, professional and/or appropriate civic organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional Growth and Development

*Weak*  
Little or no documentation of professional growth and development activities.

*Satisfactory*  
Documentation of professional growth and development activities with explanations of the value of each.

*Strong*  
Documentation of a number of significant professional growth and development activities along with a narrative describing the value and outcomes of each.

College of Education Guidelines on Promotion

Promotion is based upon length of service with the institution as well as consideration of quality of teaching, service to the institution, academic achievement, scholarship and professional development. The guidelines which follow reflect these considerations at each level of faculty advancement within the College of Education.

**Promotion to Assistant Professor**

The candidate will hold at minimum a Masters Degree along with four years of total teaching and/or related experience with three years at the rank of instructor at Armstrong Atlantic State University. In addition the candidate will demonstrate and document excellent performance in the area of instruction and satisfactory performance in scholarship, service to the institution, and professional growth and development.

**Promotion to Associate Professor**

The candidate will hold a doctorate (terminal degree) and a minimum of six years of college level teaching or eight years total teaching and/or related experience. Additionally, the candidate will document five years of service at the rank of assistant professor with four years at the rank of assistant professor at Armstrong Atlantic State University. Documentation of excellence in classroom instruction coupled with satisfactory performance in scholarship, professional growth and development, and service to the institution is required. At this level, the scholarship component will reflect professional presentations, publications, scholarly projects, grant acquisition, and/or research projects.

**Promotion to Professor**

The candidate should hold a doctorate (terminal degree) in an academic area of specialization with a minimum of twelve years of college teaching or fourteen years total teaching and/or related experience. In addition, the candidate should document five years of service at the rank of associate professor at Armstrong Atlantic State University. The candidate must
document excellence in classroom instruction and a strong record of service to the institution as well as activities that promote professional growth and development.

The candidate will demonstrate scholarly achievement beyond that required for both tenure and service at the level of associate professor. **A lack of scholarship will not be offset by superior teaching and/or service in an application for promotion to the level of professor.** Scholarship documentation should reflect significant research projects, professional presentations, publications, specialized professional projects, and/or grant acquisition.

Candidates for promotion will apply in writing to the department head. The procedure for documentation and application will follow the same steps as those established by the College of Education for tenure. Those steps have been outlined previously in this publication under the heading: *Tenure and Promotion Procedures.*

**College of Education Pre-Tenure Review**

All non-tenured, tenure track faculty will be eligible for an in depth pre-tenure review in their **third year of service**, including probationary credit. **The department head will maintain a schedule of eligibility and will notify eligible faculty in writing indicating the scheduled date of the review.** These faculty members are responsible for meeting with the department head to review the pre-tenure review process.

The pre-tenure review process allows eligible faculty to receive an evaluation that will offer recommendations helpful to developing the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service in a timely fashion in anticipation of the formal tenure review process. The process is designed to assist faculty and follows the guidelines of the formal tenure review process as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook of Armstrong Atlantic State University.*

Candidates should prepare the following documentation for review:

**Portfolio I**

- An up-to-date resume containing complete sections on teaching, research/scholarship, and service.
- Annual Faculty Evaluations (AFE) for the past three years
- Annual Professional Activities Reports (APAR) for the past three years
- SAIC summary reports for the past three years

**Portfolio II**

**Note:** This portfolio may be prepared as **support documentation** and used to expand upon the information presented on Portfolio I. It is not mandatory. Specifically, Portfolio II should support the information presented in each Armstrong Atlantic State University Annual Professional Activities Report (APAR) that is included in
Portfolio I. Portfolio II allows the applicant to showcase his/her accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, service, and professional growth and development. Items included should be selected with care, and the portfolio should not be encyclopedic in its contents. The following are examples of appropriate entries in Portfolio II:

- abstracts of grant applications and/or funded grants
- abstracts of articles submitted for publication
- abstracts of research projects completed or underway
- evidence of awards and/or honors received
- annotated bibliography of publications
- letters of commendation
- evidence of service-including campus, community, state regional, national, and international
- syllabi of new courses developed by candidate
- additional, select evidence to support performance and professional development in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service.

**Portfolios I and II** will be submitted to the department head by the deadline established at the initial meeting of the candidate and the department head. The department head will attach the Department Recommendation Form to Portfolio I.

The portfolio(s) will follow a review route similar to that which is part of the formal tenure process outlined in the *Faculty Handbook of Armstrong Atlantic State University and the College of Education Faculty Handbook*. The applicant’s portfolio(s) will be submitted to the College of Education Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion for review by the Dean of the College of Education. The report of this committee will be added to the Department Recommendation Form. All forms and portfolios will be submitted to the Dean of the College of Education for review. The Dean will make the final recommendations on pre-tenure and sign the AASU Pre-tenure, Promotion, Retention, Tenure Recommendation Form that will be submitted to the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Following the complete review, the department head will provide the candidate with a written report of the findings of the review process. It will be the responsibility of the faculty member to meet with the department head to discuss contents of the report and seek any guidance necessary for acting on the recommendations.

**Retention Review**

All non-tenured faculty who serve on the basis of yearly contracts must be reviewed annually. Candidates will request retention by notifying the department head in writing. In the absence of written notification, the department head will initiate a review. The department head must ascertain the reaction of the candidate’s departmental faculty to the application for retention. The candidate must provide FACE summary forms and the annual APAR that documents accomplishments in teaching plus any accomplishments in scholarship, service, and professional growth.
and development for review by the departmental faculty prior to their notifying the department head of their reactions to the candidate’s retention (see Regulations, Article II, Section C. 2. a and C.2.b in the AASU Faculty Handbook).

The department head will make the recommendation on retention which will then be sent to the Dean of the College of Education for approval. The recommendation will be forwarded to the Vice President of Academic Affairs.
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ARMSTRONG ATLANTIC STATE UNIVERSITY
Pre-Tenure, Promotion, Retention, Tenure Recommendation Form

Name: ___________________________________________ SSN: _______________
Dept:____________________________________________ Date: _______________

Action (check one) ____Pre-Tenure ____Promotion____ Retention ____Tenure
______________________________________________________________________

1. For all Actions: Biographical data (as of the end of the current academic year)
   College Teaching
   Total Years       Years at AASU
   As an instructor
   As An Assistant Professor
   As an Associate Professor
   As a Professor

   List of Degrees Earned, Institution, and Year.

Present Academic Rank and Title (Discipline):

Recommended Rank and Title (for Promotion Only):

Tenure Status: _____Tenured _____ On Tenure Track _____ Non-Tenure Track

Years on Tenure Track ____ Probationary Credit ___ Total years toward Tenure ____

For all actions: Department Heads Summary of the results of the departmental review process. Characterize the level of peer support for this faculty member and describe the departmental review process (additional sheets may be appended)
For Promotion & Tenure only: attach a brief paragraph justifying the recommended action for promotion or tenure. This statement will become a part of the recommendation forwarded to the Board of Regents for consideration of this action. Also attach the candidate’s professional resume.

Pre-Tenure Review Rating (check one)

_____ Satisfactory Progress toward Tenure  _____ Satisfactory with Recommendations

_____ Improvement Needed  _____ Unsatisfactory

Comments/Recommendations (additional sheets may be attached)

Department Head’s Signature _____________________ Date ________________

*A satisfactory review does not constitute a guarantee of tenure

Promotion/Tenure Recommendation

I recommend that ______________________

Name of candidate

(check one)

__________ be promoted

__________ be awarded tenure

I certify that this faculty member meets all minimum requirements for this action of Armstrong Atlantic State University and the University System of Georgia.

Retention Recommendation

I recommend that ______________________

Name of candidate

_____ be retained for academic year ____________.

_____ be retained with reservation for academic year ________.

_____ not be retained for academic year ___________.

Department Head’s Signature _______________________________ Date: ____________

*A satisfactory review does not constitute a guarantee of tenure
Acknowledgment of Faculty Member

I acknowledge that I am aware of the department head’s recommendation.

________________________________________________ Date: _____________
Faculty Member’s signature

Dean’s Recommendation

Pre-tenure Review Rating (check one)

_____ Satisfactory Progress toward Tenure      _____ Satisfactory with Recommendations

_____ Improvement Needed        _____ Unsatisfactory

Comments/Recommendations (additional sheets may be attached)

________________________________________________ Date: _____________
Dean’s Signature

* A satisfactory review does not constitute a guarantee of tenure.

Promotion/Tenure Recommendation

I recommend that _____________________________________________________

(Check one)      _____ be promoted to the rank of _________________________________.

_____ be awarded tenure.

I certify that this faculty member meets all minimum requirements for this action of Armstrong
Atlantic State University and the University System of Georgia.

____________________________________________________ Date: _______________
Dean’s Signature

Retention Recommendation

I recommend that _________________________________

_____ be retained for academic year _____________.

_____ be retained with reservations for academic year __________

_____ not be retained for academic year _______________.

____________________________________________________ Date: _______________
Dean’s Signature

• A recommendation to retain does not constitute a guarantee of tenure.
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College of Education Guidelines on Post-Tenure Review

In order to provide tenured faculty with feedback on performance effectiveness and to identify opportunities for professional development consistent with the changing needs of the university, post-tenure evaluations will be conducted. Beginning five years after the initial year in which tenure was awarded or in the fifth year following the most recent promotion action and continuing at five year intervals, all tenured faculty members will receive post-tenure evaluations.

It will be the responsibility of the department head to maintain a schedule of eligibility and to notify the eligible faculty in writing that a post-tenure review will be conducted and that documentation must be submitted by a specified date. This date will allow ample time for the faculty member to prepare the packet of information required for the review. The faculty member should meet with the Department Head to review the process as it is outlined in the Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure: College of Education and the Faculty Handbook of Armstrong Atlantic State University, identify the kinds and quantities of documentation required, establish time frames, review deadlines, and secure any other information pertinent to the review process.

Each faculty member eligible for review will prepare a portfolio containing the following items:

- a curriculum vitae covering the five years since the receipt of tenure or since the last post tenure review or promotion.
- documentation of satisfactory performance in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, service to the institution, and professional growth and development including abstracts of grant applications and grants funded, other professional publications, and/or research projects, descriptions of awards and commendations, special scholarly projects, and so on.
- Annual Faculty Evaluations (AFE) for the past five years.
- SAIC summary reports from the past five years.
- APAR forms from the past five years.
- evidence from the faculty member of the measures s/he is taking to fulfill his/her role in the institution.
- any additional documentation that will provide evidence of professional growth and development.

Teaching effectiveness will be the most important factor in all post-tenure evaluations. The role of the faculty member within the College of Education will be considered as will scholarship and service to the institution.

Basically, the post-tenure review process will involve the following: preparation of a portfolio by the faculty member who is to be reviewed; completion of a peer review procedure for the portfolio; and the completion of a Peer Review Outcome Form (PROF) by the department head which will detail the results of the review. Full time, tenure track faculty will be eligible to review the portfolio. All faculty who participate in the post tenure
review process must be willing to certify that they have reviewed the application for post-tenure review portfolio carefully before completing and/or signing any official evaluation forms.

**NOTE:** Post-tenure review will substitute for a faculty member’s annual evaluation in the year in which it is conducted.

The College of Education will adhere to the following deadlines which fall within the time frame for post-tenure review as published in the *Faculty Handbook* of Armstrong Atlantic State University:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Action to be Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 20</td>
<td>Department Head notifies each listed faculty member of the upcoming post-tenure review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Head makes time available to meet with each of the listed faculty to review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the criteria and procedures for post-tenure review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1</td>
<td>Faculty member submits the post-tenure review portfolio to the Department Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15</td>
<td>Beginning of post-tenure review by the department faculty as part of the required peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>review process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1</td>
<td>Peer review of the post-tenure review portfolio is completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15</td>
<td>Department Head prepares the Peer Review Outcome Form (PROF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>Completion date for the PROF with faculty member’s response.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possible Outcomes of the Review Process**

The following review ratings may be recommended on the PROF:

**Satisfactory** The faculty member is performing effectively as a teacher and is making contributions in the areas of research and service. Commendations or any suggestions for further development may be made in writing to the faculty member.

**Satisfactory with Recommendations** The faculty member may be performing satisfactorily in teaching and service or scholarship but the department head may believe that an area needs more attention. The department head will provide specific written suggestions to help the
faculty member strengthen a weak area and avoid future problems during performance evaluations. A formal plan of action will be written with the collaboration of the department head and the faculty member. A copy will be given to the faculty member.

**Improvement Needed**

This category requires that a written faculty plan of development be created by the department head and the faculty member. It results when a faculty member is performing satisfactorily in teaching but has inadequate contributions in service and scholarship. The faculty member and the department head will create the written plan which will be reviewed as part of subsequent annual evaluations. Comments in reference to the plan’s review must be placed in the faculty member’s annual evaluation by the department head. Deficit areas must be corrected by the next post-tenure review.

**Unsatisfactory**

A faculty member will receive an “Unsatisfactory” if his/her teaching performance is documented as **less than satisfactory**. Additionally, an “Unsatisfactory” rating will occur when a faculty member fails to respond to the improvement plan that resulted from a rating of “Needs Improvement” on the previous post-tenure review.

Tenured faculty who receive a rating of “Unsatisfactory” will meet with the Department Head and the Dean of the College of Education to develop a written comprehensive improvement plan. The plan will be reviewed annually and no pay increase will be granted until the “Unsatisfactory” is removed. Other sanctions, approved in writing by the Vice President and Dean of the Faculty, may be imposed. Failure to remove the “Unsatisfactory” by the date of the next post-tenure review will result in the institution of dismissal proceedings.

**Review of the Ratings**

A faculty member who disagrees with the rating received or with a development plan may state his/her objections on the PROF. The comments will be reviewed automatically by the Dean of the College of Education. The dean may then refer the matter to the College of Education Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion who will review the PROF, the portfolio, and any other pertinent documentation available. The faculty committee will then present the dean with a written statement of the committee’s reaction. The faculty member will be apprised in writing of the outcome of the reviews by the Dean and the committee of faculty within thirty (30) calendar days of the Dean’s receipt of the faculty member’s objections as written on the PROF.
Faculty who do not agree with the outcome of the review by the Dean and the committee may follow other appeal procedures as outlined in the Faculty Handbook of Armstrong Atlantic State University.
POST-TENURE REVIEW
PEER REVIEW OUTCOME FORM (P.R.O.F.)
(Deadline: March 15)

Faculty Name_________________________ SS#___________
Department___________________________ Date:___________

Checklist:
_____ The departmental criteria for faculty evaluation was used and are attached.
_____ A portfolio was compiled by the faculty member (Deadline: December 1) and reviewed by those involved in the peer review process (Deadline: February 15).
_____ Peer evaluation was performed according to the AASU Faculty Handbook Regulations (Article II, A.2.c.).
_____ Peer Review Outcome Form (P.R.O.F.) is completed by Department Head (Deadline: March 15).

Department Head’s Summary of the Peer Review Process and Its Outcome:

Department Head’s Review Rating:
_____ Satisfactory
_____ Satisfactory with Recommendations
_____ Improvement Needed
_____ Unsatisfactory
Department Head’s Comments:

Department Head’s Recommendations for Faculty Development and Time Schedule for Completion:

__________________________  Date: _______________
Department Head’s Signature

Faculty Member’s Comments:

Acknowledgement of Faculty Member:

I acknowledge that I am aware of the contents of this review.

__________________________  Date: ___________
Faculty Member’s Signature

Recommendation of the Academic Dean:

_____ I support this review  _____ I do not support this review.

__________________________  Date: ___________
Dean’s Signature
College of Education Special Committee Review of Outcomes of Post-Tenure Review Process

Please print or type

College of Education Department: ________________________________

Date: _________

Committee Chair: ________________________________________________

Committee Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name and Title of Faculty Member: ________________________________

State reason(s) for the committee’s review:

Committee’s findings: (please address all concerns noted on the PROF by the faculty member)

Committee’s recommendations:
Committee recommendations (cont.)

Signatures of Committee Members

Chair __________________________
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________
APPENDIX A
Faculty Information Points

**Academic Advisement** requires that each faculty member will assist in the AASU advisement program for students. The department head is responsible for the academic advisement of each student in the department’s programs (See Article VIII, Section C, Faculty Responsibilities, Regulations, *AASU Faculty Handbook*).

**Academic Freedom** refers to each faculty member’s right to pursue, advance and express the truth of scholarship. Academic freedom protects scholarship in the advancement of truth, the teacher’s right to teach, and the student’s right to learn. (See Article XV, Section B, Faculty Responsibilities, Statutes, *AASU Faculty Handbook*).

**Confidentiality of student records** falls under the regulations of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) of 1974. Student records are held confidential unless they fall within the list of exceptions provided by FERPA. (See Article VII, Section C, Faculty-Student Relations, Regulations, *AASU Faculty Handbook*).

**Faculty Handbook.** Each college maintains a faculty handbook as does the university. The *AASU Faculty Handbook* is available online at [www.vpres.armstrong.edu](http://www.vpres.armstrong.edu). College handbooks can be secured via one’s department head.

**Faculty Roles and Responsibilities.** The faculty of the university are given the responsibility for developing rules and regulations for faculty governance, providing committees, prescribing regulations regarding admissions, suspension, expulsion, discipline, scholarship, classes, courses of study, requirements for graduation, and make recommendations that foster high academic standards. (See Article XIII, Section C, The University Faculty, Statutes, *AASU Faculty Handbook*).

**Honor Code and Code of Student Conduct** address academic honesty and appropriate classroom and campus behaviors. These codes are published in the *AASU Catalog* and in the *Student Handbook*. More information on these codes can be secured through the Office of Student Affairs. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to address these codes and their expressed expectations at the beginning of each course. Standards for academic honesty should be addressed in the syllabus of each course. (See Article VII, Section A, Faculty-Student Relations, Regulations, *AASU Faculty Handbook*).

**Office Hours** refer to the required 10 hours each week that a faculty member must be available in his/her office. These hours must be posted outside the faculty member’s office door. (See Article VIII, Section B, Faculty Responsibilities, Regulations, *AASU Faculty Handbook*).

**Outside Activities** refer to activities such as consulting, teaching, speaking, and participating in business services or enterprises. Permission must be secured from one’s immediate supervisor with approval by the dean. Care must be taken to avoid conflict of interest. (See Article VIII, Section G., Faculty Responsibilities, Regulations, *AASU Faculty Handbook*).
**Policy on Student Attendance** refers to the responsibility of faculty to establish the attendance policy for his/her courses. Faculty members are expected to publish the policy in the syllabus for each class (See Article VIII, Section F, Faculty Responsibilities, Regulations, *AASU Faculty Handbook*).

**Retention** applies to non-tenured faculty who serve on the basis of annual contracts. Retention decisions are based upon the short-term and long-term needs of the university. Procedures relating to retention can be found under Article II, Section C.2.b, Evaluation and Personnel Policies, Regulations, *AASU Faculty Handbook*.

**Scheduling classes** falls under the job description of the department head under the direct supervision of the dean. Faculty may not change the scheduled time or place of a class without the approval of the department head and the dean (See Article VIII, Section E., Faculty Responsibilities, Regulations, AASU Faculty Handbook).

**Syllabi** must contain the course goals and requirements. Faculty members are required to provide students with a syllabus at the beginning of the semester (See Article VIII, Section I, Faculty Responsibilities, Regulations, *AASU Faculty Handbook*).

**Workload** consists of the activities that make up teaching, service, and scholarship. It is defined by the semester credit hour and faculty annual workload is 30 semester hours of credit. For tenured or tenure track faculty who have scholarship or service responsibilities beyond routine advisement and committee work, the work load is 24 semester hours annually (See Article VIII, Section A, Faculty Responsibilities, Regulations, *AASU Faculty Handbook*).