



# J. WHITNEY BUNTING COLLEGE OF BUSINESS & TECHNOLOGY

---

GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY

## Department Chairperson's Review of Faculty Performance

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Rank: \_\_\_\_\_

For AY: \_\_\_\_\_

This evaluation is to be completed by the department chairperson. All judgments must be documented with supportive evidence, for example, the faculty member's Individual Faculty Report. All judgments indicating "Does Not Meet Expectations" or "Needs Improvement" must be documented with supportive comments and these comments should indicate specific actions in which the faculty member needs to be engaged to bring his/her rating to a higher level. This evaluation must be signed and dated by the chairperson and the faculty member. (*Signature on this evaluation means that the faculty member has seen this document; it does not necessarily indicate agreement with the content of the evaluation*). Faculty may appeal the department chair evaluation by complying with the procedures described under #7 of the [Annual Evaluation Procedures](#) in the PPPM.

Per the [Board of Regents \(BOR\)](#) and [Georgia College statutes and procedures](#), evaluations shall include an assessment of faculty contributions to **student success** and engagement in **professional development** within their teaching, scholarship, and/or service. Therefore, evidence of student success and professional development may be duplicated in the three categories under review. Involvement in student centered activities may include effective advising and mentoring; undergraduate and graduate research; other forms of experiential learning; engagement in other GC Journeys (high impact practices); the development of student success tools and curricular materials; strategies to improve student career success; involvement in faculty development activities; and other activities identified by colleges/departments to deepen student learning. Evaluation of continuous professional growth and development involves the acquisition of knowledge and skills in an area of specialization across the scope of their responsibilities.

**Common Likert Scale:** The following scale with descriptions will be used at each stage and evaluation point of a faculty member's career, whether tenure-track or non-tenure track: annual evaluations, pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure.

Noteworthy achievement as referenced in [BOR Policy 8.3.7.3](#) is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the common Likert Scale below. Deficient and unsatisfactory as referenced throughout this document is reflective of a 1 or a 2 on the common Likert Scale below. (4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems).

**Exemplary (5):** Rating for faculty whose performance far exceeds requirements in principal professional responsibilities on a consistent basis. Normally reserved for those few individuals whose performance is outstanding to all.

**Exceeds Expectations (4):** Rating for faculty whose performance clearly and consistently exceeds requirements in principal professional responsibilities.

**Meets Expectations (3):** Rating for faculty whose performance consistently meets requirements in principal professional responsibilities. This rating recognizes satisfactory accomplishment and achievement.

**Needs Improvement (2):** Rating for faculty whose performance has approached, but not yet met, requirements in principal professional responsibilities. The need for further development is definitely recognizable.

**Does Not Meet Expectations (1):** Rating for faculty whose performance clearly fails to meet requirements in principal professional responsibilities. Improved performance is expected and required as a condition of continued employment in the position.

**Not applicable:** *only applies to non-tenure track faculty*

**\*\*\*CHAIRS – please include IFRs and SRIS scores for the review period\*\*\***

## **I. Teaching (50%):**

Categories below may be weighted in any combination in making an overall judgment.

- a. Evaluation of course planning and analysis:

Comments:

- b. Evaluation of grading procedures:

Comments:

- c. Evaluation of teaching from student feedback, including but not limited to computer summaries of SRIS and other information:

Comments:

- d. Evaluation of use of other indices such as, but not limited to formative evaluation, classroom visitations, peer opinions, and preparation of enrichment materials:

Comments:

- e. Evaluation of faculty contributions to and activities in support of student success (as applicable in the area of teaching):

Comments (optional):

- f. Evaluation of faculty professional development activities (as applicable in the area of teaching):

Comments (optional):

- g. Other information as appropriate

Comments (optional):

## II. Research/Creative/Scholarly/Practitioner Engagement Activities (35%):

Categories below may be weighted in any combination in making an overall judgment. They are not of equal importance.

a. What was the agreed upon faculty qualification status in this AY as part of their planned maintenance in the five-year review period?

- Scholarly Academic (answer b., c., d., e., and g.)
- Practice Academic (answer b., d., e., f., and g.)
- Scholar Practitioner (answer b., c., d., e., f., and g.)
- Instructional Practitioner (answer b., d., e., f., and g.)

b. Has the faculty member engaged in appropriate activities to support maintenance of this faculty qualification status during this AY? Explain.

c. Evaluation of contributions of knowledge to area of specialization including, but not limited to, research, publications, presentations at professional meetings, and grants. Refer to the current [CoBT Faculty Qualifications Policy](#) for definitions and expectations pertaining to rank, qualifications criteria, and associated Academic Engagement Activities (AEAs).

Comments:

d. Evaluation of faculty contributions to and activities in support of student success (as applicable in the area of research):

Comments (optional):

e. Evaluation of faculty professional development activities (as applicable in the area of research):

Comments (optional):

f. Evaluation of contributions to practice/application in relation to their field of teaching, in particular the Practitioner Engagement Activities (PEAs).

Comments (optional):

g. Other information as appropriate

Comments (optional):

### iii. Professional service to the institution or the community (15%):

Categories below may be weighted in any combination in making an overall judgment. They are not of equal importance.

- a. Evaluation of contributions to department and/or college and/or the university including, but not limited to, committees, advising student groups and programs directed:

Comments:

- b. Evaluation of contributions to the profession and/or community:

Comments:

- c. Evaluation of service to area of specialization including, but not limited to, professional membership, offices held, attendance at professional meetings, and chairing of sessions:

Comments:

- d. Evaluation of faculty contributions to and activities in support of student success (as applicable in the area of service):

Comments (optional):

- e. Evaluation of faculty professional development activities (as applicable in the area of service):

Comments (optional):

- f. Other information as appropriate

Comments (optional):

**Rating Scale:**

Evaluate faculty member performance in teaching, research, service, student success, and professional development using the common Likert Scale as defined earlier in this document:

- Exemplary (5)
- Exceeds Expectations (4)
- Meets Expectations (3)
- Needs Improvement (2)
- Does Not Meet Expectations (1)
- Not applicable (only applies to non-tenure track faculty)*

**Teaching:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Research/Creative/Scholarly/Practice Engagement Activities:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Professional Service:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Student Success:** \_\_\_\_\_  
*(assessment of overall effort)*

**Continuous Professional Development:** \_\_\_\_\_  
*(assessment of overall effort)*

**Planned Faculty Qualification Status for Next Academic Year (select one):**

- Scholarly Academic (SA)
- Practice Academic (PA)
- Scholar Practitioner (SP)
- Instructional Practitioner (IP)

**Faculty Member Comments (optional):**

**Dean Comments (optional):**

---

**Faculty****Signature****Date**

This is to certify that I have read the Department Chairperson's evaluation of my performance. My chairperson and I have conferred on this matter. I *have/have not (choose one)* responded formally in writing (if so, the response is referenced in the optional comments section on this form). I understand that I have the right to review the chairperson's response (if any) to my response, and furthermore, that I may review personnel files kept on me which are used in personnel decisions, and that I have the right to place in these files any information that explains my position on any matter contained in such files.

*Signature on this evaluation means that the faculty member has seen this document; it does not necessarily indicate agreement with the content of the evaluation. Faculty may appeal the department chair evaluation by complying with the procedures described in Section 3.07.03.5 in the Academic Handbook.*

---

**Department Chair****Signature****Date**

This is to certify that I *have/have not (choose one)* received a response from this faculty member and I *have/have not (choose one)* responded. I *have/have not (choose one)* made changes in my evaluation of this faculty member, based on either the response received or from the conference held with them.

---

**Dean****Signature****Date**

This is to certify that I have reviewed the material presented in this faculty review.