Business for Life

**Educating the next generation of leaders.**

AUGUSTA UNIVERSITY

**Faculty Evaluation**

**Policies & Guidelines**

Hull College of Business

**Approved:** TBD

## Table of Contents

## INTRODUCTION

As part of a comprehensive research university, the Hull College of Business (HCB) contributes to the broader institutional mission of teaching, scholarship and service.  In our teaching we seek to continually engage our students inside and outside of the classroom, integrate impactful learning experiences in our curriculum, and position our students for academic and professional success while meeting Georgia's workforce needs.  Through our scholarship we seek to improve the quality of instruction, contribute to the academy, and impact the practice of business and our community.  Through our service, we look to engage with our students, university and community to benefit society and to enhance our teaching and research.

To position the HCB to successfully fulfill our mission, we are dedicated to optimally hiring, developing, deploying, evaluating and recognizing our professorial and non-professorial track faculty over the entire faculty life-cycle.  To this end, we utilize an integrated faculty evaluation system that begins with the identification of goals and workload allocations and culminates in aligned periodic performance evaluations.  We are also committed to rewarding and recognizing our faculty as appropriate through annual performance evaluations, tenure and promotion.  Our system of workload allocation and evaluation is both fair and rigorous and provides continuous feedback for the development of our faculty.

In the following sections, more detailed information is provided regarding workload guidelines, annual performance evaluations, AASCB maintenance of qualification standards, pre-tenure, tenure, promotion and promotion reviews.  The overreaching goals of these policies and guidelines are to provide transparent systems and to position our faculty for sustained career success while simultaneously enabling the HCB and Augusta University to fulfill our mission.

## ALIGNMENTS & POLICY SUBORDINATION

As part of the University System of Georgia (USG), Augusta University policies and procedures are informed by and aligned with the Board of Regent's Policy Manual (Board of Regents Policy Manual | Overview | University System of Georgia (usg.edu)) and Academic and Student Affairs Handbook (Academic & Student Affairs Handbook | University System of Georgia (usg.edu)).  As an academic unit with in the broader University, the Hull College of business is required to establish policies guiding workload assignment and evaluation that are aligned with our institutional level policies and procedures (University Policy Library (augusta.edu)).  In the event of any conflicting language the USG level policies or Augusta University policies control.

# Section 1

# Allocation and Management of Faculty Workload for

# Full-time Faculty Guidelines

**Approved:** TBD

## Allocation and Management of Faculty Workload for Full-time Faculty Guidelines

### Purpose and Preamble

This framework is established to provide clarity and guidance to faculty and administrators about assigning and managing workloads for all full-time faculty members in the Hull College of Business as defined in the Augusta University (AU) Institutional Framework for Faculty Workload.

This policy uses a differential distributed effort model to allocate full-time faculty workload. Although faculty teaching, research, and service loads may differ across the college, the college strives for consistency and predictability in the relationship between each faculty member's assigned effort and corresponding workload.

### Definitions

**Workload:** All activities and responsibilities that a faculty member is expected to perform.

> Apportioned among defined categories which makes up a faculty member's university appointment.
> Conceptualized at both the individual level, the unit level, and the institutional level.
> Fluctuates throughout the year across and within workload categories.
> Generally subjective, with components that are difficult to measure.

**Assigned effort:** The institutional metric used to approximate the amount of time that a faculty member should direct towards his or her assigned responsibilities within each workload category.

> Expressed as a percentage.
> Assigned by the supervisor in consultation with the faculty member.
> Variable within days and weeks across the year but assigned in an annualized or semester average.
> Reflective of reasonable expectations of productivity (in terms of quality and quantity) considered standard within the discipline or profession, which will position the faculty member for successful advancement within the stated institutional mission.
> Distinct, albeit difficult to distinguish, from a multitude of valid professional commitments and endeavors faculty may choose to pursue or participate in voluntarily, beyond the duties intended by their effort assignment. It is the faculty member's responsibility to verify with the College (Dean) which commitments are intended by, and count towards the fulfillment of, their assigned effort.

**Standard:** A common or consistent application of a metric within a category that provides additional clarity to expectations for a given assigned effort. It is expected that metrics associated with a given assigned effort would be the same across faculty members within a discipline or profession.

**Benchmark:** A point of reference against which standards are established. Where benchmarks exist for a discipline or profession, these benchmarks should be identified in the written workload policies and guidelines.

## Workload Categories

Five categories are defined for the assignment of faculty workload by the *AU Institutional Framework for Faculty Workload*. The Hull College uses four of the five categories. These definitions will be used to guide management and allocation of workload. The purpose of this guidance is to promote transparency, consistency, and understanding of workload assignments across the college.

Given the sheer number and diversity of responsibilities faculty may undertake—and the broad range of factors that affect the amount of work involved with these commitments (e.g., changes in mission, policy, programming, resources, or enrollment)—this guidance is not, and cannot be, exhaustive. Faculty and deans are often called upon to be flexible and creative in adjusting expectations when urgent or obligatory duties do not align with planned effort assignments. Accordingly, it is important that faculty notify their dean promptly when they believe their workload is out of alignment with these norms. Likewise, it is incumbent upon deans to investigate such concerns and, if valid, take reasonable steps to resolve them in a prompt, fair manner that may take a variety of forms as appropriate to each case (e.g., immediate, or future reassignment from other duties, changes to contractually assigned effort, reduced teaching preps, additional pay).

There are a host of personal and professional reasons a faculty member may choose to pursue additional Teaching, Scholarship, or Service commitments beyond their assigned effort in those areas. These additional efforts are certainly valued by the college and get recognized in important ways through the established evaluation, promotion, merit increase, and/or awards processes; however, when such choices are undertaken voluntarily beyond the effort assigned, they do not obligate the college to reconfigure the faculty member's effort distribution or workload.

## Standards for Individual Faculty Members (Tracks)

Faculty workload assignments are made applying a portfolio management perspective intended to optimally align the strengths and preferences of faculty with the College's operational and strategic needs. To facilitate this alignment, the College utilizes various faculty tracks. Each faculty track is designed to have differing degrees of effort allocated to the teaching, scholarship, and service needs of the college as indicated in the tables below.

Note that at any given point in time the College may utilizes any combination of faculty tracks and may or may not utilize every track.

### Initial Track Assignments:

In general, the Teaching Focused track is utilized for non-tenure track lecturer positions. Tenure track faculty members are typically hired into the Balanced, Balanced- Scholarship or Scholarship tracks. The initial track designations for tenure track faculty, while subject to negotiation, are ultimately made by the Dean to satisfy the College's operational and strategic priorities.

### Changes in Track Assignments:

Generally, a faculty member's designated track does not change until after they have successfully received tenure. After tenure, a faculty member may request a change in track to better align with their preferences; however, any change in track is subject to the approval of the Dean and is made recognizing the resource needs of the College. Additionally, the Dean may modify track assignments to better align the preferences and performance of the faculty member with the operating needs of the college. *Once a track is changed, it is expected that the new track assignment will last for a minimum of three-years*.

### Allocation of Effort and Tracks

Each track is designed with a differing degree of effort in teaching, scholarship, and service. The variations in effort between tracks provides a mechanism for the College to align faculty strengths and preferences more optimally with the College's needs. Through this process of alignment, the College improves employee satisfaction while simultaneously increasing productivity.

The first table below indicates the five-year target effort allocation for the various faculty tracks across the major role model components. It is fully expected that variations from these five-year targets will occur based upon the College's dynamic environment. In general, the amount of effort allocated to teaching and research in a given year should normally not exceed +/-10% of the five-year target while service should normally not vary by more than +/- 5%.

***In making annual effort assignments, the Dean attempts to manage the faculty member's workload to align with the five-year target across time*** (e.g., a 10% increase in teaching with a corresponding decrease of 10% in scholarship in year one, is offset by a 10% reduction in teaching and a corresponding 10% increase in scholarship in year two).

**Five-Year Average Assigned Effort Target:**

| Track | Teaching % Effort | Scholarship % Effort | Service % Effort | Typical Faculty Qualifications |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching Focused | 80% | 10% | 10% | IP |
| Balanced | 60% | 30% | 10% | SA, SP. PA |
| Balanced- Service | 50% | 30% | 20% | SA, SP, PA |
| Balanced-Scholarship | 50% | 40% | 10% | SA, SP, PA |
| Scholarship | 40% | 50% | 10% | SA |

**College Perspective of Tracks**

The success of our College depends upon successfully fulfilling all the required components of our role model- Teaching, Scholarship and Service. We also recognize that faculty members have differing strengths and that by optimally aligning our portfolio of faculty we best position the College and individual faculty members for success. For example, one faculty member's strength and interest may align better with teaching while another's better aligns with Scholarship. By allocating a heavier emphasis on teaching to the first faculty member, it then provides additional capacity for the College to reduce the teaching load of the other faculty member and increase their effort allocated to scholarship. In this scenario both faculty members experience better alignment while the College benefits by higher levels of overall productivity and employee satisfaction.

***It is important to note that the College does not view any of the tracks as having differing relative value; rather, all faculty regardless of track assignment are equally important to the long-term success of the College. It is through the optimal management of faculty workload, including tracks and differential allocation of effort, that the College best fulfills our mission of teaching, scholarship, and service***.

## Alignment of the Standards for Individual Faculty Members (Tracks) & AACSB Faculty Designations

According to the 2020 Principles and Standard for Business Accreditation, "Faculty members can be Scholarly Academic (SA), Practice Academic (PA), Scholarly Practitioner (SP), or Instructional Practitioner (IP). Faculty members should be assigned one of these designations based on the school's criteria for initial qualifications and sustained engagement activities that support currency and relevancy in the teaching field." (p. 29).

Consequently, the College attempts to align individual faculty member workloads with their AACSB designation. These alignments are indicated in the table below.

| Track | Typical Faculty Qualifications |
|---|---|
| Teaching Focused | IP |
| Balanced | SA, SP. PA |
| Balanced- Service | SA, SP, PA |
| Balanced- Scholarship | SA, SP, PA |
| Scholarship | SA |

Note that the track and designation combinations above represent the typical alignments in the College; however, all individual track assignments and AASCB designations are determined by the Dean in consultation with the faculty member.

*The College's guiding philosophy in determination of individual tracks and AACSB designations is to operationalize the optimal alignment of faculty member strengths and preferences with the strategic management of the college.*

## Teaching

Expectations for teaching vary in proportion to the faculty member's assigned effort as reflected in their designated track. While variations in a faculty member's annual effort assignments are likely because of our dynamic environment, workload is managed over a longer period to align with the designated track's five-year target (see the table below). On an annual basis, the assigned teaching effort is established by the Dean, or designee, in consultation with the faculty member. The five-year goals for teaching effort assignments are indicated in the table below.

**Five-Year Average Assigned Effort Target (Teaching):**

| Track | Five-Year % Effort |
|---|---|
| Teaching Focused | 80% |
| Balanced | 60% |
| Balanced- Service | 50% |
| Balanced- Scholarship | 50% |
| Scholarship | 40% |

**Components of Teaching Effort:**

To inform the allocation of teaching effort the College has identified the following major drivers:
- Instructional Load
- Number of Course Preparations or New Course Assignments
- New Course or Program Development
- Course Size or Complexity

**Instructional Load:**

Generally, faculty are assigned 10% Teaching effort for each 3-credit hour course they teach in an academic year. For example, teaching six courses per year—sometimes referred to as a "3/3 load"—equates to 60% effort and teaching eight courses in an academic year equates to a "4/4 load" or 80% effort. Asymmetrical loads may happen for various reasons but will follow the same basic formula. For example, teaching three courses in fall, and two courses in spring ("3/2 load")—for a total of five courses—equates to 50% Teaching effort.

Although this formula for calculating Teaching effort is based on the number of "regular" 3 credit hour courses assigned to the faculty member, it includes time associated with the prep, consultation, and grading for each course, as well as a proportional commitment to the broader teaching-related responsibilities of the College (e.g., SLO assessment, program and course revisions, and other intermittent, difficult to quantify responsibilities that fluctuate over time, but are vital to student learning and success). Note, however, that when a faculty member is assigned a substantially greater or more concentrated portion of such College responsibilities than is typical,

these efforts should be assigned as a separate portion of effort rather than subsumed in the effort assigned for the faculty member's course load.

The following table provides the general expected alignment of instructional load with teaching effort assignments in the Hull College.

| Track | Five-Year % Effort | Normal Teaching Load |
|---|---|---|
| Teaching Focused | 80% | 4/4 |
| Balanced | 60% | 3/3 |
| Balanced- Service | 50% | 3/2 |
| Balanced- Scholarship | 50% | 3/2 |
| Scholarship | 40% | 2/2 |

Teaching loads are established and managed on an ongoing basis by the Dean to meet the operating needs of the College. Annual deviations in instructional loads from the five-year % effort in the table above are anticipated given the dynamic needs of the college. However, over an extended time, the goal is to align instructional effort with the faculty tracks above and should normally not exceed +/- 10% effort or 1 course deviation each year.

With the dean's approval, the College may depart from this standard Teaching effort calculation (i.e., 10% effort per course). In such cases, the variance shall be explained in detailed with a compelling justification to the faculty member in writing.

**Number of Course Preparations or New Course Assignments:**

In the allocation of teaching effort, the College recognizes that faculty workload is impacted by the number of different course preparations a faculty member has in each term and the variation in course preparations over time. Generally, in establishing and reviewing the teaching effort allocation the College utilizes the following baselines:

| Track | % Effort | Normal Teaching Load | Baseline Course Preparation Count Per Term |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching Focused | 80% | 4/4 | 3/3 |
| Balanced | 60% | 3/3 | 2/2 |
| Balanced- Service | 50% | 3/2 | 2/2 |
| Balanced- Scholarship | 50% | 3/2 | 2/2 |
| Scholarship | 40% | 2/2 | 2/1 |

In determining teaching effort, each additional course preparation per term above the baseline would generally receive a 5% effort modifier. For example, a faculty member on a Balanced track with three unique course preparations per term would normally equate to a 70% effort (6 courses at 10% each, 5% modifier for the first term and 5% modifier for the second term).

The College also recognizes that a new course preparation is generally more time intensive for a faculty member to prepare as compared to teaching the same preparation over time. In recognition of the increased effort requirements of a new preparation, the College will generally apply a 5% modifier to the course the first time it is offered (provided the course development activities were not incorporated into teaching effort in advance of the offering- see below). A new course assignment is defined as one that has not been instructed in the last three academic years by the faculty member. Note that this modifier does not apply in the first three years as a faculty member in the College.

***Note that the Dean, in consultation with the faculty member, is responsible for determining the appropriateness of any modifier taking into consideration a broad range of factors (difference in modality, synergies with other assigned preparations, synergies between terms, etc.) and may decide on a greater or lesser modifier than those indicated above***.

**New Course or Program Development:**

While faculty are expected to engage in continuous review and improvement of their assigned courses as part of their normal instructional effort, given our dynamic environment it is expected that the College will continually adjust our portfolio of courses and programs to meet the needs of our stakeholders. The College recognizes that designing new courses and programs requires effort and recognition distinct from the faculty member's other assigned instructional activities. Consequently, in the case where a faculty member is assigned the responsibility to create a new course or program, this assignment should be appropriately reflected in the faculty member's assigned teaching effort.

Given the vast variability in the required amount of time and effort associated with these activities, ***the amount of teaching effort allocated shall be negotiated between the Dean and the faculty member with the goal of ensuring the equitable recognition of these activities across faculty members and time***. In the determination of assigned effort, every 75 hours of anticipated course or program development activity generally equates to a 5% teaching effort.

In the case where a faculty member has received an allocation of teaching effort for the design of a new course, they shall not receive the modifier discussed above for teaching the new course if the course offering occurs within two-years of the recognized new course development activities.

**Course Size or Complexity:**

Course seating capacities naturally vary by disciplines, and the type, level, and focus of the course; however, the vast majority of 3 credit hour courses in the college have regular capacities between 25 and 50 seats. Temporary or permanent changes from these regular capacities occur only with

strong justification and approval by the Dean. Some courses may be approved for lower capacities due to various reasons including but not limited to peer-reviewed evidence that the lower capacity is critical to student success. A course section that fits these criteria and enrolls sufficiently (i.e., is not canceled due to low enrollment) shall count as one "regular" course for workload purposes.

Small-format sections and other irregular, but formally scheduled instructional duties (e.g., independent or directed studies, internships, honors thesis panels, etc.) are generally presumed to be part of a faculty member's teaching responsibilities, and do not get reflected as a percentage of their assigned Teaching effort. However, when a higher volume of such commitments arises or is assigned to a faculty member (e.g., field work supervisor, program, or internship coordinator), a portion of their Teaching effort may be allocated for those commitments. The allocated effort for these activities is assigned as negotiated with and approved by the dean. In the determination of assigned effort, every 75 hours of anticipated instructional activities generally equates to 5% teaching effort.

In all cases, faculty should confer with the Dean **prior** to the activities to determine their workload effort for Teaching.

## Research

The assignment of research effort is intended to position faculty members to attain career success, maintain their AACSB faculty designation and accomplish the strategic priorities of the College. According to the 2020 Principles and Standard for Business Accreditation the maintenance of faculty qualifications requires that:

- "there must be ongoing, sustained, and substantive academic activities (for SA) or professional engagement activities (for PA) supporting qualification status." (p. 30)
- "there must be ongoing, sustained, and substantive professional engagement activities (for IP) and scholarly activities (for SP) supporting qualification status." (p. 30)

In alignment with the AACSB 2020 Principles and Standard for Business Accreditation, the College views the research role model category broadly to include both scholarship and professional engagement. At a college level faculty are deployed from a strategic portfolio management perspective attempting to optimally align faculty strengths and preferences with the need of the College to best accomplish our goals including both impactful scholarship and professional engagement.

On an annual basis, the assigned research effort is established by the Dean, or designee, in consultation with the faculty member. While variations in annual research effort assignments are likely because of the operating needs of the College, workload assignments are managed over a longer period to align with the faculty member's designated track. The five-year goal for research effort assignments are indicated in the tables below.

**Five-Year Average Assigned Effort Target (Research):**

| Track | Five-Year % Effort |
|---|---|
| Teaching Focused | 10% |
| Balanced | 30% |
| Balanced- Service | 30% |
| Balanced- Scholarship | 40% |
| Scholarship | 50% |

As in the case of all activities, the College seeks to align assigned effort with accountability. Consequently, the expectations for research (scholarship and professional engagement) vary in proportion to the faculty member's assigned effort for the College as reflected in their track and AACSB designation (i.e., SA, PA, SP, IP). The College Faculty Qualification guidelines outline the specific expectations for scholarly activity and productivity for each of these classifications.

***It is also important to recognize that the College does not make a valuative distinction between AASCB faculty designations or between scholarship and professional engagement. We recognize that our success depends on successfully attaining our goals including both impactful research and professional engagement. We also recognize that the strategic use of faculty***

*designations and tracks increases faculty satisfaction, engagement, and productivity. Consequently, both impactful scholarship and professional engagement is valued by the College*.

**Research Activities (Scholarship and Professional Activities):**

The College considers two categories of scholarly activity (primary and secondary) and one category of professional activity. The lists below identify the associated activities by category. *Note that the activities listed below are not intended to be exhaustive and have differing values in terms of performance evaluation.* Please see the Hull College of Business Faculty-Qualifications Policy for more information.

*Primary Scholarly Activities:*

- Peer-reviewed academic research articles
- Peer-reviewed pedagogical articles or case studies

*Secondary Scholarly Activities:*

- Peer-reviewed conference presentation
- Peer-reviewed conference proceeding
- Textbook chapter
- Textbook
- Published instructional materials
- Scholarly book review published in academic journal
- Published article in trade journals
- Significant externally funded research project from a recognized funding agency*
- Policy report
- Widely available software developed by faculty

*Professional Activities:*

- Professional work or faculty internships related to the teaching discipline that is material in terms of time and substance
- Relevant consulting activity that are material in terms of time and substance
- Relevant volunteer activity that are material in terms of time and substance
- Professional paper presented at an industry conference
- Developing and presenting of executive education program
- Significant participation in business professional associations and societies
- Relevant, active service on board of directors
- Significant professional education

- Relevant certification
- Relevant editorial service with relevant academic or professional publication.
- Service on editorial board or committee
- Active participation in academic or professional association

\* Faculty are encouraged to participate in external funding opportunities and access all AU resources to support their research interests as they relate to their teaching in the business disciplines.  The Dean or Associate Dean may adjust the teaching workload expectations according to funding.  For example, the Dean may accommodate (find an alternate instructor) for course buyout where a faculty member's internal or external funding represents 10% of the faculty member's annual salary.

## Service

In addition to teaching and research, the College recognizes and values the service activities of our faculty.  In defining service, the College recognizes four broad categories of service:
- Citizenship- participating in and contributing to the life of the University
- Institutional Service – College, University, or USG
- Professional Service – Academia
- Community Service / Community Engagement

Individual faculty service effort is assigned by the Dean in consultation with the faculty member.  The guiding principle in assigning effort allocations is to optimally align the strengths and preferences of the faculty member with the service goals of the College related to the institution, profession, and community.

Depending upon the faculty member's designated track, the allocation of service effort will generally range from 10 – 20% effort.  While annual variations in service effort are anticipated given dynamic needs of the College on a year-by-year basis, the Dean attempts to manage the average load of the faculty member over an extended time to align with their designated track.

**Five-Year Average Assigned Effort Target (Service):**

| Track | Five-Year % Effort |
|---|---|
| Teaching Focused | 10% |
| Balanced | 10% |
| Balanced- Service | 20% |
| Balanced- Scholarship | 10% |
| Scholarship | 10% |

*As in the case of all activities, the College seeks to align assigned effort with accountability. Consequently, the expectations for service will vary in proportion to the allocated effort.*

**Service Activities:**

*Citizenship:*

All faculty members in the College will typically have a 5% service allocation for citizenship. Citizenship includes, but in not limited to, attending college and university assembly meetings, participating in social/recognition/service events during the year (e.g., commencement, convocation, student award ceremonies, student orientation/recruitment activities, BGS, Day of Service, etc.), completing mandatory training/compliance activities, and attending other university events or functions.  Generally, 5% effort should equate to approximately 75 hours of expected activity on an annual basis.

*Institutional Service:*

Institutional service includes a broad range of activities generally related to faculty participation in the shared governance or operations of the College, University or University System. While these activities may at times share some similarity to teaching and scholarship, the primary focus of these activities is to provide service. For example, while serving on the Academic Affairs committee may have some overlap with teaching in the College, the primary role of the committee is to participate in the shared governance of the College and is consequently considered a service activity.

In all cases, the % allocation of effort for institutional service assignments are established on an annual basis by the Dean in consultation with the Executive Committee, Committee Chairs, and/or faculty members and guided by the expected time commitment required to successfully accomplish the associated service goals. In the determination of institutional service workload assignments, 75 hours of expected activity on an annual basis should equate to approximately 5% effort. The Dean will attempt to ensure equitable recognition of workload across faculty and time in making these annual determinations.

***The following tables provides some examples of the common institutional service activities of our faculty. Note that the tables do not provide an exhaustive list of the activities.***

| Examples of College Service |
|---|
| College Committee Member |
| College Committee Secretary |
| College Committee Chair |
| P&T Committee |
| Pre or Post Tenure Review Committee |
| Assembly Chair Elect or Past Chair |
| Assembly Chair |
| Faculty Secretary |
| Search Committee |
| Other Institutional Service |

| Examples of University Service: * |
|---|
| Augusta University Faculty Senate (AUFS) |
| AUFS- Leadership |
| AUFS- Committee |
| AUFS- Committee Chair |
| Search Committee |
| Faculty Advocate |
| Parliamentarian |
| Other Institutional Service |

*Professional Service:*

Professional service includes a broad range of engagement activities either to academia or other business and professional organizations.  Some examples of professional activities include serving as an editor, serving as a reviewer or referee, reviewing textbooks, serving as a track or program chair, or active participation in an academic or professional association.

Given the vast variability in the required amount of time and effort associated with these activities, ***the amount of service effort allocated shall be negotiated between the Dean and the faculty member on a case-by-case basis with the goal of ensuring the equitable recognition of these activities across faculty members and time***.  In the determination of assigned effort, every 75 hours of anticipated activity generally equates to a 5% service effort.

*Community Service:*

AASB Standard 9 of the 2020 Principles and Standard for Business Accreditation requires that schools "demonstrates positive societal impact through internal and external initiatives and/or activities, consistent with the school's mission, strategies, and expected outcomes."  One way that the College aligns with this standard is by encouraging our faculty to engage in community service initiatives consonant with our Mission by recognizing the value of these activities through the appropriate allocation of workload effort.  Community service includes a broad range of engagement activities including serving on boards, providing pro-bono consulting, and active involvement in community organizations.

Given the vast variability in the required amount of time and effort associated with these activities, ***the amount of service effort allocated shall be negotiated between the Dean and the faculty member on a case-by-case basis with the goal of ensuring the equitable recognition of these activities across faculty members and time***.  As above, in the determination of effort, every 75 hours of activity generally equates to a 5% service effort.

***In all cases, faculty should confer with the Dean to determine which activities fulfill their assigned effort for Service and to determine expected allocation of time and % effort.***

**Participating and Supporting Faculty Members:**

Standard 3 of the AACSB  2020 Principles and Standard for Business Accreditation requires that a "school maintains and strategically deploys sufficient participating and supporting faculty" where a participating faculty member is defined as one that "actively and deeply engages in the activities of the school in matters beyond direct teaching responsibilities".  (p. 27)

A primary indicator of a participating faculty member in the College, is the degree that they participate in citizenship or other service activities (institutional, professional and community) consonant with our Mission.  In general, a faculty member that is assigned a 5% service allocation and satisfactorily meets the related performance standard(s) is categorized as a participating faculty member.

## Administration

Administrative effort is not generally assigned to faculty members. Most informal leadership and administrative activities should be categorized under Service—or, if appropriate, under Teaching or Scholarship. Administrative effort is typically reserved for ongoing, formal leadership responsibilities that include strategic planning, operational management (e.g., budget, personnel), or compliance/quality assurance (e.g., training, credentialing, policymaking, accreditation).

Administrative activities typically include those associated with the titles Deans, Assistant/Associate Deans, Department Chairs, and some directors of centers and programs. Generally, the principal duties and expectations for assigned administrative effort are established by the formal position description or appointment letter, with the understanding that additional duties may be assigned by the supervisor. Since the nature and scope of these administrative duties varies greatly at different levels of authority and across different areas of responsibility—and may change with shifting priorities, resources, or programming—it is not possible to generalize further about workload in this area.

Faculty should confer with their supervisor to determine which activities are expected to fulfill their assigned effort for Administration.

## Processes

Annually, all faculty are evaluated by the dean to review their progress and achievements from the preceding year, and to set effort-related expectations and goals for the coming year. These evaluation meetings along with fall planning meetings should include candid discussions about workload, and faculty are encouraged to ask questions to ensure they understand the specific duties they are expected to fulfill for their effort assignment, as well as to express concerns if their assigned effort distribution does not align with their understanding.

The Dean and Associate Dean will inform individual faculty members at every administrator assessment opportunity (e.g., goals proposal, one-on-one meetings with the dean, annual evaluation meetings) about where they stand with their workload commitments and how it may affect their promotion and/or tenure status.

Regardless of their track, faculty are focused first on students and then on promotion and exceeding expectations for career development. That includes attaining tenure status for tenure track faculty and promotion to senior lecturer for non-tenure track faculty. All faculty should know, on at least an annual basis, where they stand with respect to promotion and tenure.

Faculty are strongly encouraged to check in with their dean periodically throughout the year, especially when significant changes in their workload occur, to ensure their activities are aligned with their assigned effort. In some instances, these changes may be of sufficient magnitude and duration to warrant a change in workload or assigned effort, which may take a variety of forms depending on the circumstances. Faculty should work with their dean to determine when, and to what extent, such changes may be appropriate.

If faculty are not satisfied that appropriate adjustments to workload or assigned effort have been made, they should relay these concerns to the dean with suggestions for a more equitable arrangement.

When workload adjustments are deemed to be warranted, the relief may be immediate or delayed, depending on the timing and circumstances of the matter, and may entail changes to (a) the faculty member's assigned duties, (b) the effort distribution associated with those duties, or (c) both.

If appropriate workload relief must be delayed for any reason, it shall take effect no later than the next academic year; however, deans are strongly encouraged to find creative solutions that offer temporary relief as far as is practical in the interim, such as by reshuffling or exempting the faculty member from other assigned duties or exploring the possibility of a future release/reassignment or additional pay as compensation for the overloaded duties.

In all cases, these mid-year changes to workload should be documented and acknowledged, with a brief explanation, in the faculty member's next annual evaluation.

# Section 2

# Annual Evaluation of Faculty Policy

**A**pproved: TBD

## Annual Evaluation of Faculty Policy

All faculty members in the Hull College of Business (HCB), regardless of rank or responsibilities shall receive a written evaluation of performance by the Dean or other immediate supervisor as defined by the institution against the minimum criteria as prescribed in the associated criteria in BoR POLICY 8.3.5.1 FACULTY, ASA 4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems and Augusta University (AU) policies. Through the required annual performance evaluation process, the HCB provides an annual record of performance. The annual evaluation will encompass faculty-assigned work effort in the areas of teaching, research, and professional service to the institution and/or community as appropriate. In addition to these three areas, annual evaluations will include student success activities and professional growth and development as appropriate to assigned work effort.

The annual performance evaluation process supports the University's goal of securing, retaining, and developing faculty of the highest quality. Annual performance evaluations are intended to provide faculty with the opportunity to show continuous professional growth and development appropriate to the mission of the HCB, provide constructive feedback, and ensure faculty progression towards successful attainment of career milestones.

### Processes and Procedures

Each faculty member in the HCB regardless of rank or responsibilities will receive an annual performance evaluation. Performance expectations are a function of the faculty member's workload assignment, AASCB Maintenance of Faculty Qualification Requirements, and requirements associated with the next career milestone (Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Reviews).

Academic administrators in the HCB are subject to a comprehensive 360 assessment at least every five (5) years as determined by the Provost. The assessment will include activities that align with the responsibilities of the administrator as prescribed in BoR POLICY 8.3.5.1 FACULTY and AU policy.

Any changes to the HCB Annual performance evaluation process will be updated in the policies in a timely fashion. The updates are to be completed in advance of the review cycle and allow time for faculty to incorporate the expectation into their activities and preparation of review documents. Evaluators should exercise judgment during transitional periods to provide a reasonable period for faculty to adjust to any changes in performance expectations.

### Annual Review Process

1. All faculty members in the HCB will receive an annual performance evaluation by the Dean. The faculty member is responsible for the preparation of the associated documents and materials. The performance evaluation will be scheduled to facilitate the time requirements materials required or allowed by the discipline-specific annual evaluation criteria and process. This performance evaluation will be scheduled to accommodate time

requirements for decision-making and portfolio preparation of faculty who meet time-in-rank or time-in-service eligibility requirements, and who may wish to initiate the promotion or tenure process.

2. The HCB will use the AU annual evaluation instrument. Annual faculty plans and workload assignments provide the foundation for the annual performance reviews and are intended to ensure that HCB faculty members are on track to maintain AACSB Maintenance of Qualification Requirements and successful attain their next career milestone (Tenure, Promotion, Post Tenure).

3. All HCB faculty with assigned teaching workloads are required to include student success activities inside and outside of the classroom that deepen student learning and engagement in their annual performance evaluations. Student success activities may relate to teaching, research or scholarship and are embedded within these workload areas. Please see the Student Success Activities Guidelines and Student Success Examples for a more detailed presentation of AU's student success definition and examples.

4. Annual performance evaluations will include all areas where the faculty member has assigned effort. In alignment with ASA 4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems, the HCB will use a 5-point Likert scale to summarize performance in each workload category with assigned effort as well as an overall rating. The overall evaluation will indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress towards the next career milestone. In all areas of evaluation, the Dean shall appropriately assess performance considering the allocated effort in the workload category.

5. Workloads are assigned so that each faculty member can realize individual goals related to teaching, research, student success, service, or other academic initiatives. The division of a faculty member's obligations between teaching, service, and scholarship/research is left to the discretion of the Dean.

6. The Dean will discuss with the faculty member, in a scheduled conference meeting, the content of that faculty member's annual written evaluation and the progression toward the next level of review appropriate to their rank, tenure status, and career stage. By signing the evaluation form, the faculty member acknowledges they have been appraised of the content of their evaluation and have met with the Dean. Faculty will receive a signed copy of their written evaluation each year. Annual reviews are not subject to discretionary review or appeal by the faculty.

7. Although there is no formal appeal process, a faculty member who disagrees with any part of their annual evaluation is encouraged to provide a written response to the Dean within 10 working days. Any such response will be attached to the annual written evaluation and become part of the official personnel records. Within 10 working days of the faculty member's response, the Dean will acknowledge in writing the receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made because of the faculty member's written response. This acknowledgement will also become part of the official personnel records.

## USG 5-point Likert Scale for Faculty Evaluations

The University System of Georgia (USG) mandates the following 5-point Likert scale for faculty evaluations in ASA 4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems:

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

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

## Annual Performance Evaluations & Tenure and Promotion

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

USG and AU policies include requirements that faculty members satisfy the standard of Noteworthy or Meets Expectations for the award of Promotion and Tenure.  Noteworthy achievement as referenced in ASA 4.4 is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the 5- point Likert scale. Deficient and unsatisfactory performance is reflective of a 1 or 2 on the 5-point Likert scale. Meets Expectations is satisfactory progress reflective of a 3 on the 5-point Likert scale.  Each academic unit (college/department) is responsible for developing more specific performance criteria based upon the 5-point Likert Scale.

## Performance Remediation Plan

As per ASA 4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems if a faculty member's performance overall, or in any of the assigned areas of effort, is judged to be a 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations or a 2 – Needs Improvement, the faculty member must be provided with a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) to remediate their performance during the next year; however, remediation cannot be required of a faculty member outside of their contract period.

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

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

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

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

## Impact on Corrective Post Tenure Review

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

# Section 3

# Faculty Qualifications and Maintenance of Qualifications Policy

**Approved: TBD**

## Faculty Qualifications and Maintenance of Qualifications Policy

Driven by the requirements of the HCB accrediting body, the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the first requirement for all members of the Corps of Instruction is that they must be qualified and maintain those qualifications. Consistent with AACSB Standards, the HCB considers scholarly activity (academic rigor and business acumen) and professional activity (business acumen) in evaluating faculty qualifications around the following themes: *high-quality business education, distinctive academic programs,* and *experiential learning.*

### Initial Qualifications Requirements:

1. Scholarly Academic (SA) status
Faculty members may be deemed SA qualified for the five (5) years following their completion of their terminal degree. Faculty members who have fulfilled all the requirements for a terminal degree except for the dissertation will be considered SA for no more than three (3) years.

2. Practice Academic (PA) status
Faculty members may be deemed PA qualified for the five (5) years following their completion of their terminal degree. Faculty members who have fulfilled all the requirements for a terminal degree except for the dissertation will be considered SA for no more than three (3) years.

3. Scholarly Practitioner (SP) status
Faculty deemed SP generally hold a master's degree or terminal degree in a field related to their teaching area and has significant professional, technical, or managerial experience, which is: 1) current at the time of hiring; 2) substantial in terms of duration (normally at least five (5) years): and 3) related to their field of teaching.

4. Instructional Practitioner (IP) status
Faculty deemed IP generally hold a master's degree or terminal degree in a field related to their teaching area and have significant professional, technical, or managerial experience, which is: 1) current at the time of hiring; 2) substantial in terms of duration (normally at least five (5) years); and 3) related to their field of teaching.

### Maintenance of Qualifications Requirements:

1. Scholarly Academic (SA) status
Subsequent to initial qualification, SA faculty members must earn ten (10) points from the activities detailed below with a minimum of eight (8) points from the Primary Scholarly Activities category during the rolling five-year review period.

2. Practice Academic (PA) status

Subsequent to initial qualification, PA faculty members must earn ten (10) points from the activities detailed below with a minimum of three (3) points from the Primary Scholarly Activities category during the rolling five-year review window. In addition, at least five (5) points must be from the Professional Activities category.

3. Scholarly Practitioner (SP) status

Subsequent to initial qualification, SP faculty members must earn ten (10) points from the activities detailed below with at least three (3) points from Scholarly Activities including a minimum of one (1) point from the Primary Scholarly Activities category during the rolling five-year review window.

4. Instructional Practitioner (IP) status

Subsequent to initial qualification, IP faculty members must earn ten (10) points from the activities detailed below with at least six (6) points from the Professional Activities category during the rolling five-year review window.

## Changes in Qualification Status:

Faculty may occasionally have a legitimate reason to request a change in their initial qualification status. If so, faculty must initiate their request for a qualification status change during their annual evaluation meeting. During that meeting, faculty will be evaluated for the current evaluation period based on their existing status and goals for that evaluation period. If a change in status is granted during the annual evaluation meeting, the change will become effective prospectively for the evaluation period of the next academic year and beyond with goals and activities consistent with the new status. Any change of status will be noted in the annual faculty performance evaluations. Any change of status will be communicated to the relevant faculty review (pre-tenure, post –tenure, promotion and tenure) committee by the Dean in their charge to the committees. The candidate should also communicate any change in status in the five-year review to the relevant committee as a part of the portfolio submission.

## Definitions of Activities:

1. Primary Scholarly Activities (PSAs)

Peer-reviewed research article or case study. Faculty contribution to article, as reported by the faculty member, should be more than 20%.

- A* ranked journal articles per Australian Business Deans Council (ABDC) list (8 points)

- A ranked journal articles per ABDC list (6 points)
- B ranked journal articles per ABDC list (4 points)
- C ranked journal articles per ABDC list (3 points)
- Not ABDC ranked but academic peer-reviewed outlet per Faculty Affairs Committee recommendation for Dean (or designee) approval (1-8 points)

2. Secondary Scholarly Activities (SSAs):

| | Points |
|---|---|
| Academic Meeting Poster Presentation | 1 |
| Academic Meeting Presentation | 1 |
| Academic Meeting Full Paper in Proceedings | 1 |
| Academic Meeting Reviewer and/or Discussant | 1 |
| Academic Meeting Program or Track Chair | 1 |
| Academic Organization- Committee Chair (per year) | 1 |
| Academic Organization- Leadership Position (per year) | 2 |
| Academic Organization- Academic Fellow Status | 1 |
| Case Studies- Peer Reviewed (but not in ABDC Journal) | 1 |
| Competitive Grants External to the University, Funded | 1 |
| Competitive Grants External to the University, Reviewer | 1 |
| Competitive Research Awards | 1 |
| Creating Widely Used Instructional Software | 1 |
| Creating Publicly Available Instructional/Assessment Materials with Adoption | 1 |
| Patent from the US Patent & Trademark Office | 1 |
| Publications in Professional/Trade Journals & In-house Journal | 1 |
| Publication, Scholarly Book | 1-3 |
| Publication, Scholarly Book- Revision | 1 |
| Publication, Scholarly Book- Chapter | 1 |
| Publication, Scholarly Book Review Published in Academic Journal | 1 |
| Publication, Textbook | 1-3 |
| Publication, Textbook- Revision | 1 |
| Publication, Textbook- Chapter | 1 |
| Publication, Textbook- Supplemental Materials | 1 |
| Published Book Review | 1 |
| Published Introduction in Journals | 1 |
| Publicly Available Working Paper | 1 |
| Serving as Advisor for Student Internship/Consulting Projects | 1 |
| Serving as Advisor for Student Honors Project | 1 |
| Serving as Advisor for Undergraduate Research Project | 1 |
| Serving as an Ad Hoc Journal Reviewer | 1 |
| Serving on Editorial Boards | 1 |
| Serving as External Reviewer for Promotion at Other Universities | 1 |
| Evidence of an innovative use of original scholarship that is material in substance and increases engagement and impact in the classroom (per new | 1 |
| Other activities expressly deemed equivalent to the items listed above by the | 1-3 |

3. Professional Engagement Activities (PEAs)

| | Points |
|---|---|
| Professional Meeting Poster Presentation | 1 |
| Professional Meeting Presentation | 1 |
| Professional Meeting Full Paper in Proceedings | 1 |
| Professional Meeting Reviewer and/or Discussant | 1 |
| Professional Meeting Program or Track Chair | 1 |
| Professional Organization- Committee Chair (per year) | 1 |
| Professional Organization- Leadership Position (per year) | 2 |
| Certification or Licensure Directly Related to Area of Teaching (Initial) | 5 |
| Certification or Licensure Directly Related to Area of Teaching (Maintenance) per year | 1 |
| Consulting Activities or Part-Time Employment Material in Terms of Time and | 1-3 (max 5) |
| Continuing Professional Education Participant Experience related to teaching (per year) | 1-3 |
| Development and Presentation of Executive/Professional Education | 1-3 (max 5) |
| Faculty Internship | 1-3 (max 5) |
| Membership on Boards of Directors of Corporate and Non-profit Organizations | 1-3 (max 5) |
| Full-Time Professional work related to teaching discipline that is material in terms of time and substance (per year) | 3 |
| Relevant Volunteer Activity that is Material in Terms of Time and Substance | 1-3 (max 5) |
| Serve as Expert on Policy Formulation, Witness at Legislative Hearing, Member of | 1-3 (max 5) |
| Serving as a Presenter at a Workshop for Business and Management | 1 |
| Invited presentation to professional audiences | 1 |
| Participation in other activities that place faculty in direct contact with business and other professional organizations | 1 |
| Evidence of an innovative use of professional practices that are material in substance and increase engagement and impact in the classroom and/or community (per new innovation) | 1 |
| Other activities expressly deemed equivalent to the items listed above by the | 1-3 |

For Professional Engagement Activities listed as a range of 1 – 3 points, 1 point equates to approximately 75 hours of engagement. It is suggested that the faculty member keep records concerning professional activities, the number of hours involved, and associated impacts. Multiple activities with fewer hours of engagement can be combined to count as one point. Note that no single work product may be considered as multiple activities without the consent of the Dean (or designee).

# Section 4

# Pre-Tenure Review Policy

**Approved: TBD**

## Pre-Tenure Review Policy

The Hull College of Business (HCB) is committed to the ongoing support, development, and success of our faculty.  Evaluating and communicating progress towards a faculty member's progression towards their next career milestone is a foundational element of our evaluative processes.  For tenure track faculty, the pre-tenure review process, coupled with annual performance evaluations, serves to ensure that our faculty is successfully progressing towards tenure.

The purpose of the pre-tenure is to review the portfolio, communicate the areas of strength and need for improvement, and provide recommendations to support a candidate's progress toward successfully achieving tenure according to HCB and AU requirements. The process below outlines the criteria and procedures emphasizing excellence in teaching, research, and service and meeting expectations of student success and professional development.

### Process:

1. **Rating Scale:**  Candidates will be assessed using the 5-point Likert scale mandated by the USG in  ASA 4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems:

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

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

2. **Standards and Evidence:**  The candidate is expected to document activities related to teaching, research and service that demonstrate trajectory for successfully satisfying the requirements of tenure consistent with rank, time in service and assigned effort.  In addition, the candidate should provide evidence of making timely progress towards satisfying expectations in the areas of student success and professional development as appropriate to assigned workload.

3. **Review Timeline:**  Pre-Tenure reviews are conducted for faculty hired on tenure track who are not yet tenured in the spring of their third.  In the case where individuals are hired with prior credit, the HCB will use the following calendar for pre-tenure reviews:
    a. Faculty members with one year of prior credit will be reviewed in the spring semester of their second year of institutional service.
    b. Faculty members with two years of prior credit will be reviewed in the fall semester of their second year of institutional service.
    c. Faculty members with three years of prior credit will not undergo a pre-tenure review.

4. **Portfolio Requirements:**  The candidate shall prepare a pre-tenure portfolio for the review. The content and format used for the pre-tenure portfolio document should be similar to that specified by Augusta University for tenure. However, the candidate will not be required to provide letters of support.

5. **Portfolio Deadline:**  Portfolios for pre-tenure review must be completed and submitted to the Dean on or before January 15, in accordance with the approved Promotion and Tenure calendar.

6. **Review Process**:

    a. **Pre-Tenure Review Committee**:  Pre-tenure reviews will be conducted by the Hull College of Business Pre-Tenure Committee.  Upon completion of the review, the committee shall produce a written summary of its recommendation, a copy of which shall be provided to the candidate and the Dean.  The committee should note the accomplishments of the candidate, but should also detail areas of improvement, if any, that the candidate should address, as well any change in the orientation of activities that might aid the candidate in meeting the requirements for tenure. The committee should also explain how the presentation of the evidence can be improved, if possible. The committee's report should summarize its recommendations for improvement, if necessary. The written report of recommendations should also remind the candidate that the committee's comments are intended as constructive feedback towards successfully attaining tenure, but that the successful satisfaction of the committee's recommendations will not alone guarantee a positive tenure review. A statement summarizing the candidate's trajectory towards achieving tenure is required.

b.  **Dean:**  The candidate and Dean will review the Pre-Tenure Review Committee's written report together and craft a Plan of Action based on the committee's recommendations and Dean's expectations.  The Plan of Action will summarize recommendations, augment the committee's comments, and provide further guidance for the candidate. When the Plan of Action is completed, the candidate will have 10 business days to write a written response to the Dean regarding the Plan of Action if s/he chooses. Within 10 working days of the faculty member's response, the Dean will acknowledge in writing the receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the Plan of Action made because of the faculty member's written response.  The Plan of Action, and any written response and acknowledgement, will be appended to the committee report.

c.  **Required Reporting:**  The pre-tenure committee report, the Plan of Action signed by the candidate and Dean, and any written responses will be communicated to the Provost by April 15.

# Section 5


# Tenure Review Policy


**Approved: TBD**

## Tenure Policy

The University System of Georgia (USG) provides a foundation for review and reward of tenure in BoR Policy Manual 8.3.7 Tenure and Criteria for Tenure and ASA 4.5 Award of Tenure. Augusta University (AU) builds upon this foundation in our institutional tenure policy. The following provides the college specific processes and criteria relevant to decision whether to recommend tenure.

The purpose of tenure is safeguarding academic freedom and providing conditions for quality and integrity in teaching and research that is free from institutional, corporate, or political pressure. Tenure serves to promote distinction among faculty and may be granted to eligible faculty members whose professional accomplishments indicate they will continue to meet expectation in teaching, research, and professional service.

### Eligibility for Tenure Review

Tenure may be awarded, upon approval of the president, upon completion of a probationary period of at least five (5) years, and no more than seven (7) years, of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor or higher, including any years of credit awarded at time of hire. Accordingly, an applicant might apply during fifth, sixth, or seventh years.

A maximum of three (3) years credit toward the minimum probationary period may be allowed for service in tenure track positions at other institutions or for full-time service at the rank of instructor or lecturer at AU. Such credit for prior service shall be approved in writing by the president, or designee, at the time of the initial appointment at the rank of assistant professor or higher. Probationary credit awarded on appointment may be used toward determining an individual's eligibility for tenure, but the individual is not required to do so (ASA 4.5). A candidate may decline to use probationary credit on a year-by-year basis. The decision to decline probationary credit must be made prior to submission of the tenure application and portfolio. The decision to decline probationary credit may not be revoked.

A maximum of two years of interruption because of a leave of absence or part-time service may be permitted and credit for the probationary period of an interruption may be given at the discretion of the President. (BoR 8.3.7.4). Please see the AU Tenure Policy for more information and requirements regarding extending probationary tenure periods.

### General Criteria and Expectations for Tenure

Under USG and AU policy, the minimum criteria for tenure are demonstrating:

1. Excellence and effectiveness in teaching and instruction;
2. Outstanding involvement in student success activities;

3.  Academic achievement, as appropriate to the institution's mission;
4.  Outstanding service to the institution, profession, or community; and,
5.  Professional growth and development.

Within the HCB, candidates for tenure are evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service according to their assigned workload. Student success and professional development are evaluated within the categories of teaching, research, and service. As a unit within a comprehensive university, it is recognized that our faculty will have varied expertise and responsibilities and, therefore, the percentage effort in each workload category will vary within the college and across time. Consequently, the evidence put forth by the candidate will be assessed in terms of the candidate's Dean-assigned effort distribution in these areas.

In alignment with USG and AU policies, the award of tenure requires **Noteworthy** achievement in at least two of the three review categories (Teaching, Scholarship, and Service) and **Meets Expectations** in the third category. For all teaching faculty, tenure requires excellence in teaching and involvement in student success activities warranting recognition as noteworthy achievement. Student success activities are demonstrated in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service and are not required to be **Noteworthy** in each category. Rather, the candidate's student success activities should be **Noteworthy** when viewed holistically across categories.

The results of annual evaluations will be utilized to help characterize the candidate's performance. Annual faculty evaluations utilize the following Likert scale: 1- does not meet expectations, 2 – needs improvement, 3 – meets expectations, 4 – exceeds expectations, and 5 – exemplary. **Noteworthy** achievement is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the above Likert Scale. **Meets Expectations** is reflective of a score of 3. While it is not required that a candidate receives noteworthy achievement or meets expectations each year, the candidate's performance should be noteworthy or meets expectations when holistically viewed over the review period.

Satisfying the minimum requirements for tenure does not guarantee a positive recommendation. Rather tenure is recommended based upon a several factors including a holistic evaluation of the portfolio, the forecasted needs of the College and anticipated resources.

Tenure is reserved for those eligible faculty members whose professional accomplishments indicate that they will continue to serve with distinction in their appointed roles and uphold the strategic goals and mission of the university and college. The award of tenure is based on the achievement of distinction in an area of student success and the prediction of continued distinction throughout the individual's professional career.

**HCB Criteria and Expectations for Tenure**

**Scholarship:**

Candidates for tenure should have annual evaluations that when viewed holistically over the review period indicate **Noteworthy** achievement or **Meets Expectations** in scholarship. Scholarship can be in the form of basic research and discovery, applied research, the scholarship of teaching and learning, or community-engaged research.

Candidates for tenure must satisfy the HCB Maintenance of Qualification Requirements at the time of their application. In addition to the maintenance of qualification standards, candidates for tenure must be a minimum of **Meets Expectations** in scholarship as evidenced by scholarly and professional engagement appropriate for their AACSB qualification status and scaled for their average assigned effort over the review period.

| AACSB Qualification Status* | Primary Scholarly Activity Points per 10% Effort (Average Over 5-Year Review Period) | Total Scholarly Activity Points Per 10% Effort (Average Over 5-Year Review Period)** | Professional Engagement Points per 10% Effort (Average Over 5-Year Review Period) |
|---|---|---|---|
| SA or SP- Meets Expectations | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| SA or SP- Noteworthy*** | 4 | 5.33 | 0 |
| PA- Meets Expectations | 0.33 | 0.33 | 3.67 |
| PA - Noteworthy | 0.67 | 0.67 | 4.67 |

* See the HCB Maintenance of Qualifications Requirements for the definitions of the AASCB categories and Primary Scholarly Activities, Secondary Scholarly Activities and Professional Engagement Activity examples.

** Primary and Secondary Scholarly Activity points may substitute for Professional Engagement points. However, PA faculty must earn a minimum of six (6) professional engagement points for a positive tenure recommendation.

*** At least one ABDC-list B (or equivalent) journal publication is required for SA or SP-Noteworthy.

## Teaching

Candidates for tenure should have annual evaluations that when viewed holistically over the review period indicate **Noteworthy** achievement or **Meets Expectations** in teaching. To justify classification of the candidate's teaching as **Noteworthy**, for the five years prior to date of application, the candidate should provide all available teaching evaluations, have at least one detailed peer review assessment, and provide evidence of outstanding teaching consistent with assigned effort such as:

1. Assessment of instruction –including, but not limited to, test formats, case studies, projects, grading practices and formal recognition of teaching effectiveness.
2. Mentoring and advisement – including, but not limited to, academic and career advising, assisting students for interview preparation, job placement, internships, honors theses, professional presentations or research publications.

Demonstrated quality of teaching may also include community-engaged teaching that connects students and faculty members with activities that address community-identified needs through mutually beneficial partnerships that deepen students' academic and civic learning.

## Service

Candidates for tenure should have annual evaluations that when viewed holistically over the review period indicate **Noteworthy** achievement or **Meets Expectations** in service.

Service to the institution is a consideration for granting both tenure and promotion. To justify classification of the candidate's Service as **Noteworthy** achievement, progression in service activities during employment is expected consistent with assigned effort.

Demonstrated performance in service may include community-engaged service, which is the application of one's professional expertise to address a community-identified need and to support the goals and mission of the university and the community partner.

Service Categories and Examples

The following list of outcomes and activities do not constitute an exhaustive list. They are intended to provide guidance in the planning process for the candidate in preparing his/her application.

**Serving AU**

- Service as chair or member of college or university committee
- Organization and presentation of peer workshop(s)
- Contribution to accreditation and continuous improvement activities
- Serve as a sponsor or advisor of student professional organization
- Perform requested college service activity (e.g. serve on task force, ad hoc team)
- Assist in recruiting and/or retention efforts by the university
- Attendance at university academic functions, including commencements, honor and recognition events

**Serving the Professional and Academic Community**

- Serve as a reviewer for journals and/or conferences
- Serve as editor or reviewer of a trade or professional journal, national proceedings or research casebook
- Represent AU or HCOB as an elected/appointed official of state, regional, or national professional or academic organization
- Use professional expertise to serve as elected/appointed official of professional community service organizations or board of directors
- Non-compensated and university approved compensated consulting services to state, regional, or community organizations and companies
- Application or professional skill to assist a community or professional organization at the state, regional, or national level
- Organizing a state, regional, or national professionally related conference or conference session.
- Delivery of a speech or presentation to major/national professional organization or government body
- Provide professional development or other training to state, regional, community, or business organizations
- Provide professional development seminars to faculty or students
- On-going membership of a professional nature in community service or professional organization

- Participation in other community engagement

## Student Success

For all teaching faculty, the award of tenure requires involvement in student success activities warranting recognition as **Noteworthy** achievement.

Candidates for tenure must provide sufficient evidence of engagement in student success activities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, that when viewed holistically, warrant recognition as a **Noteworthy** achievement.

The following list of student success activities do not constitute an exhaustive list. They are intended to provide guidance in the planning process for the candidate in preparing his/her application.

### Examples of Student Success Activities

- **Teaching and student success activities**:  Using data and student feedback to continuously improve student engagement in the learning environment; completing early alerts for students; course and career mentoring and advising of students that promotes purposeful student choices and streamlined pathways; promoting academic growth mindset in students; developing and updating courses which include best practices for student engagement in learning, including scaffolding assignments, experiential learning activities and active learning courses; providing supplemental instruction to students (e.g., study groups, office hours, independent or directed studies, recitations, consultations, co-teaching sessions, creating online instruction guides, tutorials, etc.

- **Research and student success activities**:  Directing student research; co-authoring or co-presenting with students; sponsoring and/or supporting students to attend professional meetings and conferences; presenting or publishing papers or securing grants related to student success; providing resource support for student research success.

- **Service and student success activities**:  Serving on committees, teams, and task forces related to student success; mentoring faculty colleagues in student success activities; providing professional development sessions to faculty colleagues for student success activities; attending commencement ceremonies and other student recognition events; organizing or providing professional development activities

for students (e.g., skills workshops); participating in student recruitment, and retention activities; partnering with academic support services and student affairs in student care and outreach, student health and wellness, and student growth & development; advising student organizations.

- **Administration and student success activities**:  Providing support for curriculum development in terms of workload allocation or other resources; implementing student-centered course scheduling and development of academic calendar, policies, and student support.

## Examples of metrics related to faculty contributions to student success

### Metrics of teaching and student success activities

Various metrics are available to candidates for engagement in student success activities related to teaching including, but not limited to:
1. Quality continuous improvement of teaching as evaluated by peers;
2. Quality learning environment as indicated by student feedback;
3. Quality of efforts in supplemental instruction as indicated by student feedback and/or performance;
4. Rate of student success in course progression and sequencing courses;
5. Quality participation in program/SLO assessment;
6. Student performance on licensing/certification exams
7. Attending professional development sessions related to teaching and student success, with evidence of quality application and/or contribution.

### Metrics of scholarship and student success activities

Various metrics are available to candidates for engagement in student success activities related to scholarship including, but not limited to:
1. Number and/ quality of peer-reviewed local, regional, or national presentations, and publications, with students (non-peer review may be better captured under teaching);
2. Attending professional development sessions related to research and student success, with evidence of quality application and/or contribution.

### Metrics of service and student success activities

1. Number of recruitment and retention events attended by faculty member, with evidence of quality contribution;
2. Number of student recognition and commencement events attended;
3. Quality mentoring of faculty in student success as evidenced by mentee feedback/rating;
4. Quality of program delivered to peer faculty regarding student success, as evidenced by attendee feedback;
5. Quality of participation and partnership with student support services and student affairs as evidenced in partner feedback/evaluation;
6. Attending professional development sessions related to service and student success, with evidence of quality application and/or contribution.

## Professional Development

Candidates for tenure should at least evidence **<u>Meets Expectations</u>** in professional development related their area of teaching, scholarship, and service when viewed holistically across categories and the review period.

## External Letters

Per the Augusta University Tenure Policy the Hull College of Business hereby details our parameters regarding the format, scope, process, and restrictions on external letters of review or recommendation. External letters are defined as those review letters solicited from outside Augusta University. However, due the multidisciplinary work of many AU faculty, one letter of review is allowed from outside one's primary college on the AU campuses.

Requests for tenure requires comments on the quality and impact of the candidate's contributions from experts in the discipline outside of Augusta University in the form of at least three and no more than five external letters. The candidate should provide the names and contact information for three to five external nominees for writers to the Dean's office concurrently with submitting the portfolio. The majority of external review letters should be from reviewers of the same or higher rank and tenure status as that to which the candidate is applying. Due to potential non-responses, it is recommended that a full five nominees are provided. If necessary, a candidate can appeal to the Hull Promotion and Tenure Committee that the provided external reviewers have the equivalent requirements of tenure and/or rank as some institutions have different tenure and promotion systems.

The Chair of the Hull Promotion and Tenure Committee will solicit these letters for inclusion in the candidate's portfolio. In the solicitation letter, the writer will be asked to explicitly state any past or current relationship they have with the candidate and, if there is a relationship, to advise if they feel it would impact the objectivity of their assessment. The solicitation should also note that the writer's letter will become part of the candidate's portfolio and may be seen by faculty members serving in a promotion advisory capacity.

## Required Organization and Format of the Portfolio

Candidates will submit a completed and signed Application Form* to accompany the full portfolio.

The applicant will prepare the portfolio electronically as a single PDF file with bookmarks for each section. The portfolio shall be organized as follows. The details of the following list of items are described in Section B below.
1. University P&T Committee Portfolio Attestation*
2. Summary of Annual Evaluations and Assigned Contract Effort Form*
3. Curriculum Vitae (follow the documentation style guide appropriate to discipline)
4. Statement of Teaching (maximum one single-spaced page Calibri 12 point)
5. Statement of Scholarship (maximum one single-spaced page Calibri 12 point)
6. Statement of Service (maximum one single-spaced page Calibri 12 point)
7. Appendix A – Copies of the Annual Performance Evaluation Forms (provided by Human Resources - last 5 years)
8. Appendix B – Evidence of Teaching (course evaluation summary sheets and peer observations required)
9. Appendix C – Evidence of Scholarship/Research
10. Appendix D – Evidence of Service
11. Appendix E – Pre-tenure Review Letter or Report (for tenure candidates)

* All of the forms are available on the Office for Faculty Affairs website under Promotion and Tenure Process.

In compliance with **university policy, no other material shall be included in the portfolio and the combined total of *optional* evidence for Appendices C, D, and E shall not exceed 100 pages**. Summaries of course evaluations and required peer reviews of teaching are required and are not included in the 100-page limit.

**Additional Review and Recommendation Documents**

The following attachments shall accompany the candidate's portfolio through all levels of the tenure review process. <u>The candidate submits only the Application Form; all other documents in the attachment are appended during the review process</u>, as described below.

**Attachment 1 – Application Form** (Please see forms on the [Promotion & Tenure website)](#)

**Attachment 2 – External Letters of Review (according to HCB guidelines)**

**Attachment 3 – Internal Letters of Review**

> Appended by reviewers at each level of review: department tenure committee, Chair, college tenure committee, and Dean.

## Tenure Review

1. The HCB Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee will review all candidates for tenure. Please see the HCB Promotion and Tenure Committee Policy for more information about the composition of the committee. The deliberations of the P & T Committee (and of its sub-committees) are confidential.

2. A quorum of the HCB P&T Committee will consist of 75% of those eligible to vote who must be physically or real-time virtually present at the meeting. A 60% majority vote of those present physically and real-time virtually will be required to pass a motion to promote or to tenure. Since the vote required is 60% of the members *present*, an abstention will have the same effect as a *no vote*.

3. The committee will elect a chair each year by a simple majority vote.  It is recommended that the chair be a tenured full-professor, but at minimum the chair shall be a tenured associate professor with prior experience serving on the HCB P&T Committee.

4. The HCB P&T committee will provide a written summary of each committee recommendation for tenure to the Dean.  The summary will address teaching, scholarship and service, noting and discussing whether the candidate's performance in each area meets the standard for **Noteworthy** achievement or **Meets Expectations**.  This summary will move forward to the next level of tenure review.

5. Candidates shall be notified of the committee's recommendation within five (5) business days and receive a copy of the written summary.  The candidate notification and written summary will be provided to the candidate by the Dean.

6.  A candidate may withdraw their application at any point in the process.  If the candidate chooses to withdraw their application, no records related to the application will be retained.

## Implementation

1.  In 2022 – 2023, the University System of Georgia (USG) made significant revisions to the faculty evaluation system including the policies related to tenure.  One of these changes reflected in Augusta University (AU) tenure policy was the incorporation of student success activities in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service.
2.  Given that a significant component of a tenure review is to assess the faculty member's performance over the associated review period and that the faculty member's activities were informed by the prior policies, tenure evaluators should exercise prudent judgement and flexibility as new policies and procedures are implemented.
    a.  In the periods AY 2023- 2024 & AY 2024 - 2025, candidates should address student success in their teaching, scholarship and service narratives and evidence; however, review committees should only use the associated information to construct formative guidance to the candidate.
    b.  In the periods AY 2025 – 2026, 2026 – 2027 & AY 2027 -20228, candidates should address student success in their teaching, scholarship and service narratives and evidence; however, review committees should scale the expectation of noteworthy to recognize the shortened nature of the relevant review period.
    c.  Beginning with tenure reviews In AY 2028 – 2029, candidates for promotion are expected to be noteworthy in student success.

# Section 6

# Promotion Policy

**Approved: TBD**

## Promotion Policy

The University System of Georgia (USG) provides a foundation for promotion reviews in BoR Policy Manual 8.3.6 Criteria for Promotion and ASA 4.6 Award of Promotion. Augusta University builds upon this foundation in our institutional promotion policy. The following material provides the college specific processes and criteria to clarify the associated expectations and considerations in the decision whether to award promotion.

### Eligibility for Promotion

Faculty are eligible for and may be reviewed for promotion in rank during their fifth year or beyond of service in their current rank, unless they serve as lecturers, in which case they need to serve six years to become eligible for promotion to senior lecturer. Notifications for eligibility shall occur in the academic year before the review. Recommendations for promotion are not normally considered for individuals who are currently on leaves of absence. If recommended for promotion, the new rank will go into effect at the beginning of their next contract period.

At the time of an individual's initial appointment, a maximum of three years of probationary credit towards promotion may be awarded for service at other institutions or service in a faculty rank within the institution. Individuals serving in part-time, temporary, or limited term positions are not eligible for probationary credit towards promotion. Without the approval of the President, faculty given probationary credit towards promotion may not use their years of credit towards consideration for "early" promotion.

Under special circumstances, faculty who are performing significantly above the expectations for their current rank may be considered for "early" promotion. "Early" promotion may only be considered according to the following timetable:

- For early promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, faculty must have served a minimum of three years as a Lecturer
- For early promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor, faculty must have served a minimum of three years as an Instructor
- For early promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, faculty must have served a minimum of four years as an Assistant Professor
- For early promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, faculty must have served a minimum of four years as an Associate Professor

### General Criteria and Expectations for Promotion

The minimum criteria for promotion are demonstrating:

1) teaching and effectiveness in instruction;
2) involvement in student success activities;

3) professional service to the institution or the community;
4) research, scholarship, creative activity, or academic achievement; and
5) professional growth and development.

Within the HCB, candidates for promotion are evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service according to their assigned workload. Student success and professional development are evaluated within the categories of teaching, research, and service. As a unit within a comprehensive university, it is recognized that our faculty will have varied expertise and responsibilities and, therefore, the percentage effort in each workload category will vary within the college and across time. Consequently, the evidence put forth by the candidate will be assessed in terms of the candidate's Dean-assigned effort distribution in these areas.

The results of annual evaluations will be utilized to help characterize the candidate's performance. Annual faculty evaluations utilize the following Likert scale: 1- does not meet expectations, 2 – needs improvement, 3 – meets expectations, 4 – exceeds expectations, and 5 – exemplary. **Noteworthy** achievement is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the above Likert Scale. **Meets Expectations** is reflective of a score of 3. While it is not required that a candidate receives noteworthy achievement or meets expectations each year, the candidate's performance should be noteworthy or meets expectations when holistically viewed over the review period.

## HCB Criteria and Expectations for Promotion (Lecturers)

A Lecturer is a full-time member of the Corps of Instruction who focuses on teaching and promotion to Senior Lecturer should be for those Lecturer candidates with exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution. As with other promotions, the Hull Promotion and Tenure Committee follows the Augusta University Promotion Policy.

The criteria for promotion include the following areas of professional activity and accomplishments:

1) teaching and effectiveness in instruction;
2) involvement in student success activities;
3) professional service to the institution or the community;
4) research, scholarship, creative activity, or academic achievement; and
5) professional growth and development.

In recognition of the variability in the deployment of lecturers and workload effort allocations, candidates for promotion to senior lecture should be evaluated in the following areas:

- The candidate must at least meet expectations in the role model categories of teaching, scholarship, and service when the associated workload effort assignment in the category is at least 10% over the review period,
- The candidate must be noteworthy in the role model categories of teaching, scholarship, and service when the associated workload effort assignment in the category is at least

50% over the review period,
- For all teaching faculty, promotion requires **Noteworthy** achievement in teaching and involvement in student success activities,
- All candidates for promotion are expected to provide evidence of continued growth and professional development.

The HCB requires candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer not only be Noteworthy in teaching but also maintain AASCB qualification (see the Faculty Qualifications and Maintenance of Qualifications Policy for more information).

The candidate has the option to include up to five external letters from academic or non-academic reviewers, such as a member of the professional business community (e.g., professional organizations, governmental entities, or think tanks), who may provide insights about the professional and societal dimensions of the candidate's contributions.

## HCB Criteria and Expectations for Promotion (Professorial Ranks)

The criteria for promotion to a professorial rank include the following areas of professional activity and accomplishments:

1) teaching and effectiveness in instruction;
2) involvement in student success activities;
3) professional service to the institution or the community;
4) research, scholarship, creative activity, or academic achievement; and
5) professional growth and development.

The candidate's accomplishments in each of these areas with an assigned workload effort must at least meet expectations. In addition, the candidate's accomplishments in at least three of these areas must be noteworthy.

In alignment with USG and AU policies, the HCB requires **Noteworthy** achievement in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service for promotion. For all teaching faculty, promotion requires excellence in teaching and involvement in student success activities warranting recognition as noteworthy achievement. Student success activities are demonstrated in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service and are not required to be **Noteworthy** in each category. Rather, the candidate's student success activities should be **Noteworthy** when viewed holistically across categories.

The results of annual evaluations will be utilized to help characterize the candidate's performance. Annual faculty evaluations utilize the following Likert scale: 1- does not meet expectations, 2 – needs improvement, 3 – meets expectations, 4 – exceeds expectations, and 5 – exemplary. **Noteworthy** achievement is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the above Likert Scale. While it

is not required that a candidate receives noteworthy achievement or meets expectations each year, the candidate's performance should be noteworthy or meets expectations when holistically viewed over the review period.

## Scholarship:

Professorial rank candidates for promotion should have annual evaluations that when viewed holistically over the review period indicate **Noteworthy** achievement.  Scholarship can be in the form of basic research and discovery, applied research, the scholarship of teaching and learning, or community-engaged research.

Candidates for promotion must satisfy the HCB Maintenance of Qualification Requirements at the time of their application. In addition to the minimum maintenance of qualification standards, candidates for promotion must be **Noteworthy** is scholarship as evidenced by scholarly and professional engagement appropriate for their AACSB qualification status and scaled for their average assigned effort over the review period.

| AACSB Qualification Status* | Primary Scholarly Activity Points per 10% Effort (Average Over 5-Year Review Period) | Total Scholarly Activity Points Per 10% Effort (Average Over 5-Year Review Period) | Professional Engagement Points per 10% Effort (Average Over 5-Year Review Period) |
|---|---|---|---|
| SA or SP-Noteworthy** | 4 | 5.33 | 0 |
| PA - Noteworthy | 0.67 | 0.67 | 4.67 |
| IP - Noteworthy | 0 | 0 | 4.67 |

**\*** See the HCB Maintenance of Qualifications Requirements for the definitions of the AASCB categories and Primary Scholarly Activities, Secondary Scholarly Activities and Professional Engagement Activity examples.

**\*\*** At least one ABDC-list B (or equivalent) journal publication is required for SA or SP-Noteworthy.

## Teaching

Professorial rank candidates for promotion should have annual evaluations that when viewed holistically over the review period indicate **Noteworthy** achievement in teaching.

To justify classification of the candidate's Teaching as **Noteworthy**, for the five years prior to date of application, the candidate should provide all available teaching evaluations, have at least one detailed peer review assessment, and provide evidence of outstanding teaching consistent with assigned effort such as:

> a. Assessment of instruction – including, but not limited to, test formats, case studies, projects, grading practices and formal recognition of teaching effectiveness.
>
> b. Mentoring and advisement – including, but not limited to, academic and career advising, assisting students for interview preparation, job placement, internships, honors theses, professional presentations or research publications.

Demonstrated quality of teaching may also include community-engaged teaching that connects students and faculty members with activities that address community-identified needs through mutually beneficial partnerships that deepen students' academic and civic learning.

## Service

Professorial rank candidates for promotion should have annual evaluations that when viewed holistically over the review period indicate **Noteworthy** achievement in service.

Service to the institution is a consideration for granting both tenure and promotion. To justify classification of the candidate's Service as **Noteworthy** achievement, progression in service activities during employment is expected consistent with assigned effort.

Demonstrated performance in service may include community-engaged service, which is the application of one's professional expertise to address a community-identified need and to support the goals and mission of the university and the community partner.

Service Categories and Examples

The following list of outcomes and activities do not constitute an exhaustive list. They are intended to provide guidance in the planning process for the candidate in preparing his/her application.

**Serving AU**

- Service as chair or member of college or university committee
- Organization and presentation of peer workshop(s)
- Contribution to accreditation and continuous improvement activities
- Serve as a sponsor or advisor of student professional organization
- Perform requested college service activity (e.g. serve on task force, ad hoc team)
- Assist in recruiting and/or retention efforts by the university
- Attendance at university academic functions, including commencements, honor and recognition events

**Serving the Professional and Academic Community**

- Serve as a reviewer for journals and/or conferences
- Serve as editor or reviewer of a trade or professional journal, national proceedings or research casebook
- Represent AU or HCOB as an elected/appointed official of state, regional, or national professional or academic organization
- Use professional expertise to serve as elected/appointed official of professional community service organizations or board of directors
- Non-compensated and university approved compensated consulting services to state, regional, or community organizations and companies
- Application or professional skill to assist a community or professional organization at the state, regional, or national level
- Organizing a state, regional, or national professionally related conference or conference session.
- Delivery of a speech or presentation to major/national professional organization or government body
- Provide professional development or other training to state, regional, community, or business organizations
- Provide professional development seminars to faculty or students
- On-going membership of a professional nature in community service or professional organization
- Participation in other community engagement

## Student Success

For all teaching faculty, the award of promotion requires involvement in student success activities warranting recognition as **<u>Noteworthy</u>** achievement.

Candidates for promotion must provide sufficient evidence of engagement in student success activities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, that when viewed holistically, warrant recognition as a **<u>Noteworthy</u>** achievement.

The following list of student success activities do not constitute an exhaustive list. They are intended to provide guidance in the planning process for the candidate in preparing his/her application.

### Examples of Student Success Activities

- **Teaching and student success activities**:  Using data and student feedback to continuously improve student engagement in the learning environment; completing early alerts for students; course and career mentoring and advising of students that promotes purposeful student choices and streamlined pathways; promoting academic growth mindset in students; developing and updating courses which include best practices for student engagement in learning, including scaffolding assignments, experiential learning activities and active learning courses; providing supplemental instruction to students (e.g., study groups, office hours, independent or directed studies, recitations, consultations, co-teaching sessions, creating online instruction guides, tutorials, etc.

- **Research and student success activities**:  Directing student research; co-authoring or co-presenting with students; sponsoring and/or supporting students to attend professional meetings and conferences; presenting or publishing papers or securing grants related to student success; providing resource support for student research success.

- **Service and student success activities**:  Serving on committees, teams, and task forces related to student success; mentoring faculty colleagues in student success activities; providing professional development sessions to faculty colleagues for student success activities; attending commencement ceremonies and other student recognition events; organizing or providing professional development activities for students (e.g., skills workshops); participating in student recruitment, and retention activities; partnering with academic support services and student affairs

in student care and outreach, student health and wellness, and student growth & development; advising student organizations.

- **Administration and student success activities**: Providing support for curriculum development in terms of workload allocation or other resources; implementing student-centered course scheduling and development of academic calendar, policies, and student support.

## Examples of metrics related to faculty contributions to student success

### Metrics of teaching and student success activities

Various metrics are available to candidates for engagement in student success activities related to teaching including, but not limited to:
1. Quality continuous improvement of teaching as evaluated by peers;
2. Quality learning environment as indicated by student feedback;
3. Quality of efforts in supplemental instruction as indicated by student feedback and/or performance;
4. Rate of student success in course progression and sequencing courses;
5. Quality participation in program/SLO assessment;
6. Student performance on licensing/certification exams
7. Attending professional development sessions related to teaching and student success, with evidence of quality application and/or contribution.

### Metrics of scholarship and student success activities

Various metrics are available to candidates for engagement in student success activities related to scholarship including, but not limited to:
1. Number and/ quality of peer-reviewed local, regional, or national presentations, and publications, with students (non-peer review may be better captured under teaching);
2. Attending professional development sessions related to research and student success, with evidence of quality application and/or contribution.

### Metrics of service and student success activities

1. Number of recruitment and retention events attended by faculty member, with evidence of quality contribution;
2. Number of student recognition and commencement events attended;

3.  Quality mentoring of faculty in student success as evidenced by mentee feedback/rating;
4.  Quality of program delivered to peer faculty regarding student success, as evidenced by attendee feedback;
5.  Quality of participation and partnership with student support services and student affairs as evidenced in partner feedback/evaluation;
6.  Attending professional development sessions related to service and student success, with evidence of quality application and/or contribution.

## Professional Development

Candidates for promotion should at least evidence **<u>Meets Expectations</u>** in professional development related their area of teaching, scholarship, and service when viewed holistically across categories and the review period.

## External Letters

Per the Augusta University Promotion Policy the Hull College of Business hereby details our parameters regarding the format, scope, process, and restrictions on external letters of review or recommendation. External letters are defined as those review letters solicited from outside Augusta University. However, due the multidisciplinary work of many AU faculty, one letter of review is allowed from outside one's primary college on the AU campuses.

Requests for promotion requires comments on the quality and impact of the candidate's contributions from experts in the discipline outside of Augusta University in the form of at least three and no more than five external letters. The candidate should provide the names and contact information for three to five external nominees for writers to the Dean's office concurrently with submitting the portfolio. Due to potential non-responses, it is recommended that a full five nominees are provided. Those nominated must hold tenure and be Associate or Full Professors. If necessary, a candidate can appeal to the Hull Promotion and Tenure Committee that the provided external reviewers have the equivalent requirements of tenure and/or rank as some institutions have different tenure and promotion systems.

The Chair of the Hull Promotion and Tenure Committee will solicit these letters for inclusion in the candidate's portfolio. In the solicitation letter, the writer will be asked to explicitly state any past or current relationship they have with the candidate and, if there is a relationship, to advise if they feel it would impact the objectivity of their assessment. The solicitation should also note that the writer's letter will become part of the candidate's portfolio and may be seen by faculty members serving in a promotion advisory capacity.

## Required Organization and Format of the Portfolio

Candidates will submit a completed and signed Application Form* to accompany the full portfolio.

The applicant will prepare the portfolio electronically as a single PDF file with bookmarks for each section. The portfolio shall be organized as follows. The details of the following list of items are described in Section B below.
1. University P&T Committee Portfolio Attestation*
2. Summary of Annual Evaluations and Assigned Contract Effort Form*
3. Curriculum Vitae (follow the documentation style guide appropriate to discipline)
4. Statement of Teaching (maximum one single-spaced page Calibri 12 point)
5. Statement of Scholarship (maximum one single-spaced page Calibri 12 point)
6. Statement of Service (maximum one single-spaced page Calibri 12 point)
7. Appendix A – Copies of the Annual Performance Evaluation Forms (provided by Human Resources - last 5 years)
8. Appendix B – Evidence of Teaching (course evaluation summary sheets and peer observations required)
9. Appendix C – Evidence of Scholarship/Research
10. Appendix D – Evidence of Service

\* All of the forms are available on the Office for Faculty Affairs website under Promotion and Tenure Process.

In compliance with **university policy, no other material shall be included in the portfolio and the combined total of *optional* evidence for Appendices C, D, and E shall not exceed 100 pages**. Summaries of course evaluations and required peer reviews of teaching are required and are not included in the 100-page limit.

### Additional Review and Recommendation Documents

The following attachments shall accompany the candidate's portfolio through all levels of the tenure review process. <u>The candidate submits only the Application Form; all other documents in the attachment are appended during the review process</u>, as described below.

**Attachment 1 – Application Form** (Please see forms on the Promotion & Tenure website)

**Attachment 2 – External Letters of Review (according to HCB guidelines)**

**Attachment 3 – Internal Letters of Review**
> Appended by reviewers at each level of review: department tenure committee, Chair, college tenure committee, and Dean.

**Promotion Review**

1. The HCB Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee will review all candidates for tenure. Please see the HCB Promotion and Tenure Committee Policy for more information about the composition of the committee.

2. A quorum of the HCB P&T Committee will consist of 75% of those eligible to vote who must be physically or real-time virtually present at the meeting. A 60% majority vote of those present physically and real-time virtually will be required to pass a motion to promote or to tenure. Since the vote required is 60% of the members *present*, an abstention will have the same effect as a *no vote*.

3. The committee will elect a chair each year by a simple majority vote. It is recommended that the chair be a tenured full-professor, but at minimum the chair shall be a tenured associate professor with prior experience serving on the HCB P&T Committee.

4. The HCB P&T committee will provide a written summary of each committee recommendation for promotion to the Dean. The summary will address teaching, scholarship and service, noting and discussing whether the candidate's performance in each area meets the standard for **Noteworthy** achievement. This summary will move forward to the next level of tenure review.

5. Candidates shall be notified of the committee's recommendation within five (5) business days and receive a copy of the written summary. The candidate notification and written summary will be provided to the candidate by the Dean.

6. A candidate may withdraw their application at any point in the process. If the candidate chooses to withdraw their application, no records related to the application will be retained.

**Implementation**

1. In 2022 – 2023, the University System of Georgia (USG) made significant revisions to the faculty evaluation system including the policies related to promotion. One of these changes reflected in Augusta University (AU) promotion policy was the incorporation of student success activities in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service.
2. Given that a significant component of a promotion review is to assess the faculty member's performance over the associated review period and that the faculty member's activities were informed by the prior policies, promotion evaluators should

exercise prudent judgement and flexibility as new policies and procedures are implemented.

    a.  In the periods AY 2023- 2024 & AY 2024 - 2025, candidates should address student success in their teaching, scholarship and service narratives and evidence; however, review committees should only use the associated information to construct formative guidance to the candidate.

    b.  In the periods AY 2025 – 2026, 2026 – 2027 & AY 2027 -20228, candidates should address student success in their teaching, scholarship and service narratives and evidence; however, review committees should scale the expectation of noteworthy to recognize the shortened nature of the relevant review period.

    c.  Beginning with promotion reviews In AY 2028 – 2029, candidates for promotion are expected to be noteworthy in student success.

# Section 7

# Post-Tenure Review Policy:

**Approved: TBD**

## Post-Tenure Review Policy

The Hull College of Business (HCB) seeks to secure and maintain a faculty of the highest quality.  This goal requires that the HCB provide periodic assessment of faculty performance that is useful for faculty review and development.  The purposes of the post-tenure review process are to support the further career development of tenured faculty members as well as ensure accountability and continued strong performance from faculty members after they have achieved tenure.  Furthermore, the post-tenure review process assists faculty members with identifying opportunities for professional development that will enable them to reach their full potential for contribution to the academic discipline, institution, and the institution's mission.  Post-tenure review is intended to provide a longer-term and broader perspective than is usually provided by an annual review.  The review should be both retrospective and prospective, encouraging a careful look at possibilities for different emphases at different points of a faculty member's career.

The HCB Post-Tenure Review Policy is aligned with and expands upon the AU Policy for Review of Tenured Faculty Members, Board of Regents policy (Policy Manual 8.3.5.4 Post-Tenure Review) and University of System of Georgia policy (Academic and Student Affairs Handbook 4.7 Post-Tenure Review).  Candidates for Post-Tenure Review should review both the HCB and Augusta University policies.

## Criteria and Expectations for Post-Tenure Review

1. Within the HCB, candidates for post-tenure review are evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service according to their assigned workload.  Student success and professional development are evaluated within the categories of teaching, research, and service.

2. The results of annual evaluations will be utilized to help characterize the candidate's performance. Annual faculty evaluations utilize the following Likert scale: 1- does not meet expectations, 2 – needs improvement, 3 – meets expectations, 4 – exceeds expectations, and 5 – exemplary. **Noteworthy** achievement is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the above Likert Scale. **Meets Expectations** is reflective of a score of 3. While it is not required that a candidate receives noteworthy achievement or meets expectations each year, the candidate's performance should be noteworthy or meets expectations when holistically viewed over the review period.

3. Student Evaluations are required for all faculty whose primary responsibility is teaching.

4. All tenured faculty members will be reviewed regardless of administrative appointment. See the AU policy on Evaluation of Academic Administrators for the review process associated with faculty with assigned effort of 50% or more in administration.

5. As a unit within a comprehensive university, it is recognized that our faculty will have varied expertise and responsibilities and, therefore, the percentage effort in each workload category will vary within the college and across time.  Consequently, the evidence put forth by the candidate will be assessed in terms of the candidate's Dean-assigned effort distribution in these areas.

6. **Expectations**:  The HCB requires that candidates maintain their academic qualifications (see Faculty Qualifications and Maintenance of Qualifications Policy) and **Meets Expectations** in teaching, scholarship, and service as viewed holistically over the review period for a positive post-tenure review recommendation.  In addition, for candidates with a primary responsibility of teaching, they must at minimum provide evidence to warrant a **Meets Expectations** in student success.  It is important to note that satisfying these minimum do not guarantee a positive post-tenure review, rather the intent of the review is to holistically evaluate the candidate to ensure continued strong performance.

## Procedures and Process

1. The Hull College of Business Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is responsible for the creation and maintenance of the Post-Tenure Review Policy.  At minimum, the (FAC) should review this policy every three (3) years.

2. The review process for an individual shall be conducted five years after the most recent promotion or personnel action, and reviews shall continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a further review for promotion.  If an individual is on leave at the time of review, he/she will be reviewed during the first academic year after his/her return.  Faculty may volunteer to undergo the review process prior to the five-year timeline by notifying the Dean in writing by August 1.

3. The post-tenure review timeline may be paused or reset for the following reasons:
   a. the faculty member was on approved extended leave during the five-year period (e.g. birth or adoption of a child, or disability, sabbatical, or prolonged illness of the employee or immediate family member); therefore, the clock is paused and not reset;
   b. the faculty member is currently on leave at the planned time of review, in which case the post-tenure review may occur when the faculty member returns from leave; therefore, the clock is paused and not reset;
   c. the faculty member was promoted to a higher academic rank (i.e., Professor), which resets the five-year clock;
   d. the faculty member was promoted to an academic leadership position (e.g., Department Head, Dean, Associate Provost), which resets the five-year clock;
   e. in the case of interruption due to circumstances outside of faculty control (e.g. pandemic, natural disaster, etc.) the clock is paused and not reset.

4. **Portfolio Requirements**:

The candidate will submit a post-tenure review portfolio organized as follows to the Dean by the first day of classes in the spring semester. The details of the following list of items are described in Section B below.

    a.  Curriculum Vitae (covering only the review period)
    b.  Statement of Teaching (maximum one single-spaced page Calibri 12 point)
    c.  Statement of Scholarship (maximum one single-spaced page Calibri 12 point)
    d.  Statement of Service (maximum one single-spaced page Calibri 12 point)
    e.  Appendix A – Copies of the Annual Performance Evaluation Forms (provided by Human Resources - last 5 years)
    f.  Appendix B – AACSB Faculty Qualifications Summary
    g.  Appendix C – Evidence of Teaching (course evaluation summary sheets are required for candidates with a primary responsibility of teaching)

For areas in which the faculty member has 0% effort, the portfolio should include a brief statement indicating the category is not applicable to the review.

5. **Post-Tenure Review Committee**:  The HCB Promotion and Tenure Committee will empanel a committee to serve as the Post-Tenure Review Committee.  See the HCB Promotion and Tenure Committee section for more information.

6. **Review Process**:

    a.  The candidate is responsible for preparing and submitting the post-tenure review portfolio by the specified deadline.  See item four (4)- Portfolio Requirements above.

    b.  The committee will review the portfolio to determine if the candidate meets the minimum HCB requirements in each relevant role model area ensuring that the annual evaluations and workload allocations for faculty roles are appropriately factored into the review.

    c.  The committee will make a positive or negative post-tenure review recommendation based upon a holistic consideration of the faculty candidate's performance over the review period and ensuring continued strong performance.

    d.  Results and recommendations of the review committee will be communicated in writing to both the candidate and Dean.

    e.  The Dean will then conduct an independent review of the faculty member considering the recommendations of the PTR Committee.  The Dean will then review the findings with the individual faculty member.  The individual

faculty member will be provided with a written copy of the Dean's report at least five (5) business days prior to the meeting. The faculty member and the Dean will sign the document acknowledging that the review has been completed. This signature does not indicate agreement with the outcome of the review.

    f.   In the case of a negative post-tenure review, the faculty member will be subject to a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP).

### Performance Improvement Plan:

According to the University of System Georgia (USG) policy, any faculty member receiving a negative post-tenure review will be placed on a performance improvement plan (PIP). Accordingly, the following information is intended to align with and expand upon system policies.

1. In instances where an area of deficiency is noted, the Dean will work together to develop a formal Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) in consultation with the PTR committee based around the deficiencies identified by the committee. The PIP must be designed to assist the faculty member in achieving progress towards remedying the deficiencies identified in the review. The PIP's goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable within the designated timeframe, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member. The PIP must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of the Provost.

2. The Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) will:
   a. specify goals or outcomes that are required for the faculty member to overcome identified deficiencies;
   b. outline specific activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals or outcomes;
   c. specify available resources and supports;
   d. set appropriate deadlines which the goals or outcomes will be accomplished (which should not exceed three years);
   e. indicate the criteria by which progress will be monitored;
   f. include a plan to monitor progress, reassess the plan, and provide feedback at least twice per semester in the fall and spring including the faculty member's annual evaluation;
   g. and specify possible remedial actions if progress is deemed to be unsatisfactory.

3. Financial Support for Performance Improvement Plan

   The Dean will be responsible for financial arrangements associated with the PIP. If the nature or scope of the PIP is such that the individual cannot carry out other duties, the Dean shall make other arrangements for these duties to be completed.

4. Review of the Performance Improvement Plan Progress

   At the end of the PIP, the individual shall be reviewed by the Dean.

5. Completion of the PIP:
   a. The Dean will make a determination as to the sufficiency of the faculty member's progress towards the established PIP.
   b. In the case of a satisfactory completion of the PIP, the faculty member will be notified in writing of the outcome and that the five-year review PTR window will commence with the start of the upcoming academic year.
   c. If, after conducting a final review of appropriate materials, the Dean determines that the faculty member has failed to make sufficient progress in performance as outlined in the PIP (or has refused to reasonably engage in the process), the Dean will propose appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member's deficiencies. Disciplinary actions include, but are not limited to, reallocation of effort, salary reduction, and tenure revocation and dismissal. The faculty member must be informed in writing of the determination and proposed sanction along with their right to appeal and the associated appeal process.

6. A copy of the decision of the Dean shall be provided to the Office of the Provost (or designee).

7. Appeals and Due Process:
   a. A faculty member may appeal the decision of the Dean with respect to a determination of an unsatisfactory progress towards a PIP within ten (10) business days of receiving written notification of the decision and proposed sanction by requesting a review by the current PTR committee.
   b. The PTR committee will review the PIP, progress towards the PIP and the recommendation of the Dean. The PTR committee may base their review solely upon the record or exercise their judgment as to whether an in-person hearing is necessary. The PTR committee will issue its recommendation in writing to the Office of the Provost and the faculty member within twenty (20) business days of the request for review by the faculty member.
   c. Within five (5) business days of receiving the recommendation from the PTR committee, the Provost (or designee) shall send an official letter to the faculty member notifying him or her of the decision.

     d. The faculty member may appeal to the President of the institution within five (5) business days of receiving the decision from the Provost (or designee).

     e. Upon receipt of the appeal, the President will charge the University Promotion and Tenure (UPT) committee with reviewing the record and making a recommendation. The committee should ensure that the candidate received due process and equitable disciplinary actions at a university level. Upon the conclusion of the review, the UPT shall make a recommendation to the President either supporting the recommended sanction or proposing an alternative outcome. The UPT review shall be completed within ten (10) business days during the fall or spring terms.

8. The President will make the final determination on behalf of the institution regarding appropriate remedial action and shall notify the faculty member of his or her decision and the process for discretionary review application pursuant to BoR POLICY 6.26 APPLICATION FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW within ten (10) days of receiving the recommendation from the UPT committee.

## Record Retention

All records of reviews will be retained by the Dean's office. At the end of each academic year the college must forward to the Office of the Provost the names of the faculty members reviewed that year, the results, and the names of each member of the review committees.

## Implementation

1. The promotion/tenure unit shall prepare a plan for scheduling reviews of tenured faculty. The five-year cycle of reviews should begin during the 2023-2024 academic year with the initiation of PTR for administrative faculty, not subject to the review process under prior policy, being phased in over three review cycles beginning in 2025-2026.

2. In all cases in which the unit head is the person being reviewed under this policy, an administrative officer one level above the unit head shall assume the unit head's function in this review.

3. PTR evaluators should exercise prudent judgement and flexibility as new policies and procedures are implemented.

# Section 8

# Promotion and Tenure Committee Policy:

**Approved: TBD**

## Promotion and Tenure Committee Policy:

As a non-departmentalized college, the HCB Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T) will serve as the initial review for candidates applying for promotion and/or tenure. The HCB P&T chair will provide a written summary of the recommendation for the candidate's promotion and/or tenure review to the Dean. This summary will move forward with the candidate's portfolio to the University Tenure and Review Committee in addition to the Dena's written recommendation.

In alignment with the University requirements, the HCB P&T chair will provide the candidate with a written summary within five (5) business days of the recommendation. The summary will address how the candidate's achievements meet the expectations associated with promotion and/or tenure. This summary will be added to the candidate's portfolio as it moves to the next level of review.

A candidate may withdraw their application at any point in the process. If the candidate chooses to withdraw their file, no records related to the application will be retained.

### Restriction on Committee Membership:

No faculty member can serve on more than one P&T committee at different levels (college and university) that would then cause them to evaluate the same individual(s). No faculty in the position of Assistant Dean, Associate Dean or Dean shall serve on any P&T committee. All HCB P&T committee members shall adhere to the Augusta University (AU) Individual Conflicts of Interest Policy.

### University Promotion and Tenure Committee (UPT):

1. The HCB will have one representative on the UPT. The College representative will be elected by the full-time faculty.

2. The HCB representative shall be full-time, have tenure and have attained the rank of Associate Professor or above.

3. The HCB representative on the UPT will serve a three-year term. In the event that the position becomes vacant for any reason, the full-time faculty in the HCB will elect a new representative for the remaining portion of the unexpired term subject to the eligibility requirements in (2) above.

## HCB Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T):

The HCB Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T) is responsible for creating and maintaining the College P&T policies and procedures; as well as providing a peer review of candidates for promotion and/or tenure. The College P&T policies must be approved by the HCB P&T Committee, HCB Assembly, Dean, University Promotion and Tenure Committee, and Provost, be available to faculty and reviewed every three (3) years.

1.  The HCB will have a Promotion and Tenure Committee consisting of five (5) or seven (7) members as determined by the HCB Faculty Affairs Committee.

2.  The members of the committee shall be full time, tenured and hold the rank of associate professor or above.

3.  HCB P& T Committee will be selected by the EC committee using a list of the faculty satisfying the eligibility requirements in (2) above. EC members who intend to go up for promotion or tenure will recuse themselves from the P & T committee selection process. If the number of EC committee members eligible to make appointments is less than 3, then the P & T committee will be selected by random draw.

4.  Representatives of the HCB P&T shall serve a three (3) year term. The terms of service shall be staggered such that 1/3 of the representative transition annually. In the event that the position becomes vacant for any reason, the full-time faculty in the HCB will elect a new representative for the remaining portion of the unexpired term subject to the eligibility requirements in (2) above.

5.  In the event that a sufficient number of qualifying faculty is not available in the college, faculty outside the college shall be appointed by the Dean to serve on the College Tenure Committee subject to the process outlined in the University Promotion and Tenure Policy.

## HCB Pre-Tenure Review Committee (P&T):

1.  The HCB P&T Committee will appoint from its members three (3) member subcommittees consisting of tenured faculty members to serve as the HCB Pre-Tenure Review Committee.

2.  In the event that there are an insufficient number of tenured faculty members from the HCB P&T Committee to constitute the Pre-Tenure Review Committee, the FAC will identify by random drawing additional tenured members of the HCB Assembly to serve on the review committee.

### HCB Post-Tenure Review Committee (P&T):

1. The HCB P&T Committee will appoint from its members a three (3) member subcommittee consisting of tenured faculty members to serve as the HCB Post-Tenure Review Committee.

2. In the event that there are an insufficient number of tenured faculty members from the HCB P&T Committee to constitute the Post-Tenure Review Committee, the FAC will identify by random drawing additional tenured members of the HCB Assembly to serve on the review committee.