



**Middle Georgia**  
State University

**Department of Teacher Education & Social Work**  
100 University Parkway, Macon, GA 31206  
478.757.2544 mga.edu

Macon  
Cochran  
Dublin  
Eastman  
Warner Robins  
and online everywhere

### “Faculty Handbook” (April 2021)

These faculty guidelines are specific to the School of Education & Behavioral Sciences. They do not duplicate or supersede policy found in the USG Policy Manual, USG Academic and Student Affairs Handbook, MGA Policies, or MGA Faculty Handbook. As such, policies found in those locations are not included in these guidelines. These guidelines are intended to help faculty members better understand the culture and expectations in the School of Education & Behavioral Sciences. They also provide guidance on the expectations of faculty members in terms of teaching, the Boyer model of scholarship, and service to the institution, profession and the community.

### **Statements of Vision, Mission, Values and Strategy**

**Vision:** To be the regional leader in preparing informed, caring, and professional graduates who will transform our social world.

**Mission:** The School of Education & Behavioral Sciences is a dynamic academic community that brings faculty, students and community stakeholders together to inspire and empower the next generation of professionals, practitioners, and scholars.

Values that undergird our mission:

- Social transformation, change agents, advocacy
- Culturally-informed, adaptable, sensitive, appreciative, respectful of differing perspectives
- Seek excellence in public service
- Lifelong learning
- Global awareness and perspective
- Sharing, communication, collaboration, transformation

Strategy to achieve our mission:

- Rigorous academic programming
- Disciplinary, interdisciplinary and applied scholarship
- Innovative partnerships
- Community engagement
- Signature experiences for every student

## I. Policies, Expectations and Practices Specific to School

**Faculty Presence** – Faculty in our School are expected to be physically present on campus (holding office hours, teaching, performing scholarship and/or service) a minimum of 8 hours per week during the Fall and Spring semesters of each contract period. These hours do not have to be consecutive and may or may not overlap with (separate) office hour expectations described elsewhere.

**Public-Facing Information** – Faculty are expected to post their teaching and office hour schedule, along with contact information outside their office door. Additionally, faculty will maintain an accurate MGA Directory listing.

(Other policies to be added in the future, in accordance with School-level shared governance processes.)

## II. Annual Evaluation of Faculty – Rubrics (Department-specific)

### Department of Psychology and Criminal Justice

#### **Criteria for Professional Performance that Meets Expectations**

Tenure-track or tenured faculty shall be evaluated in three areas – teaching effectiveness, scholarly achievement, and service achievement as described in the following sections.

Lecturers and part-time faculty are solely evaluated in the area of teaching effectiveness.

The Dean and Chair shall identify and articulate progressive expectations for rank and early career status. Aspects of a faculty member's conduct that impact professional performance, positively or negatively, will be addressed in the evaluation of these performance areas. The standards for promotion and/or tenure are articulated in a separate document.

#### **Teaching**

Excellence in teaching is the primary goal of the faculty of the Department of Psychology and Criminal Justice. To ensure fairness and equity in measuring teaching and student mentoring, a definition, evaluation scale, and chart is below for measuring teaching effectiveness and student mentoring.

#### **Definition of teaching**

Consideration of teaching performance must include, but need not be limited to, the following: self-evaluation and student evaluations conducted through the on-line process established by MGA. Consideration should be given to faculty member's commitment to evidence-based innovations in teaching, e.g., development of new course activities, teaching methodologies and curriculum resources. The self-evaluation should address more than one of these categories:

- Teaching effectiveness;
- Command of one's content area;
- Appropriate use of diverse pedagogies;
- Innovative teaching and assessment strategies;
- Application of appropriate digital new media technologies.

**Student evaluations of teaching:** The department is aware of substantial meta-analytic research documenting little to no overall relationship between student ratings for the evaluation of teaching and measures of college student learning (e.g., Uttl et al., 2017). Accordingly, *to the extent permissible by university and system policy*, the department gives a minimal “weighting” to both quantitative and qualitative assessments based on anonymous evaluations completed by students and other untrained observers as a means of evaluating faculty. Student evaluations of teaching are assumed to be only a weak indicator of teaching effectiveness/student learning, but are considered a useful, but possibly nonrepresentative, indicator of student satisfaction/perception.

### **Areas of evaluation**

The three levels of teaching performance are “Exceeds Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” and “Needs Improvement.” These are differentiated in the chart below. The evaluation tool is designed to acknowledge faculty strengths and expertise as well as provide needs assessment for knowledge, skills, and performance.

*“Exceeds Expectations”* performance indicates that faculty member exceeded the expected levels of performance that are outlined at the Meets Expectations level.

*“Meets Expectations”* performance is derived from professionalism, self-reflections, advising, student course evaluations, and peer and/or department chair evaluations (if available).

*“Needs Improvement”* performance indicates that the faculty member has not met the criteria recognized as requisite for faculty members in the area of professionalism, self-reflections, advising, student course evaluations, and peer and/or department chair evaluations (if available).

	<i>Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Needs Improvement</i>
<b>Overall Teaching</b>	Exceeds expectations in <u>multiple</u> categories.	Meets or exceeds expectations in <u>all</u> categories, as applicable.	No evidence provided, or fails to meet or exceed expectations in one category or more.
<b>Components</b>			
<i>Professionalism in teaching</i>	Substantial, documented evidence of routinely going above and beyond the expectations in this category.	Meets classes as expected ( <i>face-to-face</i> ). Available for students in scheduled office hours. Logs into LMS and participates in courses regularly during academic work-week ( <i>partially/fully online</i> ). Posts grades in a timely manner. Generally meets deadlines for reporting no-shows, early alert, midterm grades, final grades, and SLOs, as applicable. Follows accommodation letters when asked to do so by students, responds to students and/or administration email in a timely manner, etc.	e.g., Cancels class or office hours without justification or notice. Fails to log in to LMS and respond to students for extended periods ( <i>partially/fully online</i> ). Fails to return graded assignments (or post grades for assignments that are not returned) in a timely matter. Fails to meet reporting deadlines consistently. Fails to follow accommodation letters when requested by students. Fails to respond to students and/or administration emails in a timely manner, etc.
<i>Self-Reflections</i>	Evidence of multiple, explicit insights gained from teaching experiences and/or feedback from students/evaluations. Reflection addresses the potential for enhancing teaching effectiveness.	Evidence of specific insights gained from teaching experiences and/or feedback from students/evaluations.	Self-reflection does not include specific examples or describe insight gained from teaching experiences and/or reviewing feedback from students/evaluations.
<i>Innovations in teaching</i>	Evidence of extensive efforts to keep courses current and evidence of impact of innovations on teaching, including preparation of courses for substantially different delivery methods (fully online, flipped classroom, problem-based, study abroad, etc.).	Evidence of efforts to keep existing courses and delivery current and responsive to assessment data or other forms of feedback.	Failure to make changes in courses in response to valid student concerns or supervisor recommendations.
<i>Advising, mentoring, recruiting, and student/alumni interactions (if applicable to position)</i>	Evidence of exemplary, dynamic interactions recruiting, mentoring, advising, supporting, and collaborating with current & potential students and alumni.	Evidence of adequate recruiting, mentoring, advising, supporting, and collaborating with current & potential students and alumni.	Minimal or no evidence of recruiting, mentoring, advising, supporting, or collaborating with current & potential students and alumni.
<i>Retention, progression, and graduation</i>	Evidence of extensive efforts to promote at-risk and likely-transfer student retention, progression, and graduation.	Evidence of efforts to retain qualified students and assist in their progression toward graduation or transfer.	No evidence of use of progression and retention strategies/evidence of negative impact on retention, progression, and graduation.

<i>Peer and/or department chair evaluations (if applicable)</i>	Highly positive feedback from multiple sources: students, peers, advisees, and other department participants (e.g., being viewed as a mentor and resource by colleagues).	Generally positive feedback from students, advisees, peers, and other department participants.	Significant negative feedback from students, peers, advisees, or department participants.
<i>Student Evaluations</i>	Student evaluations in the 4.2 -5.0 range on main teaching effectiveness question and several highly positive comments/few to no highly negative comments	Student evaluations in 3.5-4.1 range on main teaching effectiveness question and majority positive student comments/relatively few highly negative comments	Student evaluations below 3.5 on main teaching effectiveness question and/or multiple highly negative comments present.

### Scholarship and professional qualifications

Tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to participate in on-going professional development to maintain and enhance their professional qualifications. Scholarship is an important component of faculty life at MGA and, due to the mission of the University, may manifest itself in different venues/forms. To ensure that faculty efforts are examined with fairness and equity, a definition, evaluation scale, and chart with required elements are below.

#### Definition

Research and scholarship refer to conducting, disseminating and publishing empirical research, scholarly studies, literature reviews or syntheses of previous scholarly research, or the scholarship of application (as in the “Boyer model”). This can occur through a variety of different ways such as:

- Publications in refereed and non-refereed journals, books, or monographs;
- Publications that advance the work of the profession, e.g., newspaper articles, media consultations;
- Presentations at professional conferences;
- Application of one’s expertise in the community in such a way that results in information that is presented to and evaluated by scholarly peers.
- Grant writing and grant-funded projects at the local, state, or national level;
- Editorial work for newsletters, quarterly reports, or journals, including editorial board membership and pre-publication reviews;
- Published reviews of books, textbooks, or articles;
- Empirical course development research;
- Institutional research;
- Public scholarship.

**Note:** “Vanity press,” self-published, or “pay-to-play” publications will not ordinarily be counted as publications. “Duplicate publications”, which includes presenting the same research on multiple occasions at different conferences or over more than one calendar/evaluation year, will also not count as publications.

#### Areas of evaluation

The three levels of scholarship and professional qualifications are “Exceeds Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” and “Needs Improvement.” These are differentiated in the chart below. “Meets Expectations” performance is the minimum acceptable level for tenure-track and tenured faculty in the Department of Psychology and Criminal Justice. The evaluation tool is designed to reward faculty strengths and expertise as well as provide needs assessment for knowledge, skills and performance.

“Exceeds Expectations” performance reflects a quantity and/or quality of activity that is notable. Specifically, the faculty member has developed a statewide, regional or national level of peer recognition for scholarship in at least one academic area of study.

“Meets Expectations” requires one ‘written submission’ per year OR documented evidence of scholarly activity in area, as described below.

“Needs Improvement” indicates that inadequate scholarly work has been conducted at the local, state, or national level or insufficient evidence of professional development.

SCHOLARSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

	<i>Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Needs Improvement</i>
<b>Overall Evaluation of Scholarship and Professional Development</b>	Evidence reflects a quantity and/or quality of research dissemination and professional development activity that is notable.	Evidence reflects work meeting expectations in at least <i>one</i> area below.	No evidence provided or inadequate scholarly work in any area during evaluation year.
<b>Components</b>			
<i>Presentations at professional conferences</i>	Evidence of multiple presentations at state, regional, national, and/or international conference(s) in one calendar year.	Evidence of one presentation at a state, regional, national or international conference in calendar year.	No evidence of presentations at professional conferences in calendar year.
<i>Publications and Pre-Publication Activities</i>	Publication of one or more articles in peer-reviewed or non peer-reviewed journal or conference proceedings, one or more articles in press in peer-reviewed or non peer-reviewed journal or conference proceedings, book or book chapter.	Documented evidence of active engagement in the research process including submission of an IRB application, documented efforts toward data collection or analysis (including course redesign or other SoTL research), work on manuscript (e.g., description of content written), article submitted for review in peer-reviewed or non-reviewed journal or conference proceedings, or development of a book or book chapter.	No documented evidence of work toward manuscript development or clarification of research agenda. No clear steps or scholarly accomplishments noted.
<i>Institutional research</i>	Extensive institutional research activity or application of institutional research with a demonstrated substantial impact on student success or other departmental, school, or university goals.	Evidence of research on MGA students, faculty, staff, or alumni primarily for internal purposes, such as improvement of program delivery or investigating demand for new or refocused programs.	No evidence of institutional research.
<i>Grant Writing/External Funding related to scholarly expertise.</i>	Principal Investigator and lead author for a grant-funded project directed and completed successfully.	Grant proposal submitted either as an individual or as a member of a grant-writing team and/or working on a grant project that was written by another faculty member.	No evidence of grants submitted or participation in an active grant.
<i>Consulting/ Training</i>	National or statewide reputation results in multiple opportunities to consult or provide professional training for external audiences.	Evidence of substantial consultative or training work that applies scholarly expertise, including for internal audiences (example: leading a professional development seminar for the department, school, or university).	No evidence of professional consulting or training work.

	<i>Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Needs Improvement</i>
<i>Public Scholarship</i>	Multiple media appearances or at least one national or international mass media appearance applying scholarly expertise to public problems; national or international prominence as an expert on public social media.	At least one mass media appearance or interview applying scholarly expertise to public problems; regularly sharing scholarly expertise on public social media.	No evidence of public scholarship.
<i>Editorial (Referee)</i>	Completed more than one assignment for a newsletter, quarterly report, or journal.	Completed one editorial assignment in a newsletter, quarterly report, or journal.	No evidence of editorial work.
<i>Academic Reviewer</i>	Published more than one review of a book, textbook, and/or article.	Published one review of a book, textbook, and/or article.	No evidence of academic publication review work.

### **Service**

Service is another major role of tenured and tenure-track faculty at MGA. To ensure fairness and equity in measurement, a definition, evaluation scale, and chart for measuring service to the University, School, Department and, community are below. The evaluation tool is designed to reward faculty strengths and expertise as well as provide needs assessment for knowledge, skills and performance.

### **Definition**

Service involves providing assistance to others based on professional qualifications in a variety of services to the Department, School, University and community including committee work, peer mentoring of new faculty, collaboration with colleagues, support of students and alumni, and community involvement. This can occur through a variety of service opportunities such as:

- Elected to the Faculty Senate;
- Elected as member of Department, School or University committee, board, council or task force;
- Appointed or elected as Chair of a Department, School or University committee, board, council or task force;
- Faculty advisor to a Department, School or University student organization;
- Assigned mentor to new or novice faculty colleague;
- Special assignment by the Dean for the Department, School or University;
- Involvement in collaborative programs with other colleges and universities;
- Member or Chair of a community committee or board;
- Advisor, consultant or invited speaker to a community organization;
- Consultation, leadership, and advocacy work with local social work/public service community/state organizations and or councils;
- Active engagement in community activities and events;
- Officer or board member of a state, regional, national, or international professional organization;
- Advisor or consultant to a professional review board or accrediting organization;
- Editor, board member or reviewer for a scholarly journal;

**Areas of evaluation**

*"Exceeds Expectations"* performance reflects substantial leadership roles and service to the Department, School, and/or University (e.g., committees, boards, councils, task force or student organizations); recognized leadership and/or service to the community or profession.

*"Meets Expectations"* performance includes sufficient service to the Department and at least one other level (e.g., service to the School, University, student organizations, to the profession and/or to the community).

*"Needs Improvement"* performance reflects a lack of sufficient involvement in the Departmental, School, University, profession and/or community.

SERVICE

	<i>Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Needs Improvement</i>
<b>Overall Evaluation of Service</b>	Evidence reflects substantial leadership, as well as citizenship and service to the university at more than one level (e.g. department, school, and university) and service to the community or profession.	Evidence includes citizenship and service to the Department and <i>at least</i> one other level (e.g. school, University, community or profession).	Lack of evidence of consistent service citizenship and leadership to the department, school, university, community, or the profession.
<b>Potential Components</b>			
<i>Departmental, school, and/or university shared governance contributions</i>	Evidence of consistent leadership and significant contributions to department, school, and/or university shared governance.	Evidence of regular/consistent participation in department, school, and/or university shared governance such as Faculty Senate, committees, boards, and councils.	Inadequate involvement in the issues and concerns of the department, school, and/or university.
<i>Work with student organizations (if applicable)</i>	Provides consistent and substantial mentoring for a recognized student group (Psi Chi, Psychology Club ("Psyc Knights", etc.)	Supports and interacts with recognized student group(s).	Minimal or no involvement with recognized student group(s).
<i>Community partnerships</i>	Evidence of significant contributions and leadership to/with community partners.	Evidence of support and contributions to community partnerships.	Minimal or no evidence of support or contributions to community partnerships.
<i>State and/or local community engagement</i>	Consistent leadership evident at the state or local, community level.	Evidence of active involvement in a community organization.	Minimal or no engagement at the local community or state level.
<i>Service to Profession: Regional/national/international professional organizations/journals</i>	Consistent evidence of leadership, including serving on committees, task forces, or appointed offices for professional organizations and/or conference program committee(s). Evidence of Regional, National, or International recognition in the profession.	Evidence of active membership in one or more professional organizations (APS, APA, SPSP, ISSID, etc.) or active peer-review work for a scholarly journal.	Minimal or no involvement in professional organizations.

	<i>Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Needs Improvement</i>
<i>Peer mentoring and new faculty interactions, commensurate with rank</i>	Evidence of exemplary performance in peer mentoring, supporting and collaborating with new and early-career faculty.	Evidence of adequate support and collaboration with new and early-career faculty, within or outside the department.	Minimal or no evidence of meaningful interactions with new and early-career faculty.
<i>Mentoring and student/alumni interactions</i>	Evidence of exemplary, dynamic interactions mentoring, supporting and collaborating with students and/or alumni (e.g., mentoring students by providing research opportunities).	Evidence of adequate mentoring, supporting and collaborating with students and alumni.	Minimal or no evidence of interactions with students and alumni.
<i>Administrative assignment to lead initiatives (if applicable)</i>	Evidence of exemplary performance in carrying out reassigned responsibilities	Evidence of proficient performance in carrying out the responsibilities of the reassignment. (e.g., program coordinator position tasks).	Inadequate evidence of completion of assigned responsibilities.

*Revised May 15, 2020*

## Department of Political Science

**Criteria for Professional Performance:** Tenure-track or tenured faculty shall be evaluated in three areas – teaching effectiveness, scholarly achievement, and service achievement as described in the following sections.

Lecturers and part-time faculty are solely evaluated in the area of teaching effectiveness.

The dean and chair shall identify and articulate progressive expectations for rank and early career status. Aspects of a faculty member's conduct that impact professional performance, positively or negatively, will be addressed in the evaluation of these performance areas. The standards for promotion and/or tenure are articulated in a separate document.

**Teaching:** Excellence in teaching is the primary goal of the faculty of the Department of Political Science. To ensure fairness and equity in measuring teaching and student mentoring, a definition, evaluation scale, and chart is below for measuring teaching effectiveness and student mentoring.

**Definition of teaching:** Consideration of teaching performance must include, but need not be limited to, the following: self-evaluation and student evaluations conducted through the on-line process established by MGA. Consideration should be given to faculty member's commitment to evidence-based innovations in teaching, e.g., development of new course activities, teaching methodologies and curriculum resources. The self-evaluation should address more than one of these categories:

- Teaching effectiveness;
- Command of one's content area;
- Appropriate use of diverse pedagogies;
- Innovative teaching and assessment strategies;
- Application of appropriate digital new media technologies.

**Student evaluations of teaching:** The department is aware of substantial research documenting serious biases in perceptions of teaching effectiveness by students, including (but not limited to) biases that may be associated with gender, race, ethnicity, national origin, age, sexual orientation, gender expression and identity, religious identity, political expression, veteran status, and disabilities. Accordingly, *to the extent permissible by university and system policy*, the department disregards both quantitative and qualitative assessments based on anonymous evaluations completed by students and other untrained observers as a means of evaluating faculty.

**Areas of evaluation:** The three levels of teaching performance are "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," and "Needs Improvement." These are differentiated in the chart below. The evaluation tool is designed to acknowledge faculty strengths and expertise as well as provide needs assessment for knowledge, skills and performance

"Exceeds Expectations" performance indicates that faculty member exceeded the expected levels of performance that are outlined at the Meets Expectations level.

"Meets Expectations" performance is derived from professionalism, satisfactory evaluations of reassigned time activities and advising, self-reflections, and innovations in teaching.

"Needs Improvement" performance indicates that the faculty member has not met the criteria recognized as requisite for faculty members in the area of teaching and/or innovation and/or reassigned time responsibilities.

TEACHING

	<i>Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Needs Improvement</i>
<b>Overall Teaching</b>	Exceeds expectations in <u>multiple</u> categories.	Meets or exceeds expectations in <u>all</u> categories, as applicable.	No evidence provided, or fails to meet or exceed expectations in one category or more.
<b>Components</b>			
<i>Professionalism in teaching</i>	Substantial, documented evidence of routinely going above and beyond the expectations in this category.	Meets classes as expected ( <i>face-to-face</i> ). Available for students in scheduled office hours. Logs into LMS and participates in courses regularly during academic work-week ( <i>partially/fully online</i> ). Posts grades in a timely manner. Generally meets deadlines for reporting no-shows, early alert, midterm grades, final grades, and SLOs, as applicable. Follows accommodation letters when asked to do so by students.	Cancels class or office hours without justification or notice. Fails to log in to LMS and respond to students for extended periods ( <i>partially/fully online</i> ). Fails to return graded assignments (or post grades for assignments that are not returned) in a timely matter. Frequently fails to meet reporting deadlines. Fails to follow accommodation letters when requested by students.
<i>Self-Reflections</i>	Evidence of multiple, explicit insights gained from teaching experiences and/or feedback from students. Reflection addresses the potential for enhancing teaching effectiveness.	Evidence of specific insights gained from teaching experiences and/or feedback from students.	Self reflection does not include specific examples or describe insight gained from teaching experiences and/or reviewing feedback from students.
<i>Innovations in teaching</i>	Evidence of extensive efforts to keep courses current and evidence of impact of innovations on teaching, including preparation of courses for substantially different delivery methods (fully online, flipped classroom, problem-based, study abroad, etc.).	Evidence of efforts to keep existing courses and delivery current and responsive to assessment data.	Failure to make changes in courses in response to valid student concerns or supervisor recommendations.
<i>Advising, mentoring, recruiting, and student/alumni interactions</i>	Evidence of exemplary, dynamic interactions recruiting, mentoring, advising, supporting, and collaborating with current & potential students and alumni.	Evidence of adequate recruiting, mentoring, advising, supporting, and collaborating with current & potential students and alumni.	Minimal or no evidence of recruiting, mentoring, advising, supporting, and collaborating with current & potential students and alumni.
<i>Retention, progression, and graduation</i>	Evidence of extensive efforts to promote at-risk and likely-transfer student retention, progression, and graduation.	Evidence of efforts to retain qualified students and assist in their progression toward graduation or transfer.	No evidence of use of progression and retention strategies.
<i>Reassigned time (if applicable)</i>	Evidence of exemplary performance in carrying out reassigned responsibilities.	Evidence of proficient performance in carrying out the responsibilities of the reassignment.	Inadequate evidence of completion of assigned responsibilities.
<i>Peer and/or department chair evaluations (if applicable)</i>	Highly positive feedback from students, peers, and department participants.	Generally positive feedback from students, peers, and department participants.	Overall negative feedback from students, peers, and department participants.

**Scholarship and professional development:** Tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to participate in on-going professional development to maintain and enhance their professional qualifications. Scholarship is an important component of faculty life at MGA and, due to the mission of the University, may manifest itself in different venues. To ensure that faculty efforts are examined with fairness and equity, a definition, evaluation scale, and chart with required elements are below.

**Definition:** Research and scholarship refer to conducting, disseminating, and publishing research and scholarly studies, the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), and the Scholarship of Application (as in the *Boyer model*). This can occur through a variety of different ways such as:

- Publications in refereed and non-refereed journals, books or monographs;
- Publications that advance the work of the profession, e.g., newspaper articles, media consultations;
- Presentations at professional conferences;
- Grant writing and grant-funded projects at the local, state, or national level;
- Editorial work for newsletters, quarterly reports, or journals, including editorial board membership and pre-publication reviews;
- Published reviews of books, textbooks, or articles;
- Course development research;
- Institutional research;
- Consultation at local, state or national level;
- Public scholarship.

**Note:** “Vanity press,” self-published, or “pay-for-play” publications will not ordinarily be counted as publications.

**Areas of evaluation:** The three levels of scholarship and professional qualifications are “Exceeds Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” and “Needs Improvement.” These are differentiated in the chart below. “Meets Expectations” performance is the minimum acceptable level for tenure-track and tenured faculty in the Department of Political Science. The evaluation tool is designed to reward faculty strengths and expertise as well as provide needs assessment for knowledge, skills and performance

“Exceeds Expectations” performance reflects a quantity or quality of activity that is notable. Specifically, the faculty member has developed a statewide, regional or national level of peer recognition for scholarship in at least one academic area of study.

“Meets Expectations” includes professional development, along with professional productivity in one area listed above.

“Needs Improvement” indicates that inadequate scholarly work has been conducted at the local, state, or national level and insufficient evidence of professional development.

**Note:** The thresholds for “exceeds expectations” and “meets expectations” stated here reflect a 4–4 base teaching load (before release time for administrative work and any adjustments based on teaching assignments under the department and school’s workload policy). Faculty with higher teaching loads will have commensurately lower expectations for research, while faculty who are granted reduced teaching loads for research will have commensurately higher expectations in this category.

SCHOLARSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

	<i>Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Needs Improvement</i>
<b>Overall Evaluation of Scholarship and Professional Development</b>	Evidence reflects a quantity or quality of research dissemination and professional development activity that is notable.	Evidence reflects professional development, along with work meeting expectations in at least one other area below.	No evidence provided or inadequate scholarly work.
<b>Components</b>			
<i>Professional Development</i>	Evidence that information gained from participating in professional development opportunities has been used to improve teaching, service, or scholarship.	Evidence of participation in internal or external professional development opportunities.	No evidence of participation in professional growth and development opportunities.
<i>Presentations at professional conferences</i>	Evidence of multiple presentations (including poster sessions) at state, regional, national, and/or international academic conference(s).	Evidence of one presentation (including a poster session) at a state, regional, national, or international academic conference.	No evidence of presentations at professional conferences.
<i>Publications and Pre-Publication Activities</i>	Publication of one or more articles in peer-reviewed or non peer-reviewed journal or conference proceedings, one or more articles in press in peer-reviewed or non peer-reviewed journal or conference proceedings, book or book chapter.	Documented evidence of active engagement in the research process including submission of an IRB application, efforts toward data collection or analysis, work on manuscript, article submitted for review in peer-reviewed or non-reviewed journal or conference proceedings, or development of a book or book chapter.	No documented evidence of work toward manuscript development or clarification of research agenda. No clear steps or accomplishments noted.
<i>Course development research</i>	Evidence of multiple new course preparations or course redesigns, or leadership of collaborative redesign for POLS 1101 or comparable high-enrollment course(s).	Evidence of work to substantially redesign an existing course or prepare a new course, including collaboration with colleagues on POLS 1101 or other high-enrollment course redesign.	No evidence of course development research.
<i>Institutional research</i>	Extensive institutional research activity or application of institutional research with a demonstrated transformative impact on student success or other departmental, school, or university goals.	Evidence of research on MGA students, faculty, staff, or alumni primarily for internal purposes, such as improvement of program delivery or investigating demand for new or refocused programs.	No evidence of institutional research.
<i>Editorial (Referee)</i>	Completed more than one assignment for a newsletter, quarterly report, or journal.	Completed one editorial assignment for a newsletter, quarterly report, or journal.	No evidence of editorial work.
<i>Academic Reviewer</i>	Published more than one review of a book, textbook, and/or article.	Published one review of a book, textbook, and/or article.	No evidence of academic publication review work.
<i>Conference discussant</i>	Evidence of serving as a discussant on several research panels or poster sessions at academic conferences.	Evidence of serving as a discussant on a research panel or poster session at at least one academic conference (including student conferences).	No evidence of discussant activities.

	<i>Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Needs Improvement</i>
<i>Public Scholarship</i>	Multiple media appearances or at least one national or international mass media appearance applying scholarly expertise to public problems; national or international prominence as an expert on public social media.	At least one mass media appearance or interview applying scholarly expertise to public problems; regularly sharing scholarly expertise on public social media.	No evidence of public scholarship.
<i>Grant Writing</i>	Principal Investigator and lead author for a grant-funded project directed and completed successfully.	Grant proposal submitted either as an individual or as a member of a grant-writing team and/or working on a grant project that was written by another faculty member.	No evidence of grants submitted or participation in an active grant.
<i>Consulting/ Training</i>	National or statewide reputation results in multiple opportunities to consult or provide professional training for external audiences.	Evidence of consultative or training work that applies scholarly expertise, including for internal audiences (example: leading a professional development seminar for the department, school, or university).	No evidence of professional consulting or training work.

**Service:** Service is another major role of tenured and tenure-track faculty at MGA. To ensure fairness and equity in measurement, a definition, evaluation scale, and chart for measuring service to the University, School, Department and community are below. The evaluation tool is designed to reward faculty strengths and expertise as well as provide needs assessment for knowledge, skills and performance.

**Definition:** Service involves providing assistance to others based on professional qualifications in a variety of services to the Department, School, University and community including committee work, peer mentoring of new faculty, collaboration with colleagues, support of students and alumni, and community involvement. This can occur through a variety of service opportunities such as:

- Elected to the Faculty Senate;
- Elected as member of Department, School or University committee, board, council or task force;
- Appointed or elected as Chair of a Department, School or University committee, board, council or task force;
- Faculty advisor to a Department, School or University student organization;
- Assigned mentor to new or novice faculty colleague;
- Special assignment by the Dean for the Department, School or University;
- Involvement in collaborative programs with other colleges and universities;
- Member or Chair of a community committee or board;
- Advisor, consultant or invited speaker to a community organization;
- Consultation, leadership, and advocacy work with local social work/public service community/state organizations and or councils;
- Active engagement in community activities and events;
- Officer or board member of a state, regional, national, or international professional organization;
- Advisor or consultant to a professional review board or accrediting organization;
- Editor, board member or reviewer for a scholarly journal;
- Academic reviewer for potential conference session proposals.

**Areas of evaluation:** “Exceeds Expectations” performance reflects leadership in the Department, School or University committee, board, council, task force or student organizations; recognized leadership and service to the profession, or recognized leadership and active service in community organizations.

“Meets Expectations” performance includes service to the University at one level (e.g., Department, School, or University, or student organizations), and service to the profession or community at one level (e.g., local, state, regional, national, or international).

“Needs Improvement” performance reflects a lack of involvement in the Departmental, School, University, profession or community.

SERVICE

	<i>Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Needs Improvement</i>
<b>Overall Evaluation of Service</b>	Evidence reflects leadership in more than one objective of the school's strategic plan and/or the university's mission statement; as well as, citizenship and service to the university at more than one level (e.g. department, school) and service to the community or profession at more than one level (e.g., local, state, regional, national, or international).	Evidence includes citizenship and service to the university at one level (e.g. department, school), and service to the community or profession at one level (e.g., local, state, regional, national, or international).	No evidence of service citizenship and leadership to the department, school, university, community, or the profession.
<b>Components</b>			
<i>Departmental, school, and/or university shared governance contributions</i>	Evidence of leadership and significant contributions to department, school, and/or university shared governance.	Evidence of regular participation in department, school, and/or university shared governance such as Faculty Senate, committees, boards, and councils.	Minimal or no involvement in the issues and concerns of the department, school, or university.
<i>Collaboration with other colleges and universities</i>	Evidence of prominent leadership in collaborative activities, or active engagement in multiple collaborative activities.	Evidence of teaching and/or administrative collaboration with other colleges or universities, including bilateral programs and consortiums such as eCore, eMajor, USG Goes Global, and the EU Studies Certificate Program.	Minimal or no evidence of participation in collaborative programs.
<i>Work with student organizations</i>	Provides consistent mentoring for a recognized student group (PSO, Pi Sigma Alpha, SEMAU, etc.).	Supports and interacts with recognized student group(s).	Minimal or no involvement with recognized student group(s).
<i>Collaboration with colleagues at MGA</i>	Evidence of significant collaborations with colleagues.	Evidence of some collaboration with colleagues.	Minimal or no collaboration with colleagues.
<i>Community or K–12 partnerships</i>	Evidence of significant contributions and leadership to K–12 or community partners.	Evidence of support and contributions to K–12 or community partnerships.	Minimal or no evidence of support or contributions to K–12 or community partnerships.
<i>State and/or local community engagement</i>	Consistent leadership evident at the state or local community level.	Evidence of active involvement in a community organization.	Minimal or no engagement at the local community or state level.
<i>Regional/national/international professional organizations</i>	Consistent evidence of leadership, including serving on committees, task forces, or appointed offices for professional organizations and/or conference program committee(s).	Evidence of active membership in one or more professional organizations (GPSA, SPSA, APSA, ISA, Polmeth, etc.), or chairing panels at academic conferences.	Minimal or no involvement in professional organizations.
<i>Peer mentoring and new faculty interactions, commensurate with rank</i>	Evidence of exemplary performance in peer mentoring, supporting and collaborating with new and early-career faculty.	Evidence of adequate support and collaboration with new and early-career faculty, within or outside the department.	Minimal or no evidence of meaningful interactions with new and early-career faculty.

Revised January 30, 2020

## **Department of Teacher Education and Social Work**

### **Criteria for Professional Performance that Meets Expectations**

Tenure-track or tenured faculty shall be evaluated in three areas – teaching effectiveness, scholarly achievement, and service achievement as described in the following sections. The Dean shall identify and articulate progressive expectations for rank and early career status. Aspects of a faculty member's conduct that impact professional performance, positively or negatively, will be addressed in the evaluation of these performance areas.

### **Teaching**

Excellent teaching is the primary goal of the Department of Teacher Education and Social Work faculty members. To ensure fairness and equity in measuring teaching and student mentoring, a definition, evaluation scale, and chart is below for measuring teaching effectiveness and student mentoring.

### **Definition of teaching**

Consideration of teaching performance must include, but need not be limited to, the following: self-evaluation and student evaluations conducted through the on-line process established by MGA. Consideration should be given to faculty member's commitment to evidence-based innovations in teaching, e.g., development of new course activities, teaching methodologies and curriculum resources. The self-evaluation should address more than one of these categories:

- Teaching effectiveness;
- Command of one's content area;
- Appropriate use of diverse pedagogies;
- Innovative teaching and assessment strategies;
- Application of appropriate digital new media technologies.

### *Areas of evaluation*

The three levels of teaching performance are Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, and Needs Improvement. These are differentiated in the chart below. The evaluation tool is designed to acknowledge faculty strengths and expertise as well as provide needs assessment for knowledge, skills and performance

"Exceeds Expectations" performance indicates that faculty member exceeded the expected levels of performance that are outlined at the Meets Expectations level.

"Meets Expectations" performance is derived from student course evaluations, satisfactory evaluations of reassigned load activities and advising, self-reflections, AND innovations in teaching.

"Needs Improvement" performance indicates that the faculty member has not met the criteria recognized as requisite for faculty members in the area of teaching and/or innovation and/or reassigned load responsibilities.

<b>Components</b>	<i>Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Needs Improvement</i>
<i>Student Evaluations</i>	Student evaluations in the 4.0 -5.0 range	Student evaluations in 3.0-3.9 range	Student evaluations below 3.0
<i>Self Reflections</i>	Evidence of multiple, explicit insights gained from teaching experiences and/or feedback from evaluations. Reflection addresses the potential for enhancing teaching effectiveness.	Evidence of specific insights gained from teaching experiences and/or feedback from evaluations.	Self reflection does not include specific examples or describe insight gained from teaching experiences and/or reviewing feedback from evaluations.
<i>Innovations in teaching</i>	Evidence of extensive efforts to keep courses current and evidence of impact of innovations on teaching.	Evidence of efforts to keep courses and delivery current and responsive to assessment data.	Failure to make changes in courses in response to expressed concerns of students or supervisor recommendations.
<i>Administrative assignment to lead initiatives (if applicable)</i>	Evidence of exemplary performance in carrying out reassigned responsibilities.	Evidence of proficient performance in carrying out the responsibilities of the reassignment.	Inadequate evidence of completion of assigned responsibilities.
<i>Peer and/or Department director evaluations (if applicable)</i>	Positive feedback from a variety of sources such as being viewed as a mentor or resource by colleagues.	Overall positive feedback from students, peers and Department participants.	Overall neutral or negative feedback from students, peers and Department participants.

## Scholarship and professional qualifications

Tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to participate in on-going professional development to maintain and enhance their professional qualifications. Scholarship is an important component of faculty life at MGA and, due to the mission of the University, may manifest itself in different venues. To ensure that faculty efforts are examined with fairness and equity, a definition, evaluation scale, and chart with required elements are below.

### *Definition*

Research and scholarship refer to conducting, disseminating and publishing research and scholarly studies, and Scholarship of Application (see Boyer, et al). This can occur through a variety of different ways such as:

- Publications in refereed and non-refereed journals, books or monographs;
- Publications that advance the work of the profession, e.g., newspaper articles, media consultations;
- Presentations at professional conferences;
- Grant writing and grant-funded projects at the local, state, or national level;
- Editorial work for newsletters, quarterly reports, or journals;
- Published reviews of books, textbooks, or articles;
- Consultation at local, state or national level;
- Curriculum generated and customized for K-16 classrooms;
- Involvement in program accreditation and assessment efforts for regional and professional accreditation bodies, including the development of assessment plans and program evaluation.
- Development of materials that enhance social work courses: best practices, policy, training/curriculum materials for community-based agencies and advocacy).

### *Areas of evaluation*

The three levels of scholarship and professional qualifications are Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, and Needs Improvement. These are differentiated in the chart below. “Meets Expectations” performance is the Minimal or no acceptable level for tenure-track and tenured faculty in the Department of Teacher Education and Social Work. The evaluation tool is designed to reward faculty strengths and expertise as well as provide needs assessment for knowledge, skills and performance

“Exceeds Expectations” performance reflects a quantity or quality of activity that is notable. Specifically, the faculty member has developed a statewide, regional or national level of peer recognition for scholarship in at least one academic area of study.

“Meets Expectations” includes professional development and professional productivity in one area listed above.

“Needs Improvement” indicates that inadequate scholarly work has been conducted at the local, state, or national level and insufficient evidence of professional development.

<b>Components</b>	<i>Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Needs Improvement</i>
<i>Scholarship</i>	Evidence reflects a quantity or quality of dissemination and professional development activity that is notable.	Evidence reflects professional development or public dissemination in one area listed above.	No evidence provided or inadequate scholarly work.
<i>Professional Development</i>	Evidence that information gained from participating in professional development opportunities has been used to improve teaching, service, or scholarship.	Evidence of participation in professional development opportunities.	No evidence of participating in professional growth and development opportunities.
<i>Presentations at professional conferences</i>	Evidence of more than one presentation at a state, regional, national, and/or international conference.	Evidence of one presentation at a state, regional, national or international conference.	No evidence of any presentations shared at a professional conference.
<i>Publications</i>	Publication of one or more articles in peer-reviewed or non peer-reviewed journal or conference proceedings, one or more article in press in peer-reviewed or non peer-reviewed journal or conference proceedings, book or book chapter.	Evidence of active engagement in the research process including submission of IRB application, documented efforts toward data collection or analysis, documented work on manuscript, article submitted for review in peer-reviewed or non-reviewed journal or conference proceedings, or documented development of book or book chapter.	No evidence of work toward manuscript development or clarification of research agenda. No clear steps or accomplishments noted.
<i>Grant writing</i>	Principal Investigator and lead author for a grant-funded project directed and completed successfully.	Grant proposal submitted either as an individual or as a member of a grant- writing team and/or working on a grant project that was written by another faculty member.	No evidence of grants submitted or participation in an active grant.
<i>Consulting/ Training</i>	National or statewide reputation results in multiple opportunities to consult or provide professional training.	Evidence of consultative or training work that applies scholarly expertise.	No evidence of professional consulting or training work.
<i>Editorial</i>	Completed more than one assignment for a newsletter, quarterly report, or journal.	Completed one editorial assignment in a newsletter, quarterly report, or journal.	No evidence of editorial work.
<i>Academic Reviewer</i>	Published more than one review of a book, textbook, and/or article.	Published one review of a book, textbook, and/or article.	No evidence of academic publication review work.
<i>Program Assessment</i>	Led a team analyzing and interpreting program data for accreditation report.	Served on a team analyzing and interpreting program data for accreditation report.	No evidence of active participation on a program assessment team.

## **Service**

Service is another major role of faculty at MGA. To ensure fairness and equity in measurement, a definition, evaluation scale, and chart for measuring service to the University, School, Department and community are below. The evaluation tool is designed to reward faculty strengths and expertise as well as provide needs assessment for knowledge, skills and performance.

### *Definition*

Service involves providing assistance to others based on professional qualifications in a variety of services to the Department, School, University and community including committee work, peer mentoring of new faculty, collaboration with colleagues, support of students and alumni, and community involvement. This can occur through a variety of service opportunities such as:

- Elected as member of Department, School or University committee, board, council or task force;
- Appointed or elected as Chair of a Department, School or University committee, board, council or task force;
- Faculty advisor to a Department, School or University student organization;
- Assigned mentor to new or novice faculty colleague;
- Special assignment by the Dean for the Department, School or University;
- Member or Chair of a community committee or board;
- Advisor, consultant or invited speaker to a community organization;
- Consultation, leadership, and advocacy work with local social work/public service community/state organizations and or councils;
- Active engagement in community activities and events;
- Officer or board member of a state, regional, national, or international professional organization;
- Advisor or consultant to a professional review board or accrediting organization;
- Editor, board member or reviewer for a scholarly journal;
- Academic reviewer for potential conference session proposals.

### *Areas of evaluation*

“Exceeds Expectations” performance reflects leadership in the Department, School or University committee, board, council, task force or student organizations; recognized leadership and service to the profession, or recognized leadership and active service in community organizations.

“Meets Expectations” performance includes service to the University at one level (e.g., Department, School, or University, or student organizations), and service to the profession or community at one level (e.g., local, state, regional, national, or international).

“Needs Improvement” performance reflects a lack of involvement in the Departmental, School, University, profession or community.



# Middle Georgia State University

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

## SEBS Faculty Handbook

---

<b>Components</b>	<i>Exceeds Expectations</i>	<i>Meets Expectations</i>	<i>Needs Improvement</i>
<i>Service</i>	Evidence reflects leadership in more than one objective of the Department's strategic plan and the University's mission statement; as well as, citizenship and service to the University at more than one level (e.g., Department, School) and service to the profession at more than one level (e.g., local, state, regional, national, or international).	Evidence includes citizenship and service to the University at one level (e.g., Department, School), and service to the profession at one level (e.g., local, state, regional, national, or international).	No evidence of service citizenship and leadership to the Department, School, University, or the profession.
<i>Department, School, and/or University shared governance contributions</i>	Evidence of leadership and significant contributions to Department, School, and/or University shared governance, e.g., committee, board, council.	Evidence of regular participation in Department, School, and/or University shared governance.	Minimal or no involvement in the issues and concerns of the Department, School, University.
<i>K-12 partnerships and learning</i>	Evidence of significant contributions and leadership to K-12 partners.	Evidence of support and contributions to K-12 partners initiatives.	Minimal or no evidence of support or contributions to K-12 partners.
<i>Social work/public service community partnerships</i>	Evidence of significant contributions and leadership to community partners.	Evidence of supports and contributions to public service community partnership initiatives.	Minimal or no evidence of support or contributions to community partnerships.
<i>Work with student organizations.</i>	Provides consistent leadership for a student group.	Supports and interacts with student group(s).	Minimal or no involvement with student group(s).

<i>Collaborative activities</i>	Evidence of significant collaborations with colleagues in or outside the Department, School, and/or University-wide activities.	Evidence of initiating some collaboration with colleagues.	Minimal or no with collaboration with colleagues.
<i>State and/or local community engagement</i>	Consistent leadership evident at the state or local community level.	Evidence of active involvement in a community organization.	Minimal or no engagement at the local community or state level.
<i>National/international professional organizations</i>	Consistently acknowledged by peers and colleagues as a leader in the field. National reputation recognized in the profession.	Evidence of leadership serving on committees, task forces, or appointed offices for professional organizations.	Minimal or no involvement in professional organizations.
<i>Peer mentoring and new faculty interactions</i>	Evidence of exemplary performance in peer mentoring, supporting and collaborating with new and early career faculty.	Evidence of adequate support and collaboration with new faculty.	Minimal or no evidence of meaningful interactions with new faculty.
<i>Mentoring and student/alumni interactions</i>	Evidence of exemplary, dynamic interactions mentoring, supporting and collaborating with students and graduates.	Evidence of adequate mentoring, supporting and collaborating with students and alumni.	Minimal or no evidence of interactions with students and alumni.