

Effort Assignment and Evaluation Policy  
for Faculty in the College of Education

Developed by the  
Roles and Reward Committee  
College of Education  
Georgia Southern University

December 7, 2006

## Effort Assignment and Evaluation Policy for Faculty in the College of Education

This document outlines workload, or effort, assignment and evaluation policies for full-time, tenure-track, non-administrative faculty in the College of Education. These policies were developed to comply with criteria specified in Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook 2006-2007 (Faculty Handbook; 2006) and the Faculty Roles and Rewards: Recommendations on a Faculty Effort Assignment Model for Georgia Southern University (GSU Effort Assignment; 2004), and to support the College of Education's Conceptual Framework (Reflective Educators for Diverse Learners, 2004). Key features of the policy include descriptions of teaching, scholarship, and service; aspects of workload agreements; and procedures for reviews of faculty contributions. While it is clear that the policies delineated below are linked to the tenure and promotion process, procedural guidelines and criteria specific to tenure and promotion can be found elsewhere and are therefore only briefly referenced in this document. The Dean of the College of Education and the Faculty Executive Committee shall review the policies and procedures outlined below annually, and, if they judge alterations may be needed, an ad hoc committee composed of representatives from each department will be assembled to review areas of concern.

### Workload

As explained in the GSU Effort Assignment document, full-time faculty members have a workload defined as 15 hours and are expected to participate in three areas of effort: teaching, scholarship, and service. The Faculty Handbook (section 217.07) notes that the current standard teaching load at Georgia Southern is 12 hours, with the remaining workload hours distributed between scholarship and service.

#### 1. Teaching

Georgia Southern defines teaching as representing “professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and the development of critical thinking skills. Such activity typically involves teaching in the classroom, laboratory, or studio, and direction of research, fulfillment of professional librarian responsibilities, mentoring, and the like. Teaching activities also include the development of new courses, programs, and other curricular materials, including the development of online courses.” “Superior teaching is reflective, student-centered, respectful of the diversity of students, adapted to various learning styles, and focused on student learning outcomes” (Faculty Handbook, 2006, section 205.01).

Instructional faculty members at Georgia Southern are expected to be teacher-scholars—individuals who have mastery of, and remain current in, their content area of expertise and place priority on working with students to ensure their learning (for details of the teacher-scholar model, see section 203.01 Faculty Handbook, 2006). The teacher-scholar model is supported by the College of Education. Additionally, faculty members in Education must shape their teaching activities and goals in such a way to meet the professional standards set by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE; 2002). Faculty in the College of Education also recognize and value the important role that professional development—to enhance teaching and improve student learning—plays in developing a teacher-scholar. Also important are faculty instructional contributions as manifested in various forms of work in schools.

In the College of Education, teaching loads for faculty members typically range between 9 and 12 hours per semester, although adjustments to teaching load may be made with recommendation from one's chair and approval from the Dean. The College of Education faculty and administration are dedicated to modeling the highest quality teaching as the University realizes the ideal of academic distinction (i.e. "recognized among the best in the nation"). We therefore intend to move toward teaching loads that

optimally support the University's vision of distinction, the College of Education's focus on quality instruction, and better align with NCATE's target workload standards.

## 2. Scholarship

At Georgia Southern, scholarship “includes the discovery, integration, development, application, and extension of knowledge as well as aesthetic creation and is often demonstrated by publications and presentations designed for professional audiences. Scholarship is manifested in articles, scholarly books and texts, reports of research, creative works, textbooks, scholarly presentations, research grants, demonstration grants, papers read, panel participation, exhibits, performances, professional honors and awards, additional professional training or certification, degrees earned, postdoctoral work, and academic honors and awards” (Faculty Handbook, 2006, section 205.01).

College of Education faculty members are encouraged to engage in scholarly pursuits because scholarship is related to the College's commitment to professional development, research-based knowledge is linked with reflective practices (GSU College of Education, n.d.), scholarly pursuits are consistent with the teacher-scholar model, and meaningful engagement in active scholarship within one's discipline is a target standard for faculty qualifications according to NCATE (2002). In the College of Education, certain types of work in schools may lead to scholarly products and activities. For workload effort, scholarship may range between 1 and 5 hours for a given faculty member's workload assignment, although exceptions can exist where merited.

## 3. Service

The GSU Faculty Handbook describes service as “the application of one's expertise in the discipline for the benefit of a professional organization, the community, or the institution. Service also includes the academic advisement of Georgia Southern University students. Additionally, service may include work in schools, businesses, museums, social agencies, government, or the like, as well as activities undertaken on behalf of the University that do not entail systematic instruction, such as manuscript reviewing and the design and development of professional conferences. Consulting shall be designated as paid or unpaid” (Faculty Handbook, 2006, section 205.01).

Participation in shared governance and other service activities at the department, college, and university level is expected of Georgia Southern faculty members. The College of Education is also committed to regional service. This includes, for example, locating instruction throughout the region where feasible, and working in schools to help improve instructional practices. For most faculty members, service activities should require between 1 and 5 hours within the 15-hour workload assignment, although exceptions to this range may exist for heavy service assignments.

### Evaluation

The Faculty Handbook (section 205.04) identifies five types of evaluations for full-time, regular faculty. These include annual faculty reviews, pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. For each of these reviews faculty members are evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. All types of evaluation will be linked to each faculty member's workload agreements (explained below), which are set annually between the faculty member and his or her department's chair.

#### 1. Workload Agreements (Goal Setting) and Annual Reviews

Each faculty member within the College of Education is expected to provide, annually, documentation of activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. These annual reviews serve (a) as the foundation for determining faculty effort allocation in the three areas, (b) as evidence used by department chairs for merit pay recommendations, and (c) as the workload agreement that will be used for evaluating achievement within the framework of tenure, promotion, pre-tenure and

post-tenure reviews in the College of Education. Part of the workload agreement involves goal setting, goals that should be tied to the conceptual framework for the College of Education, and to Department and College objectives and needs. Additionally, goal setting and workload agreements should be carried out with consideration for faculty needs in achieving tenure and promotion. The process of workload agreement and annual review follows.

(a) Workload Agreement

Workload. Each faculty member and his or her department chair will have at least one meeting to decide upon the faculty member’s workload effort allocation for the coming calendar year. The workload, or effort, allocation and corresponding goal setting will address each of the three areas (teaching, scholarship, and service). As previously noted, teaching effort in the College of Education is currently expected to range between 9 and 12 hours per semester, and the remaining workload assignment is divided between service and scholarship unless administrative duties are assigned (see Table 1). Teaching load reassignment is possible, with the reassigned hours credited toward service, scholarship, or both, assuming the needs of the department and college in teaching are met. For example, an individual with substantial service commitments may have his or her teaching load reduced from 9 to 6 hours with the 3 hours reassigned from teaching to service. As another example, a faculty member may desire to engage heavily in scholarship and wish to have his or her teaching load reassigned to scholarship. Summer teaching, while optional in most situations, shall also be included in workload agreements and review materials where applicable.

Table 1: Workload and Ranges for Evaluative Weights

Area	Typical Workload Range in Hours	Evaluation Range in Percentages
Teaching	9-12 hours	40-80%
Scholarship	1-5 hours	10-40%
Service	1-5 hours	10-40%
Total	15 hours	100%

Timeline. Once a faculty member and his or her chair agree upon a workload assignment, a timeline for each activity must be specified. For some activities a timeline will be obvious, such as when courses end, but for others a timeline is needed to help establish parameters for expected effort and reassignment needs. An individual with a grant, for example, may require teaching or service reassignment to allow for completion of grant activities for two semesters. In scholarship, a timeline will help make clear when one anticipates results from one’s scholarly activities. For instance, in many cases the process of moving from study design to publication, or from grant application development to awarded grant, will require more than one calendar year. Timelines should provide guidance as to when a specific research activity will be completed and when manuscripts will be submitted for review. In this regard it may be useful for projects and timelines from previous workload agreements to be listed on the current workload agreement so projects in progress can be documented and evaluated in an ongoing manner.

Documentation. In addition to the timeline, each workload agreement should also specify what type of documentation will be provided to demonstrate completion and quality of one’s work. This documentation can and should be used for annual reviews, tenure, promotion, and other evaluations. For example, faculty members with reassigned time for scholarship will usually be expected to document results of the scholarly activity commensurate to the amount of reassignment. One clear way to demonstrate these accomplishments is to provide copies of published works and external grant applications. In the area of teaching, evidence for assessing instructional quality may include student ratings, copies of course syllabi and required course activities, documentation of student performance, examples of student work, and peer reviews. For service, one should describe one’s role in service

activities (e.g., chair, reader, editor) and include a sample of products from such activities (e.g., reports, revised policy statements, etc.).

**Evaluative Weights.** The final component of the annual workload agreement is the level of evaluative weighting assigned to each of the three areas. As explained in the GSU Effort Assignment document, faculty may opt to decouple actual workload hours from the evaluative weight assigned to a given area. For example, a faculty member may have a teaching load of 12 hours, with 9 hours represented by a three-course load and the remaining 3 hours directed toward student mentoring. This faculty member may choose to have teaching count 80% toward his or her annual review since 12 hours represents 80% of one's 15-hour workload. However, this faculty member may also opt to have teaching count at a lower level (e.g., 60% or 50%). This may be advantageous, for instance, to faculty members who are unable to obtain a teaching reassignment for scholarship, but who nevertheless are productive in scholarship and wish to have it formally recognized with greater credit in one's annual review. Ranges for evaluative weights, as recommended in the GSU Effort Assignment document, are listed in Table 1 (presented above). Note that there are minimum ranges in both workload hours and evaluation weights because Georgia Southern expects that each full-time, regular faculty member will be engaged, to some extent, in each of the three areas. The maximum evaluative weight for scholarship and service is 40% and the minimum for teaching is 40%.

Individual faculty members should submit evaluative weights assigned to each of the three areas of evaluation during the goal-setting component of the annual review meeting for the upcoming academic year. Faculty who do not receive the opportunity for reassigned workload hours (e.g., those faculty members expected to carry normal teaching, scholarship, and service loads) may opt to change the level of evaluative weights assigned (but not the level of their agreed-upon goals) to each of the three areas at the beginning of Fall semester by consulting with their departmental chair and then submitting a letter to their departmental chair documenting the change. Such flexibility in reallocating evaluative weights will enable each faculty member to have his or her accomplishments and strengths better recognized by chairs during the annual review process. Any such weighting changes will be within the stated limits designated for teaching, scholarship, and service.

Faculty members who receive workload reassignment, such as a reduction in teaching load for more time in scholarly pursuits, are expected to place higher evaluative weight in the area receiving the workload reassignment. The faculty member and her or his chair shall agree upon appropriate evaluative weights during the goal-setting component of the annual review meeting for the upcoming academic year. For example, an individual who receives a 3-hour reassignment from teaching to scholarship may select an evaluative weight of 35% or 40% in scholarship rather than the minimum of 10%. As a result of the workload reassignment, the faculty member should demonstrate greater productivity in the area receiving the reassigned time, and the evaluative weights agreed upon by the faculty member and the member's chair during the annual review are to remain fixed throughout the year (unless unusual/unexpected events occur that require altering the workload for that faculty member during the year).

**Chair Feedback.** In conference with each faculty member, chairs will provide feedback that should allow each faculty member to estimate the degree to which his or her acceptable goals are considered high enough relative to departmental criteria and their own professional expectations for evaluation.

#### (b) Annual Review

The annual review requires that chairs evaluate faculty accomplishments in each of the three areas. As noted above, faculty members may set evaluative weights for each area; therefore the annual review includes a necessary quantitative component. To evaluate faculty during the annual review, departments should use the 4-step rating scale provided below, or a similar multi-step scale of their choice.

1 = Unsatisfactory

2 = Satisfactory (e.g., minimal, expected performance)

- 3 = Very Good
- 4 = Excellent

To facilitate annual review evaluations, and to make expectations clear to all faculty members, each department should develop agreed-upon standards with well-defined criteria for each of the three areas of evaluation. For example, in the area of teaching, each department must specify criteria used to assign a rating of “unsatisfactory,” “satisfactory,” “very good,” and “excellent.” Similarly, criteria for each step in the scale should be developed separately for scholarship and for service.

During the annual review it is necessary to evaluate each faculty member in each area and then compute an overall rating. Below is an example of how one may implement the evaluation system for annual review.

Table 2: Example Evaluation

Area	Faculty member’s evaluative weights (percentages) for the year in review	Chair’s rating for each area using a 4-point scale where 4 indicates best performance	Product of Rating (proportion × rating)
Teaching	50%	3.5	$.50 \times 3.5 = 1.75$
Scholarship	35%	4.0	$.35 \times 4.0 = 1.40$
Service	15%	3.0	$.15 \times 3.0 = 0.45$
			Overall = 3.60

Table 2 shows an overall rating for this faculty member of 3.60 on a 4-point scale. The overall rating is the sum of the products for each of the three areas, i.e.,  $1.75 + 1.40 + 0.45 = 3.60$ . When ratings are tallied for each faculty member in a given department, merit pay would then be assigned according to each member’s overall rating.

Once each department develops standard criteria defining steps for rating scales for teaching, scholarship, and service, departmental chairs will use these standard criteria when evaluating all faculty members who maintain normal workloads (i.e., workloads without reassignment). Chairs are required to include these rating scales when providing faculty with annual reports on progress toward tenure.

As noted above, faculty may select from a range of evaluative weights for each of the three areas, except for those faculty members with reassigned workload. (For faculty with reassigned workload activities, as explained above, evaluative weights are assigned in consultation with the faculty member’s chair and are fixed for the academic year.) Such differential weighting across the three areas does not affect how the rating scales, or the criteria defining those rating scales, are applied. For example, two faculty members within one department may both have similar effort allocations per semester, e.g., 12 hours in teaching with the remaining 3 hours divided equally between service and scholarship. While both faculty members have the same assigned effort distribution, they may select different evaluative weightings for the three areas. This situation is illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3: Example Evaluation of Two Faculty Members opting for Differential Evaluative Weighting in Each Area

Faculty Member: Dr. Smith					Faculty Member: Dr. Jones				
Area	Weight %	Chair's rating	Product		Area	Weight %	Chair's rating	Product	
Teaching	70%	× 4.0	= 2.80		Teaching	50%	× 3.0	= 1.50	
Scholarship	15%	× 3.0	= 0.45		Scholarship	40%	× 4.0	= 1.60	
Service	15%	× 3.0	= 0.45		Service	10%	× 3.0	= 0.30	
Overall				= 3.70	Overall				= 3.40

In the example illustrated in Table 3, assume that both faculty members maintained the same teaching load (4 courses per semester), and had equivalent service (e.g., 1 university-level and 2 college-level committees). The only difference between the two is that Dr. Jones had a successful year in scholarship, so he opted for a weight of 40% in scholarship. In this example the departmentally defined criteria used to construct the rating scales (i.e., satisfactory, very good, etc.), discussed above, were applied equally to the evaluation of both individuals.

Change in a faculty member's workload requires a corresponding change in the standard departmental criteria used for evaluations for that faculty member. For example, a faculty member may receive a reduced teaching load (say from 9 to 6 hours per semester) with the reassigned time applied to scholarship. In this event criteria used to define rating scales must be altered to reflect the change in normal workload expectations. The appropriate level of expectation shall be defined through consultation between the respective faculty member and that member's chair. For example, a department may decide that faculty members who carry a normal workload (e.g., 9/12 hours in teaching) are expected to have one peer-reviewed publication to achieve a rating of "very good" in scholarship. However, faculty members who receive workload reassignment for scholarly pursuits will be required to demonstrate greater productivity than is normally expected to receive a rating of "very good" (e.g., perhaps a rating of very good will be defined for these individuals as two peer-reviewed publications).

## 2. Promotion, Tenure, Pre/Post-Tenure Review

Faculty members may have differentiated workloads that vary across areas, and workload can further vary for an individual across years. Given this, it is important that evaluations for promotion, tenure, and pre/post-tenure reviews take into consideration each faculty members' workload assignment for the years under review. While it is expected that all faculty members will participate, to some degree, in each of the three areas, it is possible that some individuals will opt to take minimum levels of work assignment in one area, such as service or scholarship. It is critical to present annual workload agreements---including timeline and documentation for each year under review---with evaluation materials for promotion, tenure, or pre/post-tenure review committees to consider. In addition, departmental evaluation criteria used to rate faculty members' work must also be included in review materials since such evaluative criteria may differ across departments and, sometimes, across individuals within departments for those members with re-assigned workload. Numeric ratings originating from annual reviews by departmental chairs shall not be considered as part of materials for tenure, promotion, or pre/post-tenure reviews.

## Forms

Below are examples of components that should be included on annual workload agreements.

### 1. Teaching

#### (a) Teaching Load/Activities

##### (i) Courses to be taught

Spring

Summer

Fall

##### (ii) Committees (e.g., specialist, dissertation, thesis)

##### (iii) Course development/revision

##### (iv) New/innovative activities planned

##### (v) Delivery and location of instruction (on-line, remote location, etc.)

##### (vi) Professional Development

##### (vii) Work in schools (long-term, ongoing)

##### (vii) Student Advising/Mentoring (e.g., graduate, doctoral, professional organizations, mentoring)

##### (viii) Other

(b) Timeline – this is probably needed only in special situations, such as directing dissertations, since timelines for courses are well specified elsewhere. Teaching activities continuing from previous workload agreements should also be listed here.

(c) Documentation of work completion and effectiveness/quality – student ratings; peer ratings; course syllabi, notes, and activities; external measures of student success; grade distributions; tests and assessment practices; professional development documents; etc.

##### (d) Evaluative weighting assigned to teaching

### 2. Scholarship

#### (a) Scholarship Activities

##### (i) Publications/Submissions (books, journals, book chapters)

##### (ii) Presentations/Proceedings

(iii) Research in progress

(iv) Grant activities (internal and external)

(v) Work in schools

(vi) other

(b) Timeline – When should a research project/grant activity be started and completed? When are manuscripts expected for submission? Projects continuing from previous workload agreements should also be listed here.

(c) Documentation of work completion and quality – Provide copies of publications, letters of acceptance, etc., and provide some indication of the quality of the work or quality/prestige of publication source; similar documentation for conference activities, grants, and other scholarly work.

(d) Evaluative weighting assigned to scholarship

### 3. Service

(a) Service Activities

(i) Departmental committees and service activities

(ii) College committees and service activities

(iii) University committees and service activities

(iv) Service to the profession, consulting (gratis), and related activities

(v) Work in schools (periodic, short-term activities)

(vi) other

(b) Timeline – When should service activity be started and completed? Projects continuing from previous workload agreements should also be listed here.

(c) Documentation of work completion and quality – reports, participant feedback, letters, etc.

(d) Evaluative weighting assigned to service

### Factors to Consider in Workload Assignment

The following list identifies factors that the college and departments may wish to incorporate into faculty effort assignment policies. This list is intended to be neither prioritized nor exhaustive. As previously noted, teaching load reassignment is possible, with the reassigned hours credited toward service,

scholarship, or both, assuming the department's and college's needs in teaching are met. In many instances, effort associated with an activity in a given term is not substantial enough to merit course reassignment. In such cases, banking of effort across multiple semesters may be a means of addressing the workload associated with these efforts.

## 1. Teaching (includes professional development)

Class size

Teaching assistance available to the professor (availability of GTAs, undergraduate assistants, lab supervisors, etc.)

Developing new courses or developing on-line courses, also revising existing courses

Modality of instruction (such as teaching with technology, clinical instruction, individualized instruction, etc.)

Supervision and field experiences

Curriculum development or revision

Team teaching

Number of concurrent course preparations

Graduate (thesis or dissertation) committee assignments (consider role on such committees, e.g., chair, methodologist, other)

Mentoring students (e.g., dissertation, thesis, undergraduate projects and programs, etc.)

Mentoring peers (e.g., workshops, professional development, etc.)

Teaching-related travel

Academic study program (professional development)

Pursuing advanced degrees (professional development)

Work with schools (e.g., ongoing, longitudinal, intensive activity; c.f., work with schools in service)

## 2. Scholarship

Submitted and funded internal grants or contracts for research, scholarship, and/or creative activity

Submitted and funded external grants or contracts for research, scholarship, and/or creative activity

Scholarly presentations and publications

Work in schools that leads to scholarly products (e.g., development of curriculum materials that is distributed publicly).

Other research, scholarship, and/or creative activity (normally resulting in no more than three hours of reassignment from the standard teaching load)

### 3. Service

Externally funded service grants or contracts

Other service activity (normally resulting in no more than three hours of reassignment from the standard teaching load)

Professional service, such as conference program chair or journal editor

Chair or member on a major System, University, College, or unit committee

Academic advisement (e.g., course registration, scheduling)

Work with schools (e.g., periodic activities such as workshops, lectures, one-time or short-term consulting, etc.; c.f., work with schools in teaching)

Coordinating multi-section courses

Lab Coordinator

Undergraduate or Graduate Coordinator

Program-level (director or coordinator)

Special Projects

Interim/part time administrative position

Other (e.g., accreditation activities)

## References

- College of Education, Georgia Southern University (n.d.). Reflective Educators for Diverse Learners: Conceptual Framework. Retrieved on-line, January 26, 2005:  
<http://coe.georgiasouthern.edu/cfram.pdf>
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2002). Professional standards for the accreditation of schools, colleges, and departments of education. Washington, D.C. Retrieved on-line January 26, 2005: [http://www.ncate.org/documents/unit\\_stnds\\_2002.pdf](http://www.ncate.org/documents/unit_stnds_2002.pdf)
- Task Force on Faculty Roles and Rewards, Georgia Southern University. (2004). Faculty Roles and Rewards: Recommendations on a Faculty Effort Assignment Model for Georgia Southern University. Retrieved on-line January 26, 2005:  
<http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/provost/frr/recommendations.html>
- The Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Georgia Southern University. (2006). Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook 2006-2007. Retrived on-line Jan. 25, 2005:  
<http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/provost/handbook>
- Reflective Educators for Diverse Learners (2004). College of Education Conceptual Framework, Georgia Southern University. Retrieved on-line August 23, 2005:  
<http://coe.georgiasouthern.edu/pdfs/cfram.pdf>