

Institutional Effectiveness Addendum 3.3.1.4

University of West Georgia

Submitted to the:

SACSCOC On-Site Committee

February, 2014

3.3.1.4: research within its mission, if appropriate

UWG includes research within the mission of each academic college and the Office of Research and Sponsored. Several centers exist on campus including those identified by the off-site committee ((i.e., Center for Survey Research, Center for Study of Developed Shorelines, and West Georgia Microscopy Center). Each of these centers is housed within a college and their research assessment is included in the research productivity of faculty within that college or as part of the assessment for the office of Research and Sponsored Projects. As such, the evidence of compliance presented for principle 3.3.1.4 is presented by college and/or department in this order:

Research and Sponsored Projects
College of Arts and Humanities
College of Science and Mathematics
College of Education
College of Social Sciences
Tanner Health System School of Nursing
Richards College of Business

Division/College	Academic Affairs
Department	Office of Research and Sponsored Projects
Time Period	2009-2013

What were your expected outcomes for research during this period?

The Office of Research and Sponsored Projects (ORSP) had three directors during the time period 2009 – 2013 and underwent at least one major reorganization. Annual goals under previous provosts, to whom the ORSP director reports and where there has also been significant turnover, were not subject to an explicit, formal process, such as annual reports. Formal goal-setting for the research administration occurred in early 2013. ORSP goals are listed below.

1. The current director has set a goal of facilitating faculty proposal submissions by focusing on faculty training for grant readiness, proposal preparation, and outreach.

Other goals, discussed between the ORSP director and the provost in July, 2013, include:

2. Investigate ways to fund agency account.
3. Investigate setting up a research foundation.
4. Meet regularly with deans one-on-one.
5. Increase proposal submissions 10% per year.
6. Develop a list of needed policies.
7. Write policies over next calendar year.
8. Develop common vision for the STEM Center/STEM Ed Center.
9. Host an IBC (Institutional Biosafety Committee) meeting.
10. Inaugurate an IACUC (Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee).
11. Improve ORSP website
12. Conduct annual ORSP/research satisfaction survey.
13. Promote NSF grants in general, and RUI and CAREER programs in particular.

14. Add an additional staff member in Post-Award.

15. Improve ORSP outreach to faculty.

How did the department assess the extent to which it achieved these outcomes?

1. In the past year (2013 – 2014), the ORSP has conducted numerous **workshops** and seminars on grant writing and proposal preparation. Faculty training is being assessed by taking attendance at each workshop. Each ORSP-hosted event has an after-event folder set up for it in the ORSP Google Drive, and a “hotwash” is conducted for each ORSP-hosted event. Problems and potential solutions are discussed, and changes made as needed by the ORSP director. Notes from the hotwash sessions will be archived in each event’s after-action folder beginning in 2014. Hotwashes in 2013 identified the need for better post-award training, for example. Knowledge assessments (for explicitly measuring faculty retention and mastery of content) will be developed for each workshop for 2014.
2. **Fund an ORSP Agency Account:** ORSP employees were made aware of the ORSP Agency Account prior to A Day. Donations are tracked by the ORSP director and assistant director on a quarterly basis. Moreover, the ORSP director has been given fundraising goals in 2014. Progress towards this goal will be tracked in meetings with the provost.
3. **Investigate setting up a research foundation:** A consultant that has assisted other USG institutions in setting up research foundations was contacted by the ORSP director. The ORSP director will attend a conference hosted by this individual in April 2014 and discuss specific strategies, benefits, and potential pitfalls at this meeting, and brief the UWG president and provost. However, the current president (July, 2013) does not share the enthusiasm of the previous president for setting up a research foundation. This may not be a goal for the ORSP director for 2014.
4. **Meet regularly with deans one-on-one:** The ORSP director met once with each dean individually in 2013. This process is carrying forward into 2014. A recurring calendar note has been set up in the ORSP director’s Google Calendar to connect with each of the deans in March 2014. The ORSP director also attends a provost’s deans meeting.
5. **Increase proposal submissions 10% per year:** The ORSP Pre-Award Office maintains a spreadsheet of all grants and contracts that are submitted to external entities by the ORSP going back to 2009. The ORSP director is responsible for reviewing this document and tracking the number of proposal submissions. The grants spreadsheet is maintained by the Pre-Award Specialist and is in a shared Dropbox folder. The spreadsheet is updated daily, as needed.
6. **Policy development:** A list of 15 policies was created in 2013 to be worked on throughout 2014. This is the responsibility of the ORSP director.
7. **Write policies** – ongoing. The ORSP director is reviewing progress with his staff at weekly meetings.
8. **Develop common vision for the STEM Center/STEM Ed Center:** This was discussed with the COE and COSM deans and associate deans in Spring 2013. The ORSP director and members of his staff search for grant opportunities weekly.
9. **Host an IBC meeting:** The dean of COSM and the director of Risk Management were briefed by the Associate Vice President for Research and Sponsored Projects on the necessity of IBCs for certain types of research (for example, using recombinant DNA). The AVPR was notified that UWG does not engage in that type of

research. No further action necessary.

10. **IACUC:** an IACUC was instituted in Dec 2013. An IACUC Chair has been designated. Meetings are monthly. The ORSP director serves as secretary to the UWG IACUC. All members have access to the IACUC Google Drive folder, in which the meeting minutes are archived.
11. **Improve ORSP website:** A contractor was hired in 2013 to maintain the ORSP website. ORSP training events were promoted on the ORSP website, in addition to grants opportunities. This task has been delegated to an ORSP employee in 2014.
12. **Conduct annual ORSP/research satisfaction survey:** The first ORSP/research satisfaction survey was conducted in Spring 2013. The next one will be in February 2014. The first survey highlighted the need for an excellent ORSP website for housing ORSP policies, a preference for digital communications, a reliance on chairpersons for flowing down information, and a distaste for social media for sharing grants opportunities.
13. **Promote NSF grants in general, and RUI and CAREER programs in particular:** The ORSP director is responsible for setting the faculty training calendar. As needs are identified (through word of mouth, identified by ORSP, or suggested by staff or faculty), training programs are developed, promoted, and offered. Workshops were hosted by ORSP for NSF CAREER and NSF RUI/ROA grants.
14. **Add an additional staff member in Post-Award:** An initial analysis of ORSP operations by the incoming (Jan 2013) ORSP director identified the greatest risk and need for an additional hire in Post-Award Operations. The ORSP director is responsible for analyzing operations and determining if changes are needed. This is conducted constantly and the Provost is apprised bi-weekly in Academic Affairs staff meetings.
15. **Improve ORSP outreach to faculty:** This was a need identified by the first annual (Spring 2013) ORSP/research satisfaction survey. The ORSP developed two Facebook Pages, a Google Groups "listserv" for each college, hired a casual labor employee to maintain and update the ORSP website

What improvements were implemented in your department based on analysis of the assessment results?

No assessments were identified from previous directors. Assessments were conducted in 2013.

1. Facilitating faculty proposal submissions by focusing on faculty training for grant readiness, proposal preparation, and outreach: As a result of the prior year's assessments, the ORSP has committed to offering at least two hours of training each week, in addition to workshops/seminars on specific grant mechanisms as needed or suggested by the academic deans. Outreach has shifted from a reliance on digital means of communication through Google Groups to 1) identifying specific faculty research interests (to include in grant searches) and 2) relying on department chairpersons. Additionally, the ORSP is also taking a college-by-college approach and offering college-specific (really discipline-specific) grants training courses in which a set group of faculty attend six or seven sessions that cover the complete grants lifecycle.

The UWG ORSP participated in a re-organization of the sharing schedule for indirect costs. The ORSP now receives 50% of F&A funds, and these funds are used to spur faculty development, grants readiness, and seed funding for research and service projects. Two examples that the ORSP is now piloting is a seed funding program with the explicit intention of generating preliminary data to be used in significant external grant proposals (President's Development Awards; PDA grants), and the UWG Summer Grants Institute in which a cohort of faculty work directly with ORSP staff during the summer to develop a top-notch grant proposal. These two pilot

projects are ongoing in Spring 2014.

Other goals, discussed between the ORSP director and the provost in July, 2013, include:

2. **Investigate ways to fund agency account:** no change.
3. **Investigate setting up a research foundation.** meeting planned in April 2014.
4. **Meet regularly with deans one-on-one:** no change.
5. **Increase proposal submissions 10% per year:** ORSP is going through discussions to insert peer review and external review into the proposal development and submission process. Quality has not been a focus in past years. Grant rating rubrics (checklists) are being developed within ORSP that will provide direction to the Pre-Award Specialist to use while evaluating proposals prior to submission, and the Pre-Award Specialist is being sent to a CUR meeting for professional development.
6. **Develop a list of needed policies:** done.
7. **Write policies over next calendar year:** In progress.
8. **Develop common vision for the STEM Center/STEM Ed Center:** no progress.
9. **Host an IBC (Institutional Biosafety Committee) meeting:** determined to be unnecessary.
10. **Inaugurate an IACUC (Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee):** regular meetings are now occurring.
11. **Improve ORSP website:** continuous.
12. **Conduct annual ORSP/research satisfaction survey:** In progress, set for February of each year.
13. **Promote NSF grants in general, and RUI and CAREER programs in particular:** UWG had three CAREER submissions in 2013 (our first ever). UWG also had one RUI proposal submitted (also a first) and one NSF ROA submitted. Attendance at these particular workshops may have had an impact: all submitters attended ORSP workshops in 2013.
14. **Add an additional staff member in Post-Award:** done.
15. **Improve ORSP outreach to faculty:** A shift has been made from relying on one-way digital listservs to including chairpersons or directly reaching out to faculty members by email (personal emails).

Did the improvements have the impact you intended? (if applicable)

Each of the significant grant submissions (NSF RUI and NSF CAREER) were by a faculty member that attended an ORSP workshop in 2013.

Relying on chairpersons and associate deans (most colleges delegate internal grants development to the associate

dean) has resulted in an increase in proposal submissions.

Division/College	Arts and Humanities
Department	Art
Time Period	2009-2013

What were your expected outcomes for research during this period?

The Department of Art has expectations that each departmental colleague remain current and provides evidence of scholarly research and creative activities. Each year colleagues must submit an annual report which outlines their professional performance for that given year. Additionally colleagues must submit to the dossier for third year review and during promotion and tenure processes. At each stage a colleague presents their professional development for review. For promotion to Associate Professor an Assistant Professor Colleague, must produce a minimum of professional points to be promoted to the next rank, these points are given in a tier ranking from I to III and are based on the significance of the activity. Tier I activities are worth 3 points, Tier II activities are worth 2 points and Tier I activities are worth 1 point. Selected examples of departmental creative and scholarly research are as follows: Exhibitions, Commissions, Workshops presented, Conference Presentation, Visiting/guest artist, Installation, published materials (Paper, article, chapter and or scholarly book, presentations at various Professional conferences, etc. To be promoted to full professor a faculty member must acquire an additional minimum number of points from the above list of activities in order to be promoted to the rank of Full professor. Publications and creative research are also evaluated on the degree of which peer review took place.

How did the department assess the extent to which it achieved these outcomes?

1. The Department of Art Chair receives annual Faculty reports from all Art Faculty and submits these reports to the Promotion and Tenure Committee for preview and suggestions. The Department Chair then completes an assessment of each colleague’s annual professional performance for the year, which could include suggestions from the Promotion and Tenure Committee within an annual evaluation. Additionally, the Department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee also assess each colleague’s performance during their third-year review and when the colleague goes up for tenure and/or promotion. Further this same process continues when a colleagues undergoes post tenure review.
2. Department Chair met with Tenure track colleagues and discussed processes and documents regarding research and P&T.

What improvements were implemented in your department based on analysis of the assessment results?

1. The Department Chair working and the Promotion and Tenure Committee worked to develop a process

for shared information, wherein the Promotion and Tenure Committee would preview colleagues annual reports and assist to provide departmental advise to any colleagues about their progression toward promotion and or tenure. This advice would be provided on a more consistent manner than just a review during the 3rd year and again during the Promotion and /or tenure processes. Furthermore, these new process will assist the Department Chair in providing colleagues with a broader departmental assessment of each annual report.

2. Department Chair worked with Promotion and Tenure Committee to update and revise current P&T documents and practices to make the document and process more inclusive and understandable. We are currently awaiting the COAH Dean, suggestions and comments before it is brought in front of all faculty for further discussion and a vote.

Did the improvements have the impact you intended? (if applicable)

1. During implementation of the review process the Department of Art Promotion and Tenure Committee struggled with the items requested from the Chair and elected to provide information to the chair in various individual manners.
 - a. Recently the Promotion and Tenure Committee as provided the Chair with individual review suggestions in a more systematic manner.
2. Department is still in the process of developing our updated P&T guidelines. However, we believe that this will be a better and more thorough process.

Division/College	College of Arts and Humanities
Department	English Program
Time Period	2009-2013

What were your expected outcomes for research during this period?

Expected research outcomes in English are as follows:

1. Tenure-track faculty will meet or exceed research requirements for third-year review, tenure, promotion, and/or post-tenure review (based on rank) as outlined in the program’s approved documents for each of these professional assessments. The documents that specify these expected outcomes can be viewed at the links below and are keyed to the university’s research expectations for tenure-track faculty at these ranks.
 - [Faculty Responsibilities \(Tenured and Tenure- Track Faculty\)](#)

- [Department Criteria for Tenure \(Assistant Professor\)](#)
- [Department Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor](#)
- [Department Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor](#)
- [Department Criteria for Post-Tenure Review](#)
- [Department Criteria for Third Year Advisory Review](#)
- [Department Criteria for Tenure and Promotion for Faculty in English Education](#)
- [Appendices A, B, and C: Professional Growth](#)

2. Faculty will demonstrate progress toward meeting these expected outcomes in annual reports, which require faculty to document research productivity, describe or qualify these achievements, and outline research goals for the assessment periods outlined in #1 above.

In English, only tenure track faculty have research expectations. These expectations are usually equivalent to one reassigned course per semester or two per year, unless the faculty member has been given other defined administrative assignments or has been removed from research expectations as a result of not meeting the expected outcomes. The expected outcomes for research are measured every year as part of the annual evaluation process but but are also measured over longer periods of time, typically 3-5 year intervals, that fit the framework for our professional assessments for measuring research productivity. These criteria for these assessments are documented above.

How did the department assess the extent to which it achieved these outcomes?

For the reporting period from 2009-2013:

95% of faculty met research expectations for periodic review during the time period:

1. Five tenure-track faculty members were assessed as satisfactory in meeting the research expectations for Third-Year Review.
2. Six tenure-track faculty members either met or exceeded the research expectations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.
3. Three tenured faculty members either met or exceeded the research expectations for promotion to Full Professor.

4. Two tenured faculty members either met or exceeded the research expectations for post-tenure review.

5. One tenured faculty member did not meet the research expectations for post-tenure review.

6. All tenure-track faculty expect one met or exceeded the research expectations on each annual evaluation over the reporting period.

What improvements were implemented in your department based on analysis of the assessment results?

All faculty who met or exceeded research expectations on the annual evaluation were eligible for travel funding for professional conferences and research trips.

All faculty who met or exceeded the research expectations on the annual evaluation were eligible for a two course-reassignment (one per semester) for research for the following year.

The six tenure-track faculty members who either met or exceeded the research expectations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and who were awarded tenure and promotion received a one semester paid research for the purpose of research and professional development.

The three tenured faculty members who met or exceed the research expectations for post-tenure review were awarded an additional course reassignment for one semester for research and professional development.

One faculty member who did not meet research expectations for five consecutive annual evaluations and on the subsequent post-tenure review was placed on an improvement plan which included the opportunity to receive travel funding to enhance research and professional development. Travel funding was never requested. In subsequent remedial steps over the reporting period, the faculty member was removed from upper-level and graduate teaching, since research productivity is required for teaching at that level, and was assigned an additional course assignment since the expectation for research to receive the course reassignment had not been met.

Did the improvements have the impact you intended? (if applicable)

Yes. With the exception of one faculty member, tenure track faculty in the program maintain a very high level of productivity, meeting or exceeding the defined criteria for research productivity. The tenure track faculty member who did not meet these expectations has been removed from the research track and has been assigned to a teaching track with no research expectations. This ensures that the program holds faculty accountable to the standards that are in place and expects measurable results over specific reporting periods.

Division/College	College of Arts and Humanities
Department	Foreign Languages and Literatures
Time Period	2009-2013
What were your expected outcomes for research during this period?	
<p>A faculty's research should represent a sustained contribution to his/her field. Research should be ongoing rather than sporadic, although for the purposes of annual review the chair should take into consideration the faculty member's teaching and service load when evaluating research output. Please see Faculty Handbook 103.0302 for a list of evidentiary sources relevant to promotion.</p> <p>The concrete objectives associated with this goal are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>In order to be considered as making satisfactory progress towards tenure, the faculty member reviewed should have completed a minimum of 2 articles that have been accepted by peer-reviewed publications by the time of the third-year review. Appropriate placements for such articles include scholarly journals and volumes edited by scholars in the field. Inappropriate placements include unrefereed conference proceedings and journals edited by graduate students. In addition, book-length literary translations and substantive book reviews may be considered as evidence of scholarly output, but their quality and placement will be carefully reviewed and no one shall be granted tenure whose publications consist solely of translations and book reviews.</i> 2. Upon the fifth year in rank and at the time of application for tenure and/or promotion in rank, the faculty member must have accumulated: 3. - a minimum of 4 articles (see above criteria). In certain cases, 3 articles may be deemed sufficient for granting tenure if the applicant has significant additional scholarly output (e.g. literary translations and/or substantive book reviews). An applicant for tenure who has published a scholarly book may not necessarily have published 4 or even 3 articles; the tenured-faculty should advise such a candidate on appropriate expectations based on the quantity and quality of the scholarly research represented by the book. 4. - a minimum of 6 presentations made at conferences in his/her field. 5. The requirements for research should be considered a minimum; most applicants for tenure will exceed this minimum. 	
How did the department assess the extent to which it achieved these outcomes?	
<p>For the years 2009-13:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Faculty members seeking promotion were assessed by a Faculty Committee consisting of tenured members of 	

the Dept. of Foreign Languages and Literatures. In judging whether applicants for promotion have met the Professional Development criteria (including research productivity) relevant to promotion to a given position, the Faculty committee employs the criteria listed in the University of West Georgia Faculty Handbook section 103.0302,D,3 (<http://www.westga.edu/assetsDept/vpaa/FacultyHandbook04Nov2013.pdf>) and those described in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures' guidelines for promotion and tenure (1-5 above).

During this period, each faculty member who was going through third-year review or the promotion and tenure process was provided with the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures' guidelines, was given instructions on compilation of dossiers to document their research activities, and apprised of best practices in communicating with the Department-level committee charged with assessment of the materials.

During the period being assessed, all faculty under such review were deemed to have met or exceeded expectations and minimum requirements.

2. During each spring semester, all tenured or tenure-eligible faculty wrote Annual Reports, which included, in addition to documentation and reflection on teaching and service, their research activity for the previous calendar year. In response to each such report written by faculty members, the Chair of Foreign Languages and Literatures wrote an Annual Evaluation in which he evaluated faculty members as having exceeded, met, or failed to meet expectations with regard to research activity. In making these evaluations, the Chair of Foreign Languages and Literatures deployed the evaluative criteria outlined above (1-5).

During each of the years under review, each faculty member was judged to have either met or exceeded expectations for research activity.

3. The current Chair finds the Department's guidelines to be clear, useful, and fair, given the concurrent demands placed on faculty members beyond their research responsibilities. The benchmarks for research productivity are drawn from the recommendations of key professional organizations such as the Modern Language Association (MLA) and the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages (ADFL) and thus have wide currency beyond the University of West Georgia. In one example, the Chair advised one faculty member, who has gone through third-year review and subsequently applied for tenure and promotion, to increase productivity based on the Department's guidelines, and the faculty member was able to do so.

What improvements were implemented in your department based on analysis of the assessment results?

Given the likelihood of an increase in the number of tenured faculty in the coming years, the Department met as a whole to discuss the constitution of the Faculty Committee to review third-year review and tenure and promotion applications. The consensus was that the Department would move to a Committee of the Whole to assess individual candidacies, and established a rotation for the faculty who would have the lead responsibility, i.e. drafting the letter evaluating the candidate's materials.

Did the improvements have the impact you intended? (if applicable)

It is perhaps too early to tell, but this new configuration has worked well in 2013-2014, as the Department has a relatively high number of faculty seeking promotion and going through third-year review, and all are, at this stage, proceeding well through the evaluative process.

Division/College	College of Arts and Humanities
Department	History
Time Period	2009-2013
What were your expected outcomes for research during this period?	
<p>The History Department expects each department member to show evidence each year of professional engagement and development. This can take the form of book, article, or review publications; papers presented at conferences; other scholarly presentations; exhibits; etc. To receive tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a faculty member must publish at least three scholarly articles in refereed journals. To be promoted to full professor a faculty member must publish a book with an academic press that employs outside readers.</p>	
How did the department assess the extent to which it achieved these outcomes?	
<p>The Department Chair assesses the performance of each faculty member each year in an annual evaluation. The performance of each faculty member is also assessed by the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee in a third-year review and when the faculty member goes up for tenure and/or promotion.</p>	
What improvements were implemented in your department based on analysis of the assessment results?	
<p>There has been no need for improvements. Our department is extremely productive in terms of research and publications. No faculty applicant in our department has been denied tenure and promotion since 1996. 100% of faculty have met expectations for research during the time period. This is not because of lax standards but because we hire promising faculty and encourage their professional development.</p>	
Did the improvements have the impact you intended? (if applicable)	
<p></p>	

Division/College	COAH
Department	Music
Time Period	2009-2013
What were your expected outcomes for research during this period?	
<p>Each faculty member identifies a creative/research agenda appropriate for her/his academic/performance specialty</p>	

within the discipline. Faculty are expected to continuously pursue their agendas for both annual merit pay decisions and for promotion and tenure decisions.

How did the department assess the extent to which it achieved these outcomes?

Faculty individually present dossiers for annual review, including activity in research and creative endeavors. For annual review, the chair evaluates the faculty member's level of achievement and assigns a rating of 1-10. These ratings are part of the criteria for determination of merit pay. For promotion and tenure, faculty achievement is reviewed by the chair, a departmental committee, a college, committee, the dean, the provost, and the president.

What improvements were implemented in your department based on analysis of the assessment results?

It is up to the individual faculty member to increase research and creative activity as needed if indicated by annual review or application for promotion and/or tenure.

Did the improvements have the impact you intended? (if applicable)

Improvement is variable by faculty member. Most faculty meet the expectations consistently. All faculty meet the expectations most of the time. 85.7% of faculty met the expectation during the time period.

Division/College	College of Arts and Humanities
Department	Philosophy Program
Time Period	2009-2013

What were your expected outcomes for research during this period?

One of our Program Goals is to promote professional development by supporting faculty research and other professional activities. The objectives associated with this goal are:

1. Faculty will make appropriate progress through ranks by meeting or exceeding requirements for the professional development necessary for promotion.
2. Faculty will demonstrate consistent productivity in annual reports.

How did the department assess the extent to which it achieved these outcomes?

For the years 2009-13:

1. Faculty members seeking promotion were assessed by a Faculty Status Committee (FSC) consisting of all tenured members of the Dept. of English and Philosophy (of which the Philosophy Program is a part). In judging whether

applicants for promotion have met the Professional Development criteria (including research productivity) relevant to promotion to a given position, the FSC employs the criteria listed in the University of West Georgia Faculty Handbook section 103.0302,D,3 (<http://www.westga.edu/assetsDept/vpaa/FacultyHandbook04Nov2013.pdf>) and those described in the Department of English and Philosophy's guidelines for promotion and tenure (http://www.westga.edu/english/index_225.php).

During AY2010-11, one Assistant Professor of Philosophy applied for promotion to associate professor (with tenure). This professor was judged by our FSC as having met the Professional Development criterion for that promotion. During 2011-12, one Associate Professor of Philosophy applied for promotion to professor. This professor was judged by our FSC as having met the Professional Development criterion for that promotion.

2. Early during each spring semester, all tenured or tenure-eligible faculty wrote "Annual Reports" in which they documented, among other things, their research activity for the previous calendar year. In response to each such report written by faculty members other than the Program Director of Philosophy, the Director wrote an "Annual Evaluation" in which he or she evaluated faculty members as having Exceeded, Met, or Failed to Meet Expectations with regard to professional development; the Chairperson of the Department of English and Philosophy wrote each "Annual Evaluation" of the Philosophy Program Director. In making these evaluations, the Program Director (or Department Chairperson) employed the criteria described in the Philosophy Program's "Guidelines for Annual Evaluations of Faculty Members" (<http://www.westga.edu/~phil/guidelines-for-annual-evals.html>; see especially Appendix C, "Qualitative Scale for Professional Growth Activities").

During each of the years under review, each faculty member was judged to have either Met or Exceeded Expectations for Professional Development.

In AY2012-13, a tenure-track Assistant Professor who will be applying for tenure and promotion to associate professor during AY2015-16 or AY2016-17 was judged to have met Professional Development expectations for the year in question; but the Program Director noted in his Annual Evaluation of this Assistant Professor that he had not yet met one of the necessary conditions of promotion to Associate Professor set forth in the Department of English and Philosophy's guidelines, viz. the publication of at least two articles in peer-reviewed journals.

What improvements were implemented in your department based on analysis of the assessment results?

In late spring 2013, the Program Director met with Assistant Professor mentioned above to establish a plan whereby he could increase his research productivity. They agreed that the Assistant Professor would spend less time on service responsibilities (committee work, for example) and more time conducting research and writing.

Did the improvements have the impact you intended? (if applicable)

The Assistant Professor mentioned above has had one article accepted at a peer-reviewed journal (December 2013). He has been asked to revise and resubmit another article that he has submitted to a different peer-reviewed journal (January 2014).

Division/College	COAH
Department	Theatre
Time Period	2009-2013

What were your expected outcomes for research during this period?

Creative Activity in design/directing or writing/research are required in department productions for all tenured and tenure track faculty.

How did the department assess the extent to which it achieved these outcomes?

We use several tools: KCACTF (Peer) responses, student mentoring outcomes with cross evaluations amongst faculty. Additionally, several professionally active faculty are assessed both in writing by critics and regional awards in addition to maintaining consistent offers from various theatres to work on productions. 100% of faculty met expectations for the time period.

What improvements were implemented in your department based on analysis of the assessment results?

We have improved the student mentoring process using a new rubric so faculty engaged in research/creative activity with students share outcomes. This maintains consistency as well keeping standards high and communication clear among faculty.

We have increased funding for faculty travel utilizing funds earned from textbook sales which are donated to the foundation as well as e tuition dollars. Having more funds has allowed faculty to increase travel for their own research, creative activity in addition to attending workshops designed to positively support the scholarship of teaching and

learning.

Did the improvements have the impact you intended? (if applicable)

Yes. Almost all faculty have received an increase in travel funds. In several cases, one playwright had a play selected for production from a national playwriting contests; another faculty is building a highly specialized expertise in masks design and execution and yet another faculty member has been named co-editor for the second year of a national peer-reviewed journal.

College of Science and Mathematics

In the College of Science and Mathematics, the mission statement explicitly includes research, as shown by the following quotes:

- Undergraduate research aimed at preparing students for graduate and professional schools, and for an increasingly competitive global jobs market;
- Innovative research and external funding;
- Interdisciplinary collaboration

Each of the six departments conducts research. The departments are, alphabetically, Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Geosciences, Mathematics and Physics.

For each department, the following outcomes, assessments, and improvements based on analysis of the results are listed as they relate to research. Please see pages 2 through 7 for each department.

Department of Biology

Division/College	College of Science And Mathematics
Department	Biology
Time Period	2009-2013
What were your expected outcomes for research during this period?	
<p>The mission of the Department of Biology at the University of West Georgia is to provide opportunities for professional and personal development to students, faculty, staff, and the broader university community through excellence in teaching, research, and service.</p> <p>* Research: The Department of Biology is committed to provide and maintain student-oriented research opportunities which will facilitate a more comprehensive understanding of biology and the scientific process, enhance the quality of instruction, promote professional development, and further the state-of-knowledge in the biological sciences.</p>	
How did the department assess the extent to which it achieved these outcomes?	
<p>Tenure review process Post tenure review process</p>	
What improvements were implemented in your department based on analysis of the assessment results?	
<p>Not applicable, in the past 5 years Biology faculty have been successful in the tenure process and 5 year review process.</p>	
Did the improvements have the impact you intended? (if applicable)	
N/A	

Department of Chemistry

Division/College	College of Science and Mathematics
Department	Chemistry
Time Period	2009-2013
What were your expected outcomes for research during this period?	
<p>In pursuit of the Chemistry Department's mission, the goals include the following: (i) Afford students opportunities for undergraduate research in which faculty are pursuing both internal and external funding. (ii) Provide undergraduate research students the opportunity to present their results at a local, regional, and/or national science meeting. Furthermore, the department supports faculty-directed student research as a means of engaging students as scientists in a <i>'hands-on manner'</i>.</p> <p>Undergraduate research remains the hallmark of our B.S. program. Expected outcomes for research:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each faculty member (tenured and tenure track) is required to pursue professional development/scholarly work to enhance their skills as a teacher and/or scientist, both of which impacts the students. 2. Afford students opportunities for undergraduate research. 	
How did the department assess the extent to which it achieved these outcomes?	
<p>Outcome 1: Faculty Professional Development/Scholarly Work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional Development/Scholarly Work (includes research) of each faculty is assessed in the annual review process, third year review, review for tenure, review for promotion at all ranks, and post-tenure review (every 5 years) based on performance/accomplishment outcomes defined by the Departmental Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure and the UWG Faculty Handbook. This includes actively engaging students in research, writing research grants (internal and external), and submitting research work as manuscripts to peer reviewed science journals. <p>Outcome 2: Support of Faculty-Directed Student Research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students in the B.S. Chemistry Program are required to take a minimum of 4 hours of a research as Faculty Directed Research (CHEM 4083), and a 1 hour Senior Seminar Course (CHEM 4084) where the student is required to provide a written Thesis report on their research that is evaluated by two or more faculty members (including the supervising faculty). The student must orally defend their research work before the faculty. • All research students are highly encouraged to present their work at regional and/or national science meetings (e.g. American Chemical Society Meetings) in which internal funds by the department/institution will cover the total cost. Approximately 80% of our student present their work at these meetings. 	
What improvements were implemented in your department based on analysis of the assessment results?	
<p>The Department of Chemistry's current state of progress in the area of professional development, more specifically research, has been evaluated as strong. This assesment is based on the number of students that presented at research conferences, the level of science in the research project, the type and number of faculty grants written and funded in support for research endeavours, the number of submitted and accepted journal articles, book chapters, and books produced by the faculty. The Department of Chemistry is continuously in need of expensive instrumentation, but several specific ones have been identified as future instrumentation needed to support science endeavors in the next five years.</p>	

- Instrumentation that the department needs is a Gas Chromatograph Mass Spectrometer (GCMS), Liquid Chromatography Mass Spectrometer (LCMS). And a Thermo-Gravimetric Analyzer (TGA) to begin development in the area of Materials Chemistry.
- Develop a senior level course in Materials Chemistry that will be developed to bring in ties to local industrial that employ chemists.

Did the improvements have the impact you intended? (if applicable)

Department of Computer Science

Division/College	College of Science and Mathematics
Department	Computer Science
Time Period	2009-2013
What were your expected outcomes for research during this period?	
<p>The mission of The Department of Computer Science is “to offer an excellent computer science education in a personal environment. Students, faculty, and staff will engage in extracurricular activities that enrich the learning experience and offer opportunities to interact with peers. The Faculty and Staff will dedicate themselves to preparing our students for successful careers, life-long learning, and citizenship.” In support of this mission, the department encourages each member of the faculty and staff to undertake the professional development that makes educational excellence possible. Furthermore, the department encourages and supports faculty-directed student research as a means of enriching our students’ learning experience.</p> <p>Our expected outcomes for research are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consistent with the Department of Computer Science Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion (as well as the UWG Faculty Handbook), tenure-track faculty are expected to demonstrate documented levels of performance in professional growth and development in order to receive positive recommendation for the award of tenure and to be recommended for promotion at all ranks. 2. Consistent with the institutional priorities and guidelines for performance management and within the established annual performance appraisal process, departmental staff are expected to engage in appropriate levels of professional and career development consistent with their individual job duties. 3. Consistent with the department’s mission, the department seeks to encourage and support faculty-directed student research activities within the discipline. 	
How did the department assess the extent to which it achieved these outcomes?	
<p>Research Outcome 1: Faculty Professional Growth and Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This outcome is assessed as part of the documented faculty annual review process as well as milestone reviews (e.g., third-year review, review for tenure, review for promotion at all ranks, and post-tenure review). This process includes a review of the faculty member’s professional growth and development activities (which includes research) against performance expectations defined within the Departmental Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure and the UWG Faculty Handbook. The extent to which this outcome is achieved is determined by the performance levels of each faculty member. <p>Research Outcome 2: Staff Professional Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This outcome is assessed as part of the documented annual performance appraisal for each departmental staff member. The expectations for appropriate level and activities for staff professional development/research are 	

identified, through discussion and agreement between the department chair (as supervisor) and the individual staff member, relative to the needs of the department and the duties of the job. The goals are then documented on the performance appraisal instrument and progress toward those goals is factored into the overall performance appraisal. The extent to which this outcome is achieved is determined by the level of performance of each staff member.

Research Outcome 3: Encouraging and Supporting Faculty-Directed Student Research

- This outcome is assessed based on the various research activities that computer science students engage in. These activities may include independent study/directed-research courses offered by computer science faculty during the year; students’ attendance to/participation in professional conferences, competitions, etc.; and publications authored/co-authored by computer science students. Additionally, we have a student research component embedded in the Capstone course (CS 4982) that every student must complete successfully in order to fulfill his/her graduation requirement. The extent to which this outcome is achieved is determined by course level assessment of the Capstone courses and the level of departmental support provided (faculty resources directed toward independent studies/directed-research offerings; departmental financial support to attend conferences/competitions and acquire tools/equipment to support student research).

What improvements were implemented in your department based on analysis of the assessment results?

The Department of Computer Science is satisfied with its current progress toward its professional development/research goals and has not identified any necessary improvements at present. However, we plan to make the following improvements in the future:

- Increase the support for computer science students continue to participate in a wide range of activities including design and construction of robots, participating in robotics competitions, attending various professional/research events, and publishing in professional publications/conferences.
- Increase support for faculty to participate in professional development activities (such as attending national conferences as well as giving presentations at national meeting).
- Continue to enhance the Capstone classroom research experience for students and assess the class annually to make needed curricula improvements.

Did the improvements have the impact you intended? (if applicable)

Department of Geosciences

Division/College	Science and Math
Department	Geosciences
Time Period	2009-2013
What were your expected outcomes for research during this period?	
Research is a constant part of the Departments requirements for annual review, three-year review, tenure and promotion, and five-year review. The department encourages faculty research and faculty directed student research. Tenure track faculty are expected to have active and productive research.	
How did the department assess the extent to which it achieved these outcomes?	
Research protuctivity is measured at annual review of faculty. The extent of achievement is based on number of abstracts, presentations of research, papers submitted and published, and books published.	
What improvements were implemented in your department based on analysis of the assessment results?	

Higher support of faculty and student travel to professional meetings to present their research.
Did the improvements have the impact you intended? (if applicable)

Department of Mathematics

Division/College	College of Science and Mathematics
Department	Mathematics
Time Period	2009-2013
What were your expected outcomes for research during this period?	
Research faculty (those on 9-hour teaching loads) maintain their research programs and continue publishing refereed articles, presenting at conferences, and applying for grants.	
How did the department assess the extent to which it achieved these outcomes?	
Department uses annual faculty report forms from each faculty member describing all research activities. An assessment is taken of the quantity and quality of peer-reviewed articles published, accepted, and submitted articles; of talks given at professional meetings; and of external and internal grants applied for and of those awarded.	
What improvements were implemented in your department based on analysis of the assessment results?	
To stimulate research activity, more attention was given to our departmental mentoring program. A departmental seminar in mathematics education was developed.	
Did the improvements have the impact you intended? (if applicable)	
Yes. More grant applications were submitted in mathematics education.	

Department of Physics

Division/College	College of Science and Mathematics
Department	Physics
Time Period	2009-2013
What were your expected outcomes for research during this period?	
According to mission statement of the Department of Physics, faculty are expected to do research in physics or in physics education, especially if students are involved with the projects in a meaningful way. The Department encourages faculty to go to conferences and to participate in short courses to enhance their classroom skills and to do research.	
How did the department assess the extent to which it achieved these outcomes?	
The assessment is the number of articles published, papers presented each year, professional conferences attended and shortcourse attended. This is evaluated in annual faculty evaluations, promotion and tenure dossiers, and post-tenure reviews.	
What improvements were implemented in your department based on analysis of the assessment results?	
As announced in August, 2013, the Chair encourages and will seek funding for each tenured or tenure-track faculty member will attend one national meeting each year to learn and to present results. As the Department continues to be more active in research, its efforts are hampered by lack of space, heavy teaching schedules, lack of travel funds (especially for students) and lack of equipment.	
Did the improvements have the impact you intended? (if applicable)	
NA	

College of Social Sciences

Division/College	College of Social Sciences
Department	Anthropology, Criminology, Mass Communications, Political Science and Planning, Psychology, and Sociology
Time Period	2009-2013
What were your expected outcomes for research during this period?	
First, it is important to recognize that the College of Social Sciences opened its doors on January 1, 2011. As a College we expect that our department's tenured and tenure track faculty would be actively engaged in the process of research.	
How did the department assess the extent to which it achieved these outcomes?	
Within our College each department chair evaluates all tenured and tenure track faculty annually, making note of their research activities. In addition, each department chair, in concert with the Dean, (and relevant committees of the college) evaluates all tenure track faculty in their third year of service, and again at their point of promotion and tenure, making note of their research activities. Following promotion, each department chair, in concert with relevant committees within the College, evaluate all faculty, making note of their research activities. Furthermore, research and scholarly contributions are noted in each department's annual report to the college.	
What improvements were implemented in your department based on analysis of the assessment results?	
We have reinstated an 'Annual Goal Setting' conference which includes a conversation between the department chair and individual faculty to identify and plan annual research goals and activities.	
Did the improvements have the impact you intended? (if applicable)	

College of Education

Division/College	Academic Affairs/College of Education
Department	All
Time Period	2009-2013
What were your expected outcomes for research during this period?	
<p>Each tenure track faculty member is expected to engage in scholarly research and disseminate their work in peer-reviewed journals and at regional/national/international conferences.</p> <p>A specific number of publications is not explicitly stated, since the complexity of the work factors into the time needed for completion. Typically, however, the objective is for faculty members to have completed and published (and/or presented) one scholarly research piece per academic year.</p>	
How did the department assess the extent to which it achieved these outcomes?	
<p>Faculty data on research is collected each year, and each Department Chair includes research productivity into the annual evaluation of faculty. Further, third-year faculty members undergo a more comprehensive review, where their progress toward expected research outcomes is evaluated. If a faculty member is not meeting the expected level of productivity he/she is placed on a Professional Development Plan.</p> <p>In the fifth year, when faculty are reviewed for promotion and tenure, research productivity is a major expectation for a successful review. Last year, for example, 9 College of Education faculty members were considered for tenure and were evaluated against this standard. Of these 9 (or 89%) were found to have met the standard. The other person was not retained at UWG.</p>	
What improvements were implemented in your department based on analysis of the assessment results?	
<p>Based on our College-wide annual, we have set a goal to improve research productivity. The Dean and Associate Deans in discussion with Department Chairs are taking the following three steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explicitly seeking faculty during the search process who have an established or clearly emerging research agenda; 2. Supporting and guiding untenured faculty in the research process by holding writing seminars, providing financial support for travel, and holding P&T guidance sessions. 3. Re-energizing tenured faculty by providing support for travel and guidance for further promotion. 	
Did the improvements have the impact you intended? (if applicable)	
<p>Yes, I think the combination of collecting and analyzing data, using the data as part of performance reviews, and providing support for improvement is resulting in a changed culture for research in the College of Education. Faculty now are much more engaged in research than in the past, and there is a clear expectation that this is an important part of every tenured/tenure-track faculty member's role. Faculty know they will be evaluated against this standard for merit consideration and when being considered for promotion and tenure.</p>	

Tanner Health System School of Nursing

Division/College	Tanner Health System School of Nursing
Department	Nursing
Time Period	2009-2013

What were your expected outcomes for research during this period?

Expected outcomes and results related to research in the Tanner Health System School of Nursing are integral to measuring the School's goal to "maintain faculty who demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service to the university, the community, and the profession." In 1999, the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) approved a position statement that defines scholarship for the discipline of nursing, identifies standards, and provides examples of documentation for the quality of scholarship in each of Boyer's four areas (discovery, teaching, practice, and integration). The nursing faculty of the University of West Georgia adopted the AACN Position Statement. A discussion of Boyer and the nursing's guidelines for scholarship can be found in the *2013-14 THS SON Faculty Handbook* (p. 52) online at http://nursing.westga.edu/index_190.php. Expected outcomes for nursing scholarship include publication and presentation benchmarks but no measures related to sponsored research or grant writing. The number of nurses with terminal degrees continues to grow as searches are conducted and continuing faculty complete doctoral programs. However, in general, the maturity of nursing faculty as scholars is less than that of colleagues in some of the other UWG academic units such as the sciences and social sciences. The expected research outcomes/results are presented below with those at less than the desired level highlighted in yellow.

1. *Expected outcome:* 50% of tenure track nursing faculty will submit manuscripts or abstracts for professional publication or presentation each year. *Results:*
 - 2009 – 70%
 - 2010 – 38%
 - 2011 – 63%
 - 2012 – 77%
 - 2013 – 100%
2. *Expected outcome:* 25% of submitted manuscripts and abstracts will be accepted. *Results:*
 - 2009 – 86%
 - 2010 – 100%
 - 2011 – 100%
 - 2012 – 100%
 - 2013 – 100%

How did the department assess the extent to which it achieved these outcomes?

As part of the annual faculty evaluation process, faculty members submitted their updated curriculum vitae and an "annual reporting form" that listed submitted and accepted/published manuscripts/abstracts. Supporting evidence that includes proceedings, meeting agendas and published articles were also required.

What improvements were implemented in your department based on analysis of the assessment results?

All outcomes were met for the five-year period with the exception of submissions in 2010. Improvements to support faculty research included the following: 1) release time from teaching for scholarship; 2) assignment of mentors to junior faculty; 3) increased funding to attend meetings, seminars and training sessions related to scholarship; 4)

formation of faculty Caring Circle of Scholarship to support faculty efforts; 5) development of the Virtual Research Center, a new project funded in 2013-14 by a UWG Presidential Grant – it's a joint collaboration between the THS SON and the College of Education to provide research support to both faculty and student research efforts; and 5) faculty participation in workshops/seminars offered by the UWG Office of Research and Sponsored Projects.

Did the improvements have the impact you intended? (if applicable)

Yes, There is strong evidence that tenure track faculty are increasingly active as scholars. A review of the FY13 UWG Annual Report indicates that the number of scholarly publications and presentations has increased from 12 in FY09 to 30 in FY13 (an increase of 150%), which demonstrates the SON's increasing scholarly productivity. Further evidence of the increase in scholarly productivity is that during that same time frame, the number of faculty increased only 32%, from 22 to 29. As a result of increased research potential, the faculty reviewed and approved new benchmarks in fall 2013. The new expected outcome is that 75% of tenure track faculty will publish manuscripts or present papers/posters at professional meetings (annually) and that 60% of nursing faculty will hold doctoral degrees. Continued growth in this area will call for revising standards to reflect publication selectivity, authorship, and funded grants and sponsored projects.

Approval/Accreditation Status: Identifying and monitoring faculty achievement outcomes are an integral component of nursing approval and accreditation. The Tanner Health System School of Nursing (THS SON) BSN and RN-BSN programs are fully approved by the Georgia Board of Nursing through 12/31/14 (last site visit spring 2010 with all standards met; 11 commendations and no recommendations); and the BSN, RN-BSN and MSN programs are accredited by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) through 12/31/18 (last site visit spring 2013 with all standards met and no recommendations). The THS SON submits an annual report to the GBON every July and submitted a Continuous Improvement Progress Report (CIPR) to CCNE on 11/26/13. The CIPR is a mid-accreditation cycle report required of all CCNE-accredited programs and is available in the School for review. There is currently no accreditation organization for the EdD in Nursing Education program.

Continuous Quality Improvement: These outcomes and results are also a component of the School's Total Plan for Evaluation (TPE), which measures program quality and effectiveness by assessing faculty achievement. The faculty achievement outcome levels identified above are congruent with CCNE standards and the mission of the University and the School. The TPE provides the framework for the systematic, ongoing and deliberative assessment of quality and effectiveness in relation to the mission, goals, and expected outcomes of the programs offered. Components of the TPE include expected results, data/evidentiary sources, data collection/analysis/time frame, results and actions, and action plan. A standing committee of the School, Evaluating the Caring Community, is charged with developing, recommending, implementing and evaluating policies and procedures related to the TPE and overseeing the collection of relevant data. It also participates in the review of findings and makes recommendations to the faculty. In addition, the Caring for Faculty Committee reviews standards and evaluation processes related to faculty quality measures.

Richards College of Business

The Richards College of Business clearly defines research expectations of faculty in the *RCOB Faculty Handbook* (located from link on <http://www.westga.edu/business/> under Faculty & Staff link).

Definitions for appropriate outcomes are found under Areas of Evaluation 4. Professional Growth and Development:

“In support of faculty development, the RCOB defines professional growth as: continual study, formal or informal; participation in professional organizations; and, demonstration of research or creative work. Professional growth is interpreted to include, but is not limited to, publication of peer-reviewed and editorially-reviewed journal articles, conference proceedings, books, book reviews, monographs, working papers, cases, and software. Professional growth also includes participation in professional meetings such as serving as presenter of papers, reviewer of papers, discussant, session chair, conference chair, and conference officer. Other demonstrations may include such activities as participation in special seminars and editorial boards; receipt of nationally or internationally recognized scholarship awards, and awards of non-UWG funded research grants; receipt of awarded lectureships or invited lectures at other institutions; service as journal/book reviewer or editor; and, outside consulting for compensation.”

Expectations of faculty are defined based on the faculty member’s qualifications as identified by AACSB:

An Academically Qualified (AQ) faculty member “is expected to have a minimum of three intellectual contributions in the most recent five-year academic period, at least two of which must appear in a peer reviewed journal (PRJ). Intellectual contributions must be publicly available and include, but are not limited to, publication of peer-reviewed and editorially-reviewed journal articles, conference proceedings, books, book reviews, monographs, papers presented at academic or professional meetings, working papers, cases, software, and developed course related materials. A PRJ is defined as a journal listed in Cabell’s Directory of Journals, the Index to Legal Periodicals, the Finance Literature Index, a similar index of reputable/quality journals recognized in a particular discipline, or in other quality publication outlets agreed as acceptable between the faculty member and his or her chair.” Faculty members who have completed their doctoral program within the most recent five years and those who have reached the ABS stage of doctoral studies within the most recent three years are considered AQ.

Research activities are not required for Professionally Qualified (PQ) faculty members; research is one way in which a faculty member may maintain PQ status. “To maintain PQ, the faculty member must demonstrate significant professional involvement and activity in the most recent five-year academic period. Evidence of such activity may include, but is not limited to, continuing education, maintaining certification related to the individual’s primary teaching area, professional consulting activity related to the individual’s primary teaching area, presentations at professional associations, and peer reviewed journal articles.”

Faculty research productivity is assessed annually during performance evaluations (spring semester). Additionally, a Third-Year Review is conducted with each new faculty member at the beginning of the fall term of his/her third year. For tenure-track faculty, this serves as a Pre-Tenure Review to assess progress toward tenure and/or promotion. The tenure and promotion review is a further assessment point for tenure-track faculty, and the promotion process to Senior Lecturer is an assessment point for non-tenure track faculty. All tenured faculty members undergo Post-Tenure Review every five years following the year of their last promotion or tenure review. Non-tenure track faculty undergo a Five-Year Review every fifth year following the Third Year Review or promotion to Senior Lecturer.

Results of these assessments are used:

- 1) to determine if tenure-track faculty are making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion. In all except one case, negative annual and Third-Year Reviews have resulted in marked improvements in research productivity. In the one exception, the faculty member was non-renewed prior to the tenure year.
- 2) to make tenure and promotion decisions. Because of the regular feedback, we have had success in assuring those faculty applying for tenure and promotion meet expectations.
- 3) To make annual renewal or non-renewal decisions for non-tenure track faculty. In recent years, the Richards College has non-renewed one instructor as a result of inadequate research.

Efforts to expand international research collaboration opportunities began in 2010 with the Richards College faculty visit to Grande Ecole Supérieure de Commerce et de Management (ESCEM) in France. Ten faculty visited France and participated in a three-day workshop designed to build joint research among faculty at both schools. In Fall 2011, ESCEM faculty visited UWG to continue expanding the program, and in Fall 2012 Richards College faculty again visited France for a three-day workshop. In Summer 2013, a faculty member from ESCEM (now France Business School) was the first to participate in a new faculty exchange program, spending three weeks at UWG collaborating on research. In Fall 2015, a Richards College faculty member will reciprocate by spending three weeks at FBS.