

Columbus State University

Promotion, Tenure, and Other Faculty Evaluation Policies and Procedures

Approved by the President : November 2, 2017

Approved by the Faculty: January 16, 2018

Values Statement

Faculty at Columbus State University value collegial/professional behavior, which includes the ability to contribute to a positive work environment in the department, college and university. In the exchange of ideas, the faculty member shows due respect to colleagues and to the opinions of others. This in no way undermines the value of dissenting opinions, which enrich academic discourse, but does affirm the position that “professionals do not discriminate against or harass colleagues.” (2010 AAUP Bulletin)

Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

Columbus State University evaluates its faculty annually to assess professional development and suitability for promotion and tenure. In general, department chairs reporting to deans base these internal reviews on evaluations of research, teaching, and service. In contrast, the reviews associated with promotion to the rank of associate or full professor and the awarding of tenure have an external component. Below is an overview of the policy and procedures associated with those evaluations.

A. Department Standards of Excellence

Each academic department publishes “[Standards of Excellence](#)” and reviews them annually. The “Standards of Excellence” communicate the department’s expectations of faculty as relevant to annual performance reviews, pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. These standards are consistent with institutional policies published in the CSU Statutes and the CSU Faculty Handbook. A majority vote of the tenured faculty in the department nominates department standards and changes in the standards the department wishes to establish. The department chair, dean, and provost must approve nominated standards and changes to the standards before they take effect.

B. Pre-Tenure Review Policy

Pre-tenure review helps a faculty member prepare for the tenure process. More than merely an assessment of previous performance, pre-tenure review includes a professional development plan (PDP), prepared by individual faculty members, defining the long-range plans that will allow them to reasonably expect to earn tenure. A committee of the individual faculty members’ peers and their annual evaluators review their past performance and PDP for the purpose of identifying strengths and weaknesses and making suggestions for enhancement of strengths and remediation of weaknesses. The procedure for [pre-tenure review](#) intends to develop and nurture eligible individuals and to educate them about the tenure process and criteria early in their employment at Columbus State University. Participation in this process does not assure that tenure will be awarded.

C. Evaluation for Promotion and Tenure

A faculty member's cumulative performance in support of university, college, and departmental missions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and professional service determines the outcome of the application for promotion and tenure. The awarding of tenure represents a highly important decision through which the department, college, and university incur major commitments to the individual faculty member. While the criteria for promotion and tenure are similar, tenure decisions place greater emphasis on the faculty member's potential to meet future performance expectations, promotion decisions on the candidate's performance to date.

All reviews of faculty performance must reflect the nature of the individual's discipline. Reviews should not be capricious, arbitrary, or discriminatory. Due process must be provided.

Promotion Eligibility:

University policy requires a minimum length of service in a faculty rank to be eligible to apply for a promotion. The completion of the required time in rank does not entitle a faculty member to a promotion; the appropriate performance criteria outlined in university and college policies and in the department's Standards of Excellence must be fulfilled.

At the time of an individual's appointment, a maximum of two years of probationary credit toward promotion may be awarded for service at other institutions or service at a faculty rank within the institution. Probationary credit towards promotion must be specified in the letter of offer; applicants for probationary credit should complete the Promotion and Tenure Probationary Credit Request Form. Individuals serving in part-time, temporary, visiting, or limited term positions are not eligible for probationary credit towards promotion.

Department chairs are responsible for developing a system for mentoring faculty members and for making recommendations as to when to seek promotion. The faculty member, while not required to follow that chair's advice, should give it serious consideration. The minimum lengths of service required are the following:

1. Six years of full-time service at the rank of Lecturer is required for promotion to Senior Lecturer. Individuals may stand for promotion in their sixth year.
2. Promotion to associate professor requires five years of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor. Individuals may stand for promotion in their fifth year.
3. Promotion to professor requires five years of service at the rank of associate professor at CSU. Individuals may stand for promotion in their fifth year.
4. Under special circumstances, faculty who are performing significantly above the expectations for their current rank may be considered for early promotion. (See *Academic & Student Affairs Handbook*, section 4.5 for current Board of Regents policy.)

Areas of Review:

1. Teaching effectiveness
2. Research, scholarly or creative engagement
3. Service to the institution, profession and community

Professional growth and development is expected and is considered in the evaluation of the areas reviewed.

Promotion Criteria:

Only faculty members holding terminal degrees, or the equivalent in training, ability, or experience, may be considered for tenure. Terminal degrees must come from a university that is fully accredited or, in the absence of a system of accreditation, internationally recognized.

Faculty must also exhibit satisfactory performance in all three areas with demonstrated excellence in two of the three (one of which must be teaching) as determined by departmental and college [“Standards of Excellence”](#) consistent with the guidelines that follow.

The following general guidelines shall apply to the appointment or promotion to academic ranks:

Senior Lecturer – Promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer should be based on demonstrated teaching ability and other criteria consistent with the role and position of the Lecturer as determined by the department and college.

Assistant Professor – Demonstrated academic ability and potential for professional growth serve as the bases for appointment or promotion to this rank.

Associate Professor – Actual performance as well as demonstrated potential for further development serve as the bases for promotion to this rank. Evidence must show that individuals are growing professionally and contributing to their fields. Associate Professor is a high academic rank and carries no presumption of future promotion. Promotion to associate professor without a terminal degree will only be considered in exceptional cases such as having gained high distinction as a publishing scholar or creative artist.

Professor – As the highest academic rank, the title of professor implies recognition of the individual by peers and associates as an outstanding teacher and an accomplished, productive and respected scholar or creative artist, both within and outside the university, since attaining the rank of associate professor. Candidates must also demonstrate, through scholarly publications, applied research, and/or artistic work, the ability to communicate to professional peers the knowledge and insights gained from the exploration of their area of specialization. They will need to have made important contributions in research or creative activity; university, public or professional service; and/or administrative service to professional societies. Peer review is critical, but the nature of the candidate’s discipline will determine the mode of scholarly or creative production.

Columbus State University's [Promotion and Tenure Procedures](#) detail the steps, requirements, and timeline for application, including deans' notification to candidates of their eligibility, steps and procedures at the department and college levels, and decisions of the provost and president to approve or deny.

Initial Appointment at Associate Professor or Professor

Candidates may be offered initial appointments above the rank of assistant professor provided they meet the requirements (other than years of service) for promotion to the desired rank and it is reviewed by the department, dean, and provost, and approved by the president.

D. Tenure Eligibility

Only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors employed full-time and appointed to tenure-track positions are eligible for tenure. Each department is responsible for devising appropriate standards for evaluation of candidates for tenure, and for making the original evaluation and recommendation of a candidate for tenure; but the following guidelines apply to candidates university-wide:

1. Five years of full-time, tenure-track service (probationary period) at the rank of assistant professor or higher is required for tenure. At the earliest, tenure review will take place in the fifth year of tenure track service at CSU.
2. A maximum of two years' credit toward the minimum probationary period may be allowed for service at CSU or other institutions provided it is in a tenure-track or comparable position. Faculty hired with probationary credit from another institution must complete a minimum of two full years of service in a tenure-track position at CSU to be eligible for tenure. Applicants for probationary credit should complete the [Promotion and Tenure Probationary Credit Request Form \(PDF\)](#). Individuals serving in part-time, limited term, visiting, or full-time temporary positions are not eligible for probationary credit toward tenure.
3. Except for the approved suspension of the probationary period due to a leave of absence, the maximum time a faculty member may serve in a tenure-track position at CSU without the award of tenure is seven years. If the president does not approve a recommendation for tenure, the university may proffer a terminal contract for an eighth year.
4. Administrative faculty must earn and can only be awarded tenure in their faculty classifications.
5. Only faculty members holding terminal degrees, or the equivalent in training, ability, or experience, may be considered for tenure. Terminal degrees must come from a university that is fully accredited or, in the absence of a system of accreditation, internationally recognized.

Areas of Review

1. Teaching effectiveness

2. Research, scholarly, or creative engagement
3. Service to the institution, profession, and community

Professional growth and development is expected and is considered in the evaluation of the areas reviewed.

Criteria for Tenure

Faculty must demonstrate excellence in teaching, excellence in one of the two other areas, and satisfactory performance in the third area as determined by departmental "[Standards of Excellence](#)." Further, the candidate's achievements must evince the potential for long-term effectiveness at the university. In most instances, faculty will seek tenure and promotion to associate professor in the same year.

Candidates who are not successful in their first tenure application are limited to one additional application for tenure within the seven-year probationary period. For this purpose, a review at the first level (department) is considered an application for tenure.

Possession of the foregoing qualifications does not entitle an individual to tenure. Present and anticipated staffing needs of the department, college, and university also impinge upon all tenure decisions. Therefore, denial of tenure does not necessarily imply an unfavorable evaluation of the faculty member.

E. Tenure upon Appointment

In exceptional cases, the president may approve an outstanding candidate for the award of tenure upon the faculty member's initial appointment provided that:

1. tenure has been earned at another institution
2. other than years of service, the candidate meets CSU's standards for appointment at the rank of associate professor or professor
3. the candidate brings a demonstrable national reputation to the institution
4. the committees and administrators normally involved in the tenure-approval process have made a recommendation for tenure for the candidate

F. Post-Tenure Review Policy

Post-tenure review serves the following aims:

1. to help faculty identify opportunities to reach their full potential for contribution to the university

2. to ensure that tenured faculty continue to pursue excellence in teaching, maintain academic currency, and remain engaged in scholarly/creative and service activities that support the university's mission
3. to encourage tenured faculty to examine different possible emphases at a given stage of their career

The post-tenure review system must not undermine academic freedom or tenure. All participants in the review process should begin by presuming that the faculty member is a competent and valuable asset to Columbus State University. The review must reflect the nature of the individual's discipline; should not be capricious, arbitrary, or discriminatory; and must provide for due process.

Each tenured faculty member will have a post-tenure review in the spring of every fifth year. That is, post-tenure review will occur five years after the last promotion or personnel action. To assure a meaningful and fair process, each evaluation should include review by the College Post-Tenure Review Committee (CPTRC) and a long-range professional development plan (typically five years). This process fosters faculty members' professional growth, while allowing for flexibility as departmental, college, and university missions or circumstances change.

The results of post-tenure review must be linked to rewards and professional development. Faculty members who are performing at a high level should receive recognition for their achievements.

Administrators with tenure who have some teaching responsibilities will not be subject to post-tenure review as long as the majority of their duties are administrative (typically department chair level or higher). Administrators who return full-time to the faculty will be placed in the post-tenure review cycle and evaluated under those guidelines in the fifth year following their return and at subsequent five-year intervals.

The following are the areas of evaluation for post-tenure review:

1. teaching effectiveness
2. research, scholarly or creative engagement
3. service to the institution, profession, and community

Faculty must demonstrate satisfactory performance in all three areas as determined by departmental/college "Standards of Excellence."

Columbus State University's Procedures for [Post-Tenure Review](#) detail the steps, requirements, and timeline of the process, as well as establish the criteria for satisfactory outcomes and the remediation and appeals processes for unsatisfactory outcomes.

G. Annual Evaluation of Faculty

As required by [Board of Regents policy](#), the university evaluates the performance of each faculty member annually. Evaluations take place before March 31 and cover the performance of responsibilities from the previous calendar year.

Faculty members are responsible for documenting their specific accomplishments, and the quality and significance of those accomplishments, in a portfolio submitted to the department chair by February 15 of each year. The department chair reviews accomplishments against the objectives established and approved by the faculty member and the department chair in the previous year's annual review meeting. Following review of the previous year's performance, the faculty member, in consultation with the department chair, will establish goals to serve as the basis for the following year's annual review.

In the annual review process, the department chair will evaluate each faculty member's performance as *satisfactory performance*, *unsatisfactory performance*, and *excellent performance*.

The document [Annual Evaluation Process, Areas of Review, and Ratings Criteria](#) establishes the basic procedure for annual review at CSU. In brief, the annual evaluation involves the creation of a portfolio by the faculty member under review, a scheduled meeting in the spring with the faculty member's department chair, a written response from the department chair as to the faculty member's performance in the three areas of review—teaching, research, and service—and the faculty member's signature on a statement indicating acknowledgement of the evaluation. The document outlines specific contents required in the portfolio, including teaching evaluations, sample syllabi and other course documents, and self-evaluation narratives written by the faculty member.

Pre-Tenure Review Procedure

1. All probationary faculty (tenure-track faculty not yet awarded tenure) will undergo a pre-tenure review no later than the end of the spring term of the third year of employment at CSU. Faculty who have been awarded probationary credit toward tenure must undergo pre-tenure review at the end of the second year of employment with CSU.
2. During the first semester at CSU the faculty member, in consultation with his/her department chair will prepare a one-year PDP covering the first full calendar year designed to enhance the faculty member's eligibility for tenure as well as support the objectives of the department, the goals of the college, and the mission of the university.
3. This plan will provide the basis for the annual evaluation of the faculty member the following spring. The PDP will specify goals with a time frame for each, activities to assist the faculty member in achieving those goals, and an ongoing evaluation plan. A copy of the PDP will be sent by the annual evaluator to the dean for review and budgetary considerations. This process is repeated in years two and three.

4. In the third year (or second for those with probationary credit) pre-tenure review will follow the faculty member's annual evaluation for that year.
5. The faculty member will prepare a portfolio in the same format required in the formal tenure process. This portfolio will include a description of accomplishments with appropriate documentation in the same format as the formal tenure process described in the Columbus State University Faculty Handbook.
6. A Pre-Tenure Committee is formed for each faculty member undergoing pre-tenure review. Each Pre-Tenure Review Committee shall be composed of a minimum of three tenured faculty from the department/college. One member of the committee should be selected from a department within the college from which the faculty member is not assigned. The committee and the committee chair will be selected by the faculty member and the department chair, and approved by the dean.
7. Materials submitted by the faculty member will be evaluated by the Pre-Tenure Review Committee. Using the [Pre-Tenure Review Evaluation Form \(PDF\)](#), the committee will provide recommendations to assist the candidate in preparation for tenure review. In addition, the committee will grade the faculty member in the areas of teaching, research and service using the following evaluations: *Satisfactory Progress or Unsatisfactory Progress*.
8. The department chair will review materials and make a recommendation which provides an analysis of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses.
9. The assessment and review recommendations of the Pre-Tenure Review Committee will be forwarded to the dean with a copy of the Evaluation Form being sent to the faculty member and department chair.
10. Following review of the portfolio and evaluation form, the dean will indicate that he/she concurs or does not concur with the committee (*Satisfactory Progress or Unsatisfactory Progress*).
11. If the dean is aware of any proposed program/department changes that might prevent the granting of tenure to an otherwise qualified faculty member, it is incumbent upon him or her to notify the faculty member of that possibility.

At the conclusion of this process, all materials will be returned to the faculty member. The original evaluation by the Pre-Tenure Review Committee will be placed in the candidate's personnel file so that it is available to be used in the tenure process.

Promotion and Tenure Procedures

General Procedure

Following are the normal procedures for handling the promotion and tenure process. Faculty and administrators at all levels are responsible for taking measures to prevent bias and conflicts of interest and to preserve the integrity of the process. Deans or their designees shall ensure that the chairs of committees at each level are aware of the timeline as well as the policies and processes that guide the review, vote, and reporting of results.

In the case of dual appointments, the dean and provost will determine at the time of hire which department will be considered the home department for purposes of promotion and tenure review.

1. The dean notifies all faculty of the college who are eligible by Board of Regents policies for consideration for promotion and for tenure. The policies of the Board of Regents require that all members of the faculty in their final probationary year undergo a tenure review. Members of the faculty who have met the minimum time requirements for tenure, but who are not in the final probationary year, should consult with the department chair prior to reaching a decision on applying for tenure.
2. Eligible faculty members must notify the dean in writing of their intent to apply or withdraw from consideration for promotion or tenure by the deadline published in the Academic Affairs calendar.
3. Faculty who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure must submit to the dean all required materials including a [curriculum vitae following the approved format \(DOCX\)](#) and an accompanying cover sheet — the [Application for Promotion Form \(PDF\)](#) and/or the [Application for Tenure Form \(PDF\)](#). Candidates are solely responsible for providing ample supporting evidence in the materials submitted for review by the published deadline. Candidates may not include letters of support from individuals who participate in the decision-making process either as administrators or as tenured faculty serving on a personnel committee. Departments or colleges may require external reviews (i.e. those outside the university) as a part of their Standards of Excellence.

Materials submitted for promotion and/or tenure will be limited to a single 4"-5" binder. Faculty may prepare additional materials as appendices, but rather than submitting them will make note that they are available if reviewers request them.

Nothing in this document will prevent the campus, at the direction of the provost, from requiring the electronic submission of materials.

4. After a recommendation has been made at one level, candidates may elect to write a response to any recommendation and include any additional materials to be considered by the next level of review; however, recommendations made at a prior level of review will not be reconsidered.

Candidates may find the timeline for each level of review posted to the Academic Affairs Planning Calendar.

5. The dean is responsible for maintaining the application file and for making it available to the department head and to the department and college personnel committees.
6. Candidates may withdraw their applications from consideration at each subsequent step in the review by written notification to the appropriate administrator at the level of withdrawal. Withdrawal by a candidate in the final probationary year will result in a notice of non-renewal of contract for the following academic year.
7. Candidates may use probationary credit awarded toward tenure at the time of hire at their own discretion to meet length of service eligibility requirements, or they may choose to use their actual service dates rather than accelerate their tenure applications via the probationary credit.

At times, unusual circumstances may arise (for example, when an administrator [typically someone at the department chair level or higher] stands for promotion or tenure) that call for a modification to these processes by the Office of the Provost. For example, the dean appoints additional members to the college personnel committee and names the committee chair. If a dean, associate dean, or assistant dean stands for promotion or tenure, it will be the responsibility the Provost or designee from the Office of the Provost, to appoint the additional members and name the committee chair.

The review of administrators that takes place within the college will be as follows:

- A department chair will be reviewed by the department personnel committee (if one exists), college personnel committee, and dean;
- An assistant or associate dean will be reviewed by the department personnel committee (if one exists), college personnel committee, and dean;
- A dean will be reviewed by the department personnel committee (if one exists) and the college personnel committee.

As with all faculty, administrators reviewed for promotion and tenure must meet department, college, and university standards.

Departmental Procedures

1. According to established procedures, academic departments should form personnel committees, provided there are at least three tenured faculty members eligible to serve. Faculty members who are related to any candidate by blood or marriage, who are romantically involved, or have other major conflicts of interest are ineligible to serve. Neither faculty applying for promotion or tenure nor the department chair may serve on the committee.
2. Formation of department and college personnel committees occurs during fall planning week each year.

3. Departmental committee voting will adhere to the following policies and procedures
 - While every effort should be made to establish a meeting time that enables all committee members to attend, a quorum (majority) of those serving on the committee must be present in order to conduct a vote.
 - Only members in attendance in person or electronically (by phone or video) may vote. Committee members who have reviewed materials but are unable to participate may provide the committee chair with written input, which should be considered by the committee but will not be counted as a vote.
 - An affirmative vote from a majority of those participating in the committee meeting is required for the vote to be considered a positive recommendation. Likewise, a non-affirmative vote from a majority of those participating in the committee meeting is required for the vote to be considered a negative recommendation. If a majority either way is not achieved initially, the committee should seek outside clarification of issues as necessary and continue to deliberate. If after further deliberation there is not a majority either affirmative or non-affirmative, the application will go to the next level of review without a recommendation from the committee.
 - The numerical vote of the committee is to be reported in a letter, and each member present will sign the letter to attest to its review.
 4. The letter should reflect both the identified strengths and areas of concern.
 5. Department personnel committees must submit their letter to the candidate, department chairperson, and the dean. In the absence of department personnel committees, chairpersons have the options of (a) appointing an ad hoc committee of at least three tenured faculty to advise them with respect to the merits of applications, (b) requesting individual recommendations in writing from faculty, or (c) submitting their recommendations without input from department faculty. All committee and administrative recommendations will be in writing and made available to the applicant.
 6. Department chairpersons must submit to their deans their recommendations including support or non-support of department committee action (when such a committee exists) and all materials concerning the departmental review of applications, and they must inform applicants of their recommendations, in writing, at that time.
-

College-Level Procedure

1. Each college forms a personnel committee responsible for deliberating the merits of each application in the college, the recommendation of the department chair, and the recommendation of the department personnel committee, if provided.
2. The College Personnel Committee (CPC) should be composed of the following:
 1. one faculty member from each department elected by the faculty of that department

2. two at-large faculty members appointed by the dean to ensure a balance of professional viewpoints and expertise

Tenured faculty who are not under consideration for promotion or tenure are eligible to serve on this committee, provided they have no conflicting interest. It is considered a conflict of interest if the faculty member is related to a candidate from the College by blood or marriage or is involved in a romantic relationship with the candidate.

1. Department chairs may not serve as a member of the CPC.
2. The dean will appoint the chair of this committee from its elected membership.
3. The CPC will review all applications for promotion and tenure and be responsible for the following
 - Reviewing Board of Regents criteria for tenure and promotion as recorded in [BOR policy](#) and in correspondence from the chancellor.
 - Reviewing and applying department and college “Standards of Excellence”.
 - Reviewing department chair and departmental faculty or committee recommendations.
 - Developing a formal recommendation to the dean of support or non-support for the application.
4. Voting policies and procedures to be followed by the college personnel committee include
 - All members of the college personnel committee should be present either in person or electronically (by phone or video) for deliberation and voting. If extenuating circumstances prevent a member from participating, the department will be represented by an alternate elected by the department from among its department personnel committee members. The election of the alternate shall take place in the Fall at the time personnel committees are elected. If the department has no personnel committee, it may elect an eligible faculty member to serve as an alternate to the college committee.
 - If the need for an alternate to serve on the college committee is made with too little time for him or her to review all of the college’s applicant materials, alternates will participate in discussion and vote on only the recommendations for faculty within the alternate’s department.
 - An affirmative vote from a majority of those participating in the committee meeting is required for the vote to be considered a positive recommendation. Likewise, a non-affirmative vote from a majority of those participating in the committee meeting is required for the vote to be considered a negative recommendation. If a majority either way is not achieved initially, the committee should seek outside clarification of issues as

necessary and continue to deliberate. If after further deliberation there is not a majority either affirmative or non-affirmative, the application will go to the next level of review without a recommendation from the committee.

5. The letter from the CPC will include
 - the numerical vote of the committee.
 - an identification of both strengths and areas of concern.
 - the signature of each participating member of the committee to attest to its review.
6. Submission of a minority report is allowed.
7. The CPC chairperson will forward a copy of the committee's letter to the applicant.
8. The CPC chairperson will submit the outcome of the committee's deliberation to the dean with all supporting materials.
9. After reviewing and applying all policies relevant to promotion and tenure (See college level procedures, #3), the dean will make a recommendation based on the evaluation by the committee(s), by the department chairperson, and as a result of his or her own evaluation. The dean will notify the applicant of his or her recommendation, in writing, including the rationale for the recommendation. The dean will then submit the recommendation to the provost, in writing, along with all supporting materials. No materials may be added once the documents leave the college.

Procedures for Promotion of Library Faculty

Faculty members of the University Libraries who are appointed to non-tenure track professoriate lines are eligible for promotion but not for tenure. Faculty in the library are not organized into departments and will not have personnel committees as outlined in the procedures for the academic colleges. The procedures for the consideration of promotion of the library faculty are as follows:

The Dean of Libraries will be responsible for the following:

- notifying faculty at the appropriate time of their eligibility for promotion;
- reviewing Board of Regents criteria for promotion as recorded in [BOR policy](#) and in correspondence from the chancellor;
- reviewing the relevant criteria, policies, and procedures for promotion in the CSU Policies and Procedures and the library's Standards of Excellence;
- notifying eligible faculty of their appointment to a library personnel committee, i.e. all faculty holding the rank of associate professor who have no conflict of interest and assuming there are at least three faculty members eligible to serve;
- ensuring that the library personnel committee is informed of the criteria, review processes, and timeline for review of applications for promotion and making applicant materials available to committee members;

- appointing a chair of the library personnel committee;
- based on his or her own review and with consideration for the recommendation of the library personnel committee, developing a formal recommendation to the Provost of support or non-support of the application for promotion, including the rationale for the recommendation;
- submitting to the provost the letter of recommendation and all supporting materials;
- notifying the applicant of his or her recommendation.

The Library Personnel Committee will follow the procedures identified for college personnel committees and will provide to the dean its letter of recommendation, which will also be copied to the applicant.

Provost's Recommendation, President's Decision

1. After a review of the portfolio and the recommendations made by the dean, department chairperson, and committees, the provost will recommend to approve or deny each candidate's application for tenure and/or promotion and will include rationale for the recommendation. The provost will notify the dean and candidate, in writing, of that recommendation, then submit materials to the president for action.
2. The president will make a decision on the tenure and/or promotion of each candidate following review of the candidate's portfolio and recommendations made by the provost, dean, chair and committees. The president will notify the provost, dean, department chair, and candidate, in writing, of that decision.

Timeline

The institutional review of faculty for tenure and promotion must be completed by early February of a given academic year in order to meet the data entry deadline of the end of February for the annual report to the Board of Regents.

Procedures for Post-Tenure Review

1. The dean will inform, in writing, twelve months in advance, the faculty members scheduled the next spring for post-tenure review.
2. The faculty member, in consultation with the department chair, will create a five-year Professional Development Plan (PDP) specifying goals with a reasonable time frame for each, activities to assist the faculty member in achieving those goals, and an on-going evaluation. The chairperson will evaluate this PDP annually to monitor progress and/or suggest possible modification. In those cases where a faculty member and a department chair cannot agree on a PDP, a mutually acceptable neutral party will arbitrate.

The tenured faculty member will submit to the department chair and the college post-tenure review committee (CPTRC) a PDP and portfolio documenting performance. The portfolio will be

limited to a single 3"-4" binder. Faculty may prepare additional materials as appendices, but rather than submitting them will make note that they are available if reviewers request them.

Nothing in this document will prevent the campus, at the direction of the provost, from requiring the electronic submission of materials.

3. In addition to the [Post-Tenure Review Form \(DOCX\)](#), the portfolio should be composed of the following:
 1. a current curriculum vitae
 2. annual performance reviews for the years under consideration
 3. a statement prepared by the faculty member detailing his or her accomplishments for the period under review
 4. student and peer evaluations of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness for the period under review
 5. any other documentation deemed relevant by the faculty member under review
 6. The department chair will submit to the CPTRC an assessment of the faculty member indicating whether performance has been satisfactory or unsatisfactory in each of three areas of responsibility over the past five years. The candidate may attach a response within five university working days following receipt.
 7. The CPTRC will review the materials and render a recommendation of satisfactory or unsatisfactory in each of the three areas of responsibility. In the case of a satisfactory recommendation, the CPTRC may elect to include comments about the faculty member's identified areas of excellence and/or possibilities for future professional development. In the case of an unsatisfactory recommendation, the CPTRC will make recommendations about the faculty member's future professional development. The candidate may attach a response within five university working days following receipt.
 8. The CPTRC recommendation will be forwarded to the faculty member, the department chair, and the dean.
 9. The dean will review the evaluations prepared by the department chair and the CPTRC and provide his or her own written assessment of the candidate's overall performance to include budget considerations for merit pay and/or professional development costs. The dean will send this written evaluation to the candidate, department chair, and provost. The college and the Office of Academic Affairs will each maintain a copy of the evaluation in the candidate's permanent personnel files.

Outcome:

The department chair and CPTRC will give the faculty member a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating in each of the three primary areas of responsibility: teaching; research, scholarly, or creative achievements; and service.

Faculty must earn a satisfactory rating in all three areas to receive an overall satisfactory recommendation.

In the event of a split recommendation by the department chair and CPTRC, the dean will assign the overall satisfactory/unsatisfactory rating.

Satisfactory Outcome:

A satisfactory outcome will result in a post-tenure merit salary review. The satisfactory outcome and qualitative comments included in the post-tenure evaluation will serve as the basis for recommendations on merit pay increases, equity adjustments, and professional development funding.

Unsatisfactory Outcome:

An unsatisfactory outcome in any of the three areas will require the faculty member to create a revised PDP (RPDP). Working with the department chair, the faculty member will develop a formal plan for faculty development that includes clearly defined and specific goals or outcomes, an outline of activities to be undertaken, a timetable, and an agreed-upon monitoring strategy.

The department chair must approve the RPDP and submit it to the dean for review and budgetary consideration. The dean should allocate faculty development funds, as available, to address the areas needing improvement. The candidate's progress on the RPDP must be noted at each annual review. Faculty receiving an unsatisfactory outcome may not be recommended for merit pay increases or equity adjustments until performance has returned to satisfactory. The faculty member will resubmit documentation for Post-tenure Review until achieving a satisfactory outcome. If the faculty member fails to make satisfactory progress, the chair and dean may, after three years:

- Continue to work with the faculty member
- Reassign the faculty member, including to non-teaching duties
- Initiate other personnel actions, including dismissal for cause (Regular independent dismissal processes will apply.)

Retirement Exemption:

Faculty who submit a formal letter of intent to retire are exempt from Post-tenure Review if the official date of retirement is within one year after the semester of the scheduled review.

(Effective Fall 2020)

Appeals:

A faculty member who disagrees with an unsatisfactory post-tenure review may appeal:

- First, in writing within fifteen university working days after the date of the notification by the dean, to the University Post-Tenure Appeals Committee (UPTAC), which is composed of five faculty members drawn from a pool of tenured associate or full professors. Each Fall semester, the faculty of every college will elect the members of this pool with every college having the same number of representatives as they have faculty senators. The senate executive officer and the provost will randomly draw a seven-member panel from this pool with at least one faculty member from each college. Tenured faculty are eligible to serve on this committee provided they have no conflicting interest. It is considered a conflict of interest if the faculty member is related to the candidate by blood or marriage or is involved in a romantic relationship with the candidate. The faculty member who is appealing will select any five of the seven. Faculty members may not be a member of the UPTAC in the same year that they are scheduled to receive post-tenure review. Members of the UPTAC cannot have served on the CPTRC for the faculty member making the appeal. The UPTAC recommendation may concur with the recommendation or reverse it. Voting policies and procedures that apply to college personnel committees will govern the voting of the UPTAC.
- Then, in writing within fifteen university working days after the date of the UPTAC notification, to the university president through the provost.

Annual Evaluation Process, Areas of Review, and Ratings Criteria

Process

1. The department chair will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's annual written evaluation.
2. The faculty member will sign a statement acknowledging having been apprised of the content of the annual written evaluation.
3. The faculty member may elect to respond in writing to the content of the evaluation. The response must be submitted to the department chair within ten working days and will be attached to the evaluation.
4. The department chair will acknowledge in writing receipt of this response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made as a result of either the conference or the faculty member's written response. This acknowledgement will also become a part of the record.
5. The evaluator's recommendations for merit pay increases will reflect the results of the evaluation. Only faculty receiving ratings of satisfactory performance and excellent performance will be considered for merit pay increases.

Areas of Review

1. Teaching effectiveness
2. Research, scholarly or creative engagement
3. Service to the institution, profession and community

Annual Evaluation Criteria

All faculty in all disciplines will be evaluated annually in each of these components.

While recognizing the diversity of disciplines and faculty accomplishments across the university, these criteria will serve as the basis for evaluation of all faculty, and thus all college and departmental governance documents (“Standards of Excellence”) must reflect them.

Reviews should not be capricious, arbitrary, or discriminatory. Due process must be provided.

Each department will establish “Standards of Excellence” consistent with the criteria above, faculty will use those standards as a guide to department-specific expectations, and the standards will serve as the bases for annual, promotion, pre-tenure, tenure, and post-tenure evaluations.

Evaluation of Teaching

While Columbus State University requires, values, and rewards intellectual contributions and professional service, the institution focuses on the pursuit of excellence in teaching. Thus, faculty evaluations pay particular attention to teaching performance, and excellent performance in research and service cannot compensate for unsatisfactory performance in teaching.

Recognizing that teaching is the highest priority of the institution, assessments of teaching used to promote growth in teaching must take place each academic year. Assessment of teaching shall take place through observation, consistent with the following policies:

- The faculty member may select the colleague who is to assess teaching. The observer may come from inside or outside the department and from faculty, administrative, or, when appropriate, staff positions; to help eliminate bias, observers must be approved by the chair.
- At a minimum, the written evaluation is to include strengths and suggestions for improvement.
- The faculty member is encouraged to include the evaluation in review materials, as it is his or her responsibility to document teaching effectiveness through multiple means.
- Over time, attention should be given to evaluating a variety of instructional delivery methods, e.g., online, hybrid, face-to-face, labs, and studios.
- In support of this process, departments may develop their own rubrics, approve the use of rubrics developed by the Faculty Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning, the Center of Online Learning, or from other resources, including other departments or individual faculty; in all cases rubrics may be used if they are approved by the chair.

(Effective Fall 2018 to allow time for the development of rubrics.)

In evaluating a faculty member, the department chair will base the teaching performance rating on specific criteria identified in the academic unit's "Standards of Excellence."

Documenting teaching effectiveness should focus on both the quality and significance of a faculty member's contributions. At a minimum, the evaluation of teaching must include the following components: student evaluation of all courses taught (courses with response rates less than 30% or with fewer than six students may be excluded by the faculty member from the evaluation of teaching) and faculty self-assessment. Faculty members are encouraged to supplement the required elements to demonstrate superior performance, as it is their responsibility to document teaching effectiveness through multiple means.

To allow full consideration of quality, creativity, differences in disciplines, delivery methods, and workload, faculty are encouraged to provide evidence of any of the following, if applicable:

Student Feedback: Student comments and other student feedback received and not already included with the required student course evaluations.

Peer Evaluations: The faculty member may submit one or more observations of his or her classroom instruction. It may be useful to include results from multiple observations as well as comments on what the faculty member has learned by being an observer of others' teaching. It might also be helpful to emphasize particular innovations or to demonstrate that the faculty member has effectively adapted instruction as the result of the peer observation process.

Department chairs may make appropriate comparisons to departmental and historical evaluations and consider the relationship of student evaluations to grade distributions, and differences based on course level, e.g., lower division, upper division, graduate, required and elective courses.

Teaching Load: Number of courses taught, student credit hours generated; number of preparations; new preparations; new course developments; new delivery methods.

Pedagogy: Evidence of innovative course or content development, teaching materials, and instructional techniques; experiential learning opportunities; international education activities; incorporation of problem-solving strategies; use of high-impact practices; direction of student research.

Assessment and Assurance of Learning: Evidence of assessment of learning outcomes; course revisions and pedagogical changes in response to collected data; design of course assessment instruments; development of rubrics to measure student learning outcomes; involvement in QEP; involvement in the first-year experience.

Advising, Mentoring, Recruitment of Students: Advising logs; recruitment activity/success; orientation and visitation; mentorships, job referrals and internships; undergraduate or graduate research.

Faculty Development Activities in Teaching: Teaching seminars and workshops; training or research related to alternative delivery methods; pedagogical enhancements; conducting peer observations of colleagues; and maintaining currency in teaching field.

Department chairs should also consider unusual grade distributions, high attrition rates, class cancellations, and faculty availability to students and colleagues.

Faculty members may provide other measures of teaching effectiveness such as teaching awards, evidence of handling diverse and challenging teaching assignments, and securing grants for curriculum development. Materials presented as evidence of teaching effectiveness will be most informative if they demonstrate growth and improvement over time. The department chair will evaluate the above areas of teaching effectiveness allowing for varying emphases on the components to reflect differences in load, discipline, and circumstances. The areas are not necessarily equally weighted.

Evaluation of Research and Creative Activity

Productivity standards may vary by workload and area of primary teaching responsibility. At a minimum, departmental standards must require evidence that a faculty member's work includes some externally validated research, scholarly, and/or creative work. Each unit's "Standards of Excellence" will define and clarify quality expectations.

Faculty should provide evidence of all scholarly, research, and creative activities in the annual portfolio. All scholarly activities may be included and will be considered within the context of the university's mission. Greater weight will be placed on peer-reviewed publications, juried/invitational performances or exhibits, and competitive grants related to the faculty member's academic discipline.

The guidelines presented here represent the minimum expectations. Faculty should be aware that meeting the minimum expectations may not be sufficient for the award of tenure.

Evaluation of Service:

The university expects faculty to be available to students and colleagues, to accept appropriate committee assignments, and to actively participate in departmental, college, university and university system activities.

Service activities should contribute to the growth of the faculty member and to the enhancement of the department, college, university, and academic and local communities. In the annual portfolio, the faculty member should identify whether service is to the institution (college, university, and university system), profession, or community. Each entry should include how the faculty member contributed to the advancement of the college/university mission.

Institutional Service

Faculty members must participate in the internal affairs and governance of the department, college, university and, when possible, the university system. Such activities include committee work, assigned

administrative duties, special departmental projects and activities, and consultation with, and assistance to, college-related outreach units.

Professional Service

Academic service activities may include serving as a reviewer, discussant, or chair in a national, regional, or local conference; serving as a member of an editorial review board; and editing conference proceedings. Holding key leadership roles in national, regional, or local organizations is evidence of professional service activity. Departments should identify appropriate, discipline-specific organizations consistent with the faculty member's performance objectives.

Community Service

Service to the local community forges and enhances partnerships between the community and Columbus State University. The university encourages faculty members to apply their professional expertise to enhance the local community. Community service includes active contributing memberships in area organizations, committee membership (especially serving as chairperson), serving on a board of directors or its equivalent, donating professional services such as giving speeches, presenting continuing education programs, and consulting (both with and without remuneration). The primary motivation for community service should be the enhancement of the Columbus State University community, and community service should be consistent with the university's mission.

Date of Effectiveness

Procedural items in this document will be implemented immediately upon approval and at the discretion of the Provost except as noted in the document.

FOR OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT USE ONLY:

Response:

Approve

Approve (Minor Edits)

Disapprove

Submitted by:

C. L. Markwood

Christopher L. Markwood, President

Date:

11/2/17