

COLUMBUS STATE UNIVERSITY

SCHWOB SCHOOL OF MUSIC

Effective January 2012

Schwob School of Music Standards of Excellence

These *Standards of Excellence* communicate the school's expectations of faculty as relevant to pre-tenure review, tenure and promotion, post-tenure and annual performance reviews. They are consistent with institutional policies published in the CSU Statutes and the CSU Faculty Handbook. School standards and changes in the standards are first recommended by a majority vote of the tenured faculty in the department. Recommended standards and changes to the standards must be approved by the department chair, dean and provost before they take effect.

1. Superior teaching; demonstrating excellence in instruction in all teaching assignments; success in recruitment and retention.

Examples may include:

- Effective syllabi and class materials
- Evidence of peer review
- Examples of innovative teaching
- Examples of outstanding student work
- Participation in teaching-related conferences and seminars
- Honors, awards, and other recognition in the area of teaching
- Evidence of student learning and achievement such as creative or research projects, recitals, competitions, and auditions
- Consistent, positive student evaluations
- Evidence of recruiting activities such as clinics, school visits, data relating to number and quality of auditioning students

2. Research, scholarly or creative achievement, as appropriate to current academic rank. 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.

Examples:

- applied and accepted or invited to conduct or perform at a state, regional, national, or international conference or organization
- applied and accepted to present a clinic, paper, or masterclass at a state, regional, national, or international conference

- invited to adjudicate at a state, regional, national, or international conference, university, or other professional venue
- invited to perform or conduct at a university or other professional performing venue
- invited to teach, either privately or in a masterclass, at a high school, college, university, conservatory, or other professional educational institution (including summer music festivals)
- publication of an article or review in a journal appropriate to the field
- publication of a musical composition or arrangement for distribution
- peer review of a recording, live performance or composition in an appropriate journal
- release of a commercial recording
- collaboration with a composer leading to a premiere

3. Outstanding service to the institution, profession and community as appropriate to discipline, rank and other responsibilities.

Faculty are expected to be available to students and colleagues, accept appropriate committee assignments, and actively participate in departmental, college, university and university system activities. To meet expectations, faculty must refrain from conduct that disrupts the productive activities of the department, college or university.

Service activities are designed to 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, service should be identified as service 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.

Examples may include:

- Evidence of successful academic advising
- Active participation on department, college, or university committees
- Serving local, regional, and national organizations relevant to the faculty member's discipline
- Adjudicating, providing clinics, master classes, or lessons
- Service in an area related to the faculty member's area of expertise which enhances the local community

Pre-Tenure Review Policy

Purpose

The pre-tenure review is designed to assist a faculty member in preparing for the tenure process in a timely manner. The pre-tenure review should be more than merely an assessment of previous

performance. It should include a professional development plan (PDP) prepared by the faculty member that defines his/her long range plans that will allow him/her to reasonably expect to earn tenure. The past performance of the faculty member and the PDP will be reviewed by a committee of the faculty member's peers and his/her annual evaluator for the purpose of identifying strengths and weaknesses and making suggestions for enhancement of those strengths and remediation of any weaknesses. This process is intended to develop and nurture eligible individuals and 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.

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 found in the CSU Faculty Handbook, the committee will provide feedback in the form of 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 that 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.

Tenure and Promotion

Promotion and tenure decisions are based on a faculty member's cumulative performance in support of university, college and departmental missions in the areas of teaching, scholarship and professional service. The awarding of tenure represents a highly important decision through which the department, college and university all incur a major commitment to the individual faculty member. While the criteria for promotion and tenure are similar, tenure decisions will place greater emphasis on the faculty member's demonstrated potential to consistently meet performance expectations in the future. Promotion decisions will place greater emphasis on the quality and significance of the candidate's cumulative performance.

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

1. Five years of full-time, tenure-track service at the rank of assistant professor is required for promotion to associate professor.
May stand for promotion in fifth year
2. Five years of service at the rank of associate professor at CSU is required for promotion to professor.

May stand for promotion in fifth year

Areas of Review

1. Superior teaching; demonstrating excellence in instruction in all teaching assignments; success in recruitment and retention.
2. Research, scholarly or creative achievement, as appropriate to current academic rank. 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.
3. Outstanding service to the institution, profession and community as appropriate to discipline, rank and other responsibilities.

Refer to Schwob School of Music Standards of Excellence, page 1 of this document.

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 three (one of which must be teaching) as determined by departmental or college *Standards of Excellence* consistent with the guidelines that follow.

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

Assistant Professor – Appointment or promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor should be based upon demonstrated academic ability and potential for professional growth

Associate Professor – Appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is based upon actual performance as well as demonstrated potential for further development. There must be evidence that the individual is growing professionally and is contributing to his/her field. Associate Professor is a high academic rank and should carry 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. The candidate must also have demonstrated, 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 his/her area of specialization. It is expected that he or she will 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 mode of the scholarly or creative production will be determined by the nature of the candidate's discipline.

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 approved by the department, dean, provost and president.

Promotion and Tenure Procedures

- Dean provides to all faculty of the college a list of faculty members in the college 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.
- Each eligible faculty member must notify the dean in writing of his/her intent to apply or withdraw from consideration for promotion or tenure by the deadline published in the Academic Affairs calendar.
- Faculty who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure must submit to the dean all materials to be considered in the review. A curriculum vitae following the approved format must be included in the material. The candidate is solely responsible for providing ample supporting evidence in the materials submitted for review by the published deadline. The application is sent forward to the dean by the applicant with accompanying cover sheet.
- The dean is responsible for maintaining the application file and for making it available to the department head, and to the departmental and college personnel committees.
- The applicant may withdraw his/her application 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.
- Probationary credit awarded toward tenure at the time of hire may be used at the discretion of the candidate to meet length of service eligibility requirements. Candidates granted probationary credit toward tenure may use their actual service dates, and are therefore not required to accelerate their tenure applications due to the probationary credit.

Departmental Procedure:

- Academic departments should form personnel committees provided there are at least three tenured faculty members who are 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.
- The department chair may not serve on the committee.
- Formation of department and college personnel committees occurs during Fall planning week each year.
- Departmental committee recommendations must be submitted to the candidate, department chairperson, and the dean. In the absence of a departmental personnel committee, the chairperson has options of (a) appointing an ad hoc committee of tenured faculty to advise him or her with respect to the merits of the application, and (b) requesting individual recommendations in writing from faculty. All committee and administrative recommendations will be in writing and made available to the applicant.
- The department chairperson must submit to the dean his or her recommendation including support or non-support of departmental committee action (when such a committee exists) and all materials concerning the departmental review of the application. The applicant will be informed in writing of the recommendation of the department chairperson at the time of transmittal of the recommendation to the college committee. All materials from the departmental review will be returned to the office of the dean for review by the college committee.

College Level Procedure:

- Each college forms a personnel committee which is responsible for deliberating the merits of each application in the college, the recommendation of the department chair, and the recommendation of the departmental committee, if provided.
- The College Personnel Committee (CPC) is composed of the following membership: one faculty member from each department elected by the faculty of that department; two at-large faculty members appointed by the dean to ensure a balance of professional viewpoints and expertise within the Review Committee. Faculty standing for election or appointment to this Committee must be tenured and may neither be under consideration for promotion nor related by blood or marriage to any candidate under consideration for promotion or tenure. This includes individuals who may be dating, but not married, and same-sex partners who are not legally married.
- Department chairs may not serve as a member of the CPC.
- The dean will appoint the chair of this committee from its elected membership.
- The CPC will review all applications for promotion and tenure and be responsible for the following:

1. Review of Board of Regents' criteria for tenure and promotion as recorded in Board policy and in correspondence from the Chancellor;
 2. Consideration of appropriate departmental/college *Standards of Excellence*.
 3. Consideration of department chair and departmental faculty or committee recommendations; and
 4. Development of a formal recommendation to the dean of support or non-support for the application.
- The recommendation of the CPC will include:
 1. The numerical vote of the committee, since the recommendation need not be unanimous (submission of a minority report is allowable).
 2. The rationale for the recommendation.
 3. Review of this report must be attested to by each member's signature. The committee chairperson will forward a copy of this recommendation to the applicant.
 - The CPC recommendation will be submitted to the dean with all supporting materials.
 - Candidates may elect to write a response to any decision and include any additional materials after a recommendation has been made at one level that will be considered by the next level of review. Previous decisions will not be reconsidered by the prior level of review.
 - The dean shall make his or her recommendation on the basis of the evaluation by the committee(s), by the department chairperson, and his or her own evaluation. The applicant will be informed in writing by the dean of his or her recommendation to include the rationale for the recommendation. The dean must submit in writing his or her recommendation to the provost along with all supporting materials. No materials may be added once the documents leave the college.

President and Provost

- After a review of the portfolio and 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. Notification will be provided in writing to the dean and candidate. Materials will be submitted to the president for action.
- 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. Notification will be provided in writing to the provost, dean, department chair and candidate.

Tenure Eligibility

Only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors who are employed full-time and who are appointed in tenure-track positions are eligible for tenure. The initial evaluation of a faculty member and recommendation for the award of tenure shall be the responsibility of the faculty member's department. Each department shall devise appropriate standards for such evaluation.

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 before being eligible for consideration for tenure.
3. Except for the approved suspension of the probationary period due to a leave of absence, the maximum time that may be served in a tenure track position at CSU without the award of tenure shall be seven years provided, however, that a terminal contract for an eighth year may be proffered if a recommendation for tenure is not approved by the President.
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. Superior teaching; demonstrating excellence in instruction in all teaching assignments; success in recruitment and retention.
2. Research, scholarly or creative achievement, as appropriate to current academic rank. 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.
3. Outstanding service to the institution, profession and community as appropriate to discipline, rank and other responsibilities.

Refer to Schwob School of Music Standards of Excellence, page 1 of this document.

Criteria for Tenure

Faculty must demonstrate satisfactory performance in all three areas with demonstrated excellence in two of three (one of which must be teaching) as determined by departmental *Standards of Excellence*. The candidate's achievements must demonstrate potential for long-term effectiveness at the university.

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 be awarded tenure. In tenure decisions, present and anticipated staffing needs of the department, college, and university are fully considered. Since the tenure decision involves factors which extend beyond determination of the competence, performance and promise of the faculty member under review, the failure to award tenure does not necessarily imply an unfavorable evaluation of the faculty member.

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:

- Tenure has been earned at another institution
- Candidate meets CSU's standards for appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor
- Candidate brings a demonstrably national reputation to the institution
- Tenure must be approved by the committees and administrators normally involved in the tenure approval process.

Post-Tenure Review Policy

Purpose:

1. Assist faculty with identifying opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential for contribution to the university.
2. 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. Encourage examination of possibilities for different emphases at different points of a faculty member's 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 (CSU). The review must reflect the nature of the individual's discipline, and it 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 each faculty member's professional growth, while making each faculty member accountable to his/her colleagues and the university's mission.

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

Administrators who have tenure and who may also have some teaching responsibilities will not be subject to post-tenure review as long as a majority of their duties are administrative in nature. At such time as an administrator may return full-time to the faculty, she/he will be placed into the post-tenure review cycle and will be evaluated under those guidelines as a faculty member in the fifth year following the return to the faculty and at subsequent five year intervals.

Areas of Evaluation

1. Superior teaching; demonstrating excellence in instruction in all teaching assignments; success in recruitment and retention.
2. Research, scholarly or creative achievement, as appropriate to current academic rank. 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.
3. Outstanding service to the institution, profession and community as appropriate to discipline, rank and other responsibilities.

Refer to Schwob School of Music Standards of Excellence, page 1 of this document.

Criteria

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

Procedure:

1. The dean will inform, in writing, twelve (12) 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. This PDP will be evaluated annually for monitoring of progress and/or for possible modification. Neutral party arbitration, by a mutually acceptable party, will be employed in those cases where a faculty member and a department chair cannot agree on a PDP.

3. The tenured faculty member shall submit a PDP and appropriate documentation of performance for review of both by the department chair and the CPTRC. Documentation for each faculty member should include a portfolio comprised of a current curriculum vitae, annual performance reviews for the years under consideration, a statement prepared by the faculty member detailing his or her accomplishments, student and peer evaluations of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness, and any other documentation deemed relevant by the faculty member under review.
4. The department chair will submit to the CPTRC an assessment of the faculty member which indicates whether his or her performance has been satisfactory or unsatisfactory in each of three areas of responsibility over the past five years. Candidate may attach a response within five university working days following receipt.
5. 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. Candidate may attach a response within five university working days following receipt.
6. The CPTRC recommendation will be forwarded to the faculty member, the department chair and the dean.
7. The dean will review the evaluations prepared by the department chair and the CPTRC and provide his or her own written assessment of candidate's overall performance to include budget considerations for merit pay and/or professional development costs. This written evaluation will be sent to the candidate, department chair and provost, and will be maintained in the candidate's permanent personnel files in the college and Academic Affairs.

Outcome:

Faculty will be given a satisfactory/unsatisfactory rating in each of the three primary areas of responsibility: teaching; research, scholarly or creative achievements; and service by the department chair and CPTRC.

A satisfactory rating must be earned 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 creation of 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 RPDP must be approved by the department chair and submitted to the dean for review and budgetary consideration. Faculty development funds should be allocated, as available, to address the areas in need of 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 a satisfactory outcome is achieved.

Retire Exemption

Faculty who submit a formal letter of intent to retire are exempted from Post-tenure Review if the official date of retirement is within three (3) years after the semester of scheduled review.

Appeals:

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

- First, in writing within fifteen (15) university working days after the date of the notification by the dean, to the University Post-Tenure Appeals Committee (UPTAC) that is composed of five faculty members drawn from a pool of tenured associate or full professors. Annually, the faculty of every college shall elect the members of this pool with every college having the same number of representatives as their number of faculty senators. The Senate Executive Officer and the provost shall randomly draw a seven-member panel from this pool with at least one faculty member from each college. The faculty member who is appealing will select any five (5) 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.

- Then, in writing within fifteen (15) university working days after the date of the UPTAC notification, to the university president through the provost.

Annual Evaluation of Faculty

As required by Board of Regents policies, the performance of each faculty member will be evaluated annually. The evaluation will take place by **March 31** and will cover the performance of responsibilities from the previous calendar year.

It will be the responsibility of each faculty member to document his or her specific accomplishments, and the quality and significance of those accomplishments, in a portfolio submitted to the department chair by **February 15** of each year. Accomplishments will be reviewed by the department chair 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, goals should be established 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 evaluation process will be as follows:

- The department chair will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's annual written evaluation.
- The faculty member will sign a statement indicating that he/she has been apprised of the content of the annual written evaluation.
- The faculty member may elect to respond in writing to the content of the evaluation. The response must be submitted within ten working days to the department chair and will be attached to the evaluation.
- The department chair will acknowledge in writing his/her 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 records.
- The results of the evaluation will be reflected in recommendations by the evaluator for merit pay increases. Only faculty receiving ratings of satisfactory performance and excellent performance will be considered for merit pay increases.

Areas of Review

1. Superior teaching; demonstrating excellence in instruction in all teaching assignments; success in recruitment and retention.
2. Research, scholarly or creative achievement, as appropriate to current academic rank. 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.
3. Outstanding service to the institution, profession and community as appropriate to discipline, rank and other responsibilities.

Refer to Schwob School of Music Standards of Excellence, page 1 of this document.

Annual Evaluation Criteria

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

While recognizing the diversity of disciplines and the manifestation of faculty accomplishments across the university, these criteria will be the predominant basis for evaluation of all faculty and must be reflected in all college and departmental governance documents (*Standards of Excellence*). To meet expectations, faculty must refrain from conduct that disrupts the productive activities of the department, college or university.

Each department will establish *Standards of Excellence*, consistent with the criteria above, to be used by its faculty as a guide to department-specific expectations related to annual, promotion, pre-tenure, tenure, and post-tenure evaluations.

Evaluation of Teaching

While intellectual contributions and professional service are required, valued and rewarded, Columbus State University remains committed to the pursuit of excellence in teaching. As such, particular attention is paid to faculty teaching performance, and excellent performance in research and service cannot compensate for unsatisfactory performance in teaching.

Effective teaching is a necessary condition for satisfactory performance, and will be determined by the department chair based on specific criteria identified in each unit's *Standards of Excellence*.

Documenting teaching effectiveness should focus on both the quality and significance of a faculty member's contributions. Faculty members are encouraged to supplement the required elements to demonstrate superior performance. At a minimum, the evaluation of teaching must include the following components: student evaluation of all courses taught, annual peer or administrative evaluation (as determined at departmental level), and faculty self-assessment. 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 and Peer Evaluations: Student evaluations in all courses taught; student comments and other student feedback; (courses with response rates less than 30% and with fewer than six students may be excluded from the evaluation of teaching); Annual peer evaluation of classroom instruction as determined by departmental guidelines.

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; 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.

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; 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 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

Faculty are expected to be available to students and colleagues, accept appropriate committee assignments, and actively participate in departmental, college, university and university system activities.

Service activities are designed to 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, service should be identified as service 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 are expected to participate in the internal affairs and governance of the department, college, university, and 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 that are 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 application of faculty professional expertise to enhance the local community is encouraged. Community service includes active contributing memberships in area organizations, committee membership/chairperson, board of directors or equivalent, professional services such as speeches, continuing education programs presented, and consulting (both with and without remuneration). Community service consistent with the University's mission. The primary motivation for community service should be the enhancement of the Columbus State University community.