TSYS School of Computer Science
Turner College of Business and Computer Science
Departmental Standards of Excellence for Promotion and Tenure
(October 13, 2011) [revised by Chairperson 12/6/2011]

The school views the education of students as its most important task, and works to encourage excellence in teaching in its entire faculty. We hold good teaching to be our primary standard of excellence. Since all good teaching depends on the mastery of the knowledge of a subject matter, the TSYS School of Computer Science promotes scholarship in its broadest interpretation as its secondary standard of excellence. This scholarship and research may include grant writing, traditional publication in journals, proceedings and conferences, but is also meant to include the development of student research and publications as equally important. Subject matter mastery is also a function of training and development, especially in computer science where new technologies appear quickly. Our faculty must be versatile with a broad range of skills. For this reason, we hold professional development as our third standard of excellence. Finally, we are a department of service. This service encompasses much faculty effort, primarily devoted to our current students, but also includes future students as well as alumnae. The department embraces service to the university as our fourth standard of excellence.

These standards are used in yearly performance evaluations of our faculty. A Faculty Performance Evaluation is included at the end of this document and reflects the specifics of the weights we give to various activities and categories. These yearly standards are also used in matters of promotion and tenure.

In an effort to enhance transparency and fairness, and to provide guidelines for what the College considers to be important to its mission, the following directions for faculty performance are offered. Department chairs should use these guidelines to communicate their expectations to new faculty upon employment.

A checklist is included to provide specific information to faculty to help guide their behaviors; however, it should be noted that the list is not exhaustive and other activities as deemed important by the faculty member and/or the department chair could be included in the annual portfolio under the "other" category. A Likert scale system is used for each category of performance, to provide the faculty a guide to help direct their behaviors while still leaving evaluative discretion for the chairs to recognize performance differences that cannot be incorporated in a checklist. School chair retain the discretion to determine the importance of activities on a faculty member's overall performance rating.

At the end of each calendar year, faculty performance will be evaluated by the school chair. Faculty will submit annual evaluation portfolios to school chairs by January 31 of each year (covering the previous calendar year's accomplishments). An outline for the portfolios can be found in the faculty section of the College's website. Each of the three areas (teaching, research and scholarship, and service) shall be evaluated at five levels of performance: *Exceptional, Exceeds expectations, Satisfactory, Needs Improvement* and *Unsatisfactory.* Because of the importance of teaching to the College's mission, faculty are encouraged to go beyond the requirements of a "Satisfactory" rating in teaching.

Promotion and Tenure
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, research and 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.

Promotion and tenure decisions involve the faculty of the college, department chairs, and the Dean. Reviews should not be capricious, arbitrary, or discriminatory. Due process must be provided.

Concerning the specific matters of promotion and tenure we adopt the criteria specified in the Columbus State University Faculty handbook [106.4, 107.1] and in Board of Regents Policy Manual [BOR 8.3.6, 8.3.7]:

Criteria for Tenure

a. Superior Teaching; demonstrating excellence in instruction

b. Research, Professional development, academic achievement, as appropriate to the mission

c. Outstanding service to the institution, profession, or community

Noteworthy achievement in all three of the above need not be demanded, but should be expected in at least two. A written recommendation should be submitted by the head of the school concerned, setting forth the reasons for tenure. The faculty member's length of service with an institution shall be taken into consideration in determining whether or not the faculty member should be tenured.

A complete discussion of the specific policies and procedures may be found in CSU Faculty Handbook. After meeting the time requirements established by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, faculty may choose to submit their credentials for tenure consideration. Tenure is a requirement for continued employment at Columbus State University. Except for the approved suspension of the probationary period due to a leave of absence, the maximum time that may be served without the award of tenure is seven years. Full-time faculty members who have not been on the tenure track for a minimum of five-year probationary period required by the Board of Regents should not expect to be tenured. At a minimum level, faculty must demonstrate, through the body of their work:, an overall "Exceptional or Exceeds Expectations" rating in two of the three areas (one of which must be teaching), and an overall "Satisfactory" or higher rating in the third area. Through their body of work:, faculty should demonstrate generally positive trends, or consistently high performance, and the potential for long-term effectiveness at the university.

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.

Criteria for Promotion

The following departmental criteria used for promotion shall include:
1. Superior teaching as determined by peer and student evaluation and administrative review.
2. Research and Scholarship;
   - Academic achievement; this shall include scholarly and artistic attainment, as determined by peers and administrative reviewers.
   - Professional growth and development; this shall include contributions to the teaching profession, a scholarly discipline and the overall common educational process, as determined by peers and administrative reviews.
   - Related activities, such as research, addresses, symposia, which may enhance teaching capacity
3. Outstanding service to the institution and the community

Only faculty members holding terminal degrees, or the equivalent in training, ability, and experience, may be considered for promotion. Terminal degrees must come from a university that is fully accredited, or in the absence of a system of accreditation, the university must be internationally recognized. Faculty must also exhibit satisfactory performance in all three areas with demonstrated excellence in two of the three. One of the areas of excellence must be teaching.

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

Assistant Professor – Promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor should be based on demonstrated academic ability and potential for professional growth.

Associate Professor – Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is based on actual performance as well as demonstrated potential for further development. There must be evidence that the individual is growing professionally and is contributing to their field. Additionally, at a minimum faculty must demonstrate, through the body of their work, an overall "Exceeds Expectations" rating in two of the three areas (one of which must be teaching), and an overall "Satisfactory" or higher rating in the third area. 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.

Professor – As the highest academic rank, the title of Professor implies recognition by peers as an outstanding teacher, and an accomplished, productive scholar, both within and outside the university since attaining the rank of Associate Professor. The candidate must have demonstrated, through scholarly peer-reviewed publications, an active research life that contributes to the profession. 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. Additionally, at a minimum faculty must demonstrate, through the body of their work:, an overall "Exceeds Expectations" rating in two of the three areas (one of which must be teaching), and an overall "Satisfactory" or higher rating in the third area, as well as at least two ratings of "exceptional" in teaching, research or service during the relevant period.

Pre-Tenure Review
The College utilizes the Pre-Tenure Review Policy published by Columbus State University (see CSU's Faculty Handbook). The College's annual performance and pretenure review screenings are designed not only to ensure that faculty members are maintaining academic qualifications and continuously

improving, but also to provide guidance to faculty members leading up to promotion and/or tenure application(s).

Post-Tenure Review Policy
The College utilizes the Post-Tenure Review Policy published by Columbus State University (see CSU's Faculty Handbook).

Faculty Performance Evaluation – Policies and Procedures
TSYS School of Computer Science

Policies
Areas of performance evaluated shall be: teaching, scholarship and professional growth, and professional service. Each of the three areas of performance shall be evaluated at five levels of performance: *Exceptional, Exceeds expectations, Satisfactory, Needs Improvement* and *Unsatisfactory.*. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to furnish compelling evidence that a particular rating is deserved in each area of performance.

The Review Standards – Teaching
Faculty will summarize their notable teaching accomplishments in their portfolio and will provide sufficient supplements to demonstrate teaching effectiveness (copies of syllabi, tests, sample projects, student research, experiential activities, advising/mentoring activities, etc.). In addition, faculty will include all student evaluation reports for all courses taught during the calendar year in their portfolios. In order to be in compliance with the University's Promotion and Tenure Standards, these all will be examined during the performance evaluation process and improvement plans will be made for any courses in which the average is judged to be extremely low or reflects a significant decline from the previous years' evaluations for this course,
Additionally, in order to retain the faculty preferred process used in the past faculty will choose the four courses with the highest overall student evaluation ratings and calculate the mean of those evaluation scores and report this in their performance evaluation. For Graduate faculty, a student evaluation report for at least one graduate course should be included in the annual evaluation portfolio mean evaluation calculation. The mean of the highest four evaluations will be used in the evaluation of performance, but all of the student evaluations will be examined and addressed if needed. This is to ensure that a minimum quality level is maintained in all courses. The school chair will consider all of the items listed below in his/her evaluation of overall teaching effectiveness, to include course level and/or content, course delivery format, and course rigor. It is important to note that these items may not carry equal weights. These factors will then be used to rate the faculty member on a five point Likert scale listed below the criterion.

Criterion to be considered for evaluation of teaching:
Basic criterion:
- o Student evaluation ratings
- o Course rigor
- o enhance student learning
- o Appropriate grade distributions
- o Advising
- o Maintenance of course records (assessment, tests etc.)

o Course organization, to include detailed syllabi with clear weekly schedules, due dates, testing dates and well defined grading system

o Workload, as reflected by class size and manual grading of projects and/or essay exams

Activity criterion:
that exceed the standard set by faculty teaching in the discipline. *(Standards should not be relative comparisons with other faculty, but instead should be predetermined for each course by the faculty teaching* in *the discipline. This standard should be communicated to the faculty by the school chair at the beginning of the evaluation period)*

Secondary Requirements:

o New course development

o Application of innovative instructional methods

o Mentoring a student researcher who completes a project and presents the research results at a professional meeting or published the results in a journal

o Supervising one or more internships

o Receipt of an external instructional grant

o Receipt of an internal instructional grant

o Being a finalist for a department, college or university level teaching award

o Winning a department, college or university level teaching award

o Serving as a thesis advisor for a student

o Teaching four or more preparations during the regular academic year

o Assessment activities beyond the satisfactory requirement

o Faculty development activities to improve teaching (includes conferences, workshops, and/or training sessions)

o Other: _____ _

Evaluation scale:

5) Exceptional - A faculty member receiving this rating must have a high teaching evaluation average on their high four classes, accompanied by appropriate course rigor and grade distributions. Syllabi include clear weekly schedules, due dates, testing dates and well defined grading system. The faculty member will engage in several of the activity criteria listed above, indicating a high level of engagement in teaching. This faculty member will be actively involved in course and curriculum development and will participate in any discipline, school or college activities intended to improve program offerings and quality. This faculty member will meet all of the required teaching responsibilities including class meetings, office hours and advising. This faculty member will treat students in a respectful manner, including replying to student emails, voice mail and other communications in a timely manner, posting grades in a reasonable time, providing appropriate feedback to students to accompany their grades and/or making him/her available to any student wishing to discuss their performance.

4) Exceeds Expectations - A faculty member receiving this rating must have a relatively high teaching evaluation average on their high four classes, or evaluations that reflect a marked improvement from past evaluations for the same faculty member, accompanied by appropriate course rigor and grade distributions in nearly all of their classes. Syllabi include clear weekly schedules, due dates, testing dates and well defined grading system. This faculty member will be engaged in at least two of the above listed activity criteria, indicating a moderately high level of engagement in teaching. This faculty member will be involved in course and curriculum development and will participate in any discipline, department or

college activities intended to improve program offerings and quality. This faculty member will meet all of the required teaching responsibilities including class meetings, office hours and advising. This faculty member will usually treat students in a respectful manner, including replying to student emails, voice mail and other communications in a timely manner, posting grades in a reasonable time, providing appropriate feedback to students to accompany their grades and/or making him/her available to any student wishing to discuss their performance.

3). Satisfactory - A faculty member receiving this rating must have a high four teaching evaluation average at or above the average for the same course taught by other faculty members or courses requiring the same level of rigor, and evaluations that reflect consistency in level from past evaluations for the same faculty member, accompanied by appropriate course rigor and grade distributions in the majority of their classes, and no courses that are very lacking in rigor. Syllabi include clear weekly schedules, due dates, testing dates and well defined grading system. This faculty member will be engaged in at least one of the above listed activity criteria, indicating involvement in teaching. This faculty member will be involved in course and curriculum development and will participate in any discipline, department or college activities intended to improve program offerings and quality. This faculty member will meet all of the required teaching responsibilities including class meetings, office hours and advising. This faculty member will generally treat students in a respectful manner, including replying to student emails, voice mail and other communications in a relatively timely manner, posting grades in a reasonable time, providing feedback to students to accompany their grades and/or making him/her available to any student wishing to discuss their performance.

2) Needs improvement - A faculty member receiving this rating has failed to meet one or two of the requirements for satisfactory performance. They may have a teaching evaluation high four average of below the standard established for a "satisfactory rating", or several courses that lack rigor or have inappropriate grading distributions. Syllabi may lack one or more of the following items: weekly schedules, due dates, testing dates or well defined grading system. They also may show little if any effort at updating or improving their courses. They also may show a pattern of failure to respect students through direct interaction or by failing to reply to student emails, voice mail and other communications in a relatively timely manner, post grades in a reasonable time, provide feedback to students to accompany their grades and/or make themself available to any student wishing to discuss their performance.

1)   Unsatisfactory - A faculty member receiving this rating has failed to meet three or more of the requirements for satisfactory performance. They may have a teaching evaluation high four average of below the standard established for a "satisfactory rating", or several courses that lack rigor or have inappropriate grading distributions. Syllabi may lack one or more of the following items: weekly schedules, due dates, testing dates or well defined grading system. They also may show little if any effort at updating or improving their courses. They also may show a pattern of failure to respect students through direct interaction or by failing to reply to student emails, voice mail and other communications in a relatively timely manner, post grades in a reasonable time, provide feedback to students to accompany their grades and/or make themself available to any student wishing to discuss their performance.

The Review Standards – Scholarship and Professional Growth
Faculty must enter all of their intellectual contributions into Digital Measures, making sure that the record is complete (to include published journal articles, conference proceedings, as well as research in

progress). Publications should be classified as "peer-reviewed" or non-peer-reviewed publications, and should further be classified as "discipline-based scholarship" (basic research), "contributions to practice" (applied research), or "pedagogical" in nature. Abstracts of all publications in the past five-year period should be provided in each annual evaluation portfolio. Greater weight will be placed on peer-reviewed publications and activities, but other publications and activities will be considered.

Criterion to be considered for evaluation of Scholarship and Professional Growth:

Basic criterion:
- Maintain current knowledge in the discipline.
- Participate in appropriate continuing education, and attend conferences or workshops.
- Support the efforts of colleagues to carry out academic/scholarly efforts.

Activity criterion:
1. Receive a research grant.
2. Publish a research paper in a refereed journal.
3. Publish a book within the discipline.
4. Author a discipline-related book chapter.
5. Publish a peer-reviewed paper in the proceedings of a discipline-related professional conference.
6. Mentor a graduate researcher who presents the research results at a discipline-related professional conference.
7. Perform editorial work for a scholarly journal or publication.
8. Work on a funded research project.
9. Complete a research project.
10. Orally present research findings at a professional meeting.
11. Attend a discipline-related professional meeting.
12. Attend a continuing education course in the discipline and/or obtain professional certification.
13. Serve as a referee or reviewer for a scholarly publication including conference proceedings.
14. Edit a book related to the discipline.
15. Present a paper in a colloquium.

Evaluation scale for Tenure Track Faculty:
Exceptional - To receive this rating a faculty member must have either multiple peer reviewed activities (e.g. journals, proceedings, grants) or a single peer reviewed activities of exceptional quality. An active stream of research projects under review by high quality outlets may also be considered.

Exceeds expectations - To receive this rating a faculty member must have a peer reviewed activity. The faculty member may also receive this rating by having two or more "other" publications/activities related to their discipline,

Satisfactory - To receive this rating, a faculty member must have an "other publication/activities" published during the year. and at least two peer reviewed activities in the past two years, or a letter indicating that they have a paper under consideration, in revise and resubmit, or accepted by a peer reviewed journal.

Needs improvement - To receive this rating, a faculty member would fail to meet the satisfactory requirements listed above, but would have submitted a weak activity.

Unsatisfactory - To receive this rating, a faculty member would fail to have participated in any scholary activity at the time of review.

The Review Standards – Service
Faculty members will enter all service activities in Digital Measures. Service activities should be classified as "service to the institution," "service to the community," or "other." Any chairmanships or officer positions and/or special duties should be noted. Faculty should also indicate the amount of time committed to each service obligation during the evaluation year. Supporting materials should be included in the portfolio. Examples of supporting materials include thank you letters, meeting minutes, committee reports, or other relevant documents.

Basic criterion:
1. Regular participation with active involvement in all school committees and meetings when appropriate.
2. Assumption of a fair share of the school's advising responsibilities.
3. Support the responsible execution of school service activities.
4. Collaborate with university faculty, staff and students in internally-based community outreach programs.

Activity criterion:
1. Chair a university committee.
2. Chair a college committee.
3. Contribute to regional professional activities related to the discipline.
4. Contribute to national professional activities related to the discipline.
5. Contribute to international professional activities related to the discipline.
6. Chair a department level committee with significant workload.
7. Coordinate curriculum development that has significant impact on an academic program.
8. Serve as faculty advisor for student organizations or activities.
9. Provide significant community or institutional service relating to the discipline.
10. Provide administrative support for the department.

Evaluation scale for Tenure Track Faculty:
5) Exceptional - To receive this rating, a faculty member must exhibit significant leadership in their service activities. This could include acting as chair to one or more major university, college or department committees with significant time demands, multiple chairmanships of lesser committees and acting as faculty advisor to student organizations and active participation as a member on several other committees (the specific number depends on time commitment to the committees, (faculty senate requires more time and energy than who's who, as an example). Other activities could include major roles in professional organizations such as presiding as an officer in a national or regional academic professional organization, serving as program or track chair for a regional, national or international conference, or active participation in local professional organizations in field, membership on boards of directors or other professional service activities as approved by the department chair.

4) Exceeds Expectations - To receive this rating, a faculty member must exhibit leadership in their service activities. This could include serving as chair of one or more college committees that meet one or more times per year, or serving as chair on multiple committees while serving on a lesser number of

committees as an active member. Other activities could include major roles in professional organizations such as presiding as an officer in a national or regional academic professional organization, serving as program or track chair for a regional, national or international conference, active participation in local professional organizations in field, membership on boards of directors or other professional service activities as approved by the department chair.

3) Satisfactory – To receive this rating, a faculty member must exhibit active participation in service activities. While this need not include service as a chair, this does require active participation on committees and subcommittees the faculty member is on. The quantity of committees the faculty member is on will depend on the time commitment to the committee. Other activities could include major roles in professional organizations such as presiding as an officer in a national or regional academic professional organization, serving as program or track chair for a regional, national or international conference, active participation in local professional organizations in field, membership on boards of directors or other professional service activities as approved by the department chair.

2) Needs improvement - To receive this rating a faculty member will be a passive or reluctant participant in their service activities. This may be reflected by participation in a small number of committees, particularly those with a low service time expectation. This may also be reflected through a pattern of missing committee meetings, or through passive attendance without engaging fully in the committee's charge.

1) Unsatisfactory - To receive this rating, a faculty member would engage in little to no service activities, or only in activities that are unrelated to their field or the interests of the college and university.

Procedures

Materials submitted by faculty for annual performance evaluation shall include
- Annual Faculty Evaluation Cover Sheet (with percentages)
- CSU's *Faculty Professional Development Plan*, completed to reflect goals and emphases for the upcoming year,
- a Portfolio,
- and a CV (in Digital Measures).

1. The *Faculty Professional Development Plan* shall include three percentages, one for each of the evaluation areas:
- percentages shall total 100%
- percentages shall represent the relative emphasis the faculty member plans to give to each of the three areas
- percentages shall have the following lower and upper bounds:
    - Teaching: 50% - 80%
    - Professional Growth and Development: 10% - 40%
    - Service: 10% - 30%

2. The Portfolio shall provide the basis on which the faculty evaluation is conducted, It shall include three sections, one for each of the three areas of evaluation, each with the following content:
   a. Teaching
- Required materials (organized by course)
    - One-two page Narrative describing teaching accomplishments, including discussion of improvements made/planned based on student & peer evaluations
    - Copies of summaries of numerical student evaluations for selected courses (in Digital Measures)
    - Copies of course syllabi/outlines for all courses (in Digital Measures / Department Files)
    - Sample Copies of exams and other assessments for those selected courses
- Additional materials may include, but are not limited to
    - A list of courses taught each semester, noting new preparations and new course creations (Could be part of Narrative)
    - Copies of course assignments
    - Copies of handouts
    - Copies of graded exams
    - Peer evaluations of course materials
    - Peer evaluations of course delivery
    - Written student feedback
    - For *new courses developed*, a course outline along with a narrative or supplemental materials that describe the faculty member's contribution in the development of the course
    - For *the application of innovative instructional methods*, a course outline along with a narrative or supplemental materials that describe the faculty member's contribution in the application of the method, along with a thorough discussion on the evaluation of the new method
    - Copies of grant proposal submissions along with a description of the role of the faculty member in the preparation of the proposal (just abstract)

b. Scholarship, Professional Development
- Required materials
  - One-two page Narrative describing Scholarship, Professional Growth and Development accomplishments
  - Copies of peer-reviewed publications or works accepted for publication but not yet published (just abstract)
- Additional materials may include, but are not limited to
  - Copies of papers submitted but not yet accepted (just abstract)
  - Copies of grant proposal submissions along with a description of the role of the faculty member in the preparation of the proposal (just abstract)
  - For continuing education courses, a description of the course and its value to the faculty member (could be included in Narrative)

c. Service
- Required materials
  - One-two page Narrative describing Service activities
  - A list of all department, college and university committees on which the faculty member has served (in Digital Measures)

- Additional materials may include, but are not limited to
  - A list of professional conference program committee memberships. (in Digital Measures)
  - Copies of lists of professional conference reviewers. (in Digital Measures)

Wherever appropriate, Web links to access the above material may be provided instead of hard copies.

The procedure begins with each faculty member preparing a portfolio reflecting activities in the three designated areas for the given calendar year. Consistent with university policy, it is expected that each faculty take the responsibility for presenting a case for performance ratings in each of the three categories.

Timelines and deliverables for the procedure:

Due Date	Deliverable	Activity
February 15th	Faculty Portfolio	Faculty submit portfolios to school chair.
Mar. 8-19th	Chair Assessment of Portfolios	Chair takes two weeks to assess faculty portfolios; reports to faculty should include a rating for each category along with comments reflecting on any unusually noteworthy performances.
March 31st	Letter of Annual Review from Chair	Chair writes performance review letters for faculty; chair meets with faculty to discuss contents of letter.