

Turner College of Business and Computer Science
Department of Accounting and Finance
Department of Management and Marketing
Departmental Standards of Excellence
Effective January 2012

This document communicates the department's expectations of tenure-track faculty as relevant to annual performance reviews, pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.

Areas of Review

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

Annual Performance Evaluation Standards

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.

At the end of each calendar year, faculty performance will be evaluated by the department chair. Faculty will submit annual evaluation portfolios to department 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 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.

1. 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 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 below a 3.75 or reflects a decline of more than 0.5 from the previous years' evaluations for this course and instructor. 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 portfolio. For Graduate faculty, a student evaluation report for at least one graduate course should be included in the mean evaluation calculation. The mean 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 department 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.

Rating	Requirements
Exceptional	Meet all requirements for the rating of “Exceeds Expectations” and have extensive additional engagement in teaching as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work load • Innovation in instructional development • Professional development related to teaching • Assessment/AOL beyond what is required • Advising, mentoring or recruiting students • Higher student evaluations • Other similar activities
Exceeds Expectations	Meet all requirements for the rating of “Satisfactory” and have additional engagement as evidenced by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Work load b. Innovation in instructional development c. Professional development related to teaching d. Assessment/AOL beyond what is required e. Advising, mentoring or recruiting students f. Higher student evaluations g. Other similar activities
Satisfactory	Must satisfy all of the following requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comply with university system and university policies such as attendance, academic dishonesty, and meeting classes. • Have student evaluations that are satisfactory given the discipline, course level and rigor as identified by the department chair. • Course rigor appropriate for a course of the level (lower division, upper division, graduate) and type. • A grading distribution appropriate for the type and level of course. • Meet the college’s office hour policy. • Submit detailed syllabi in acceptable format to the department chair in a timely manner. • Submit summaries of all student evaluation forms. • Submit required annual assessment activities. • Cover required course content as demonstrated through artifacts and other relevant data (e.g. examples of tests, student projects, course management techniques, and/or other student feedback. • Fulfill student advising/mentoring responsibilities. • Faculty member will treat students in a respectful manner, including replying to student emails, voicemail 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 himself/herself available to any student wishing to discuss their performance.
Needs Improvement	Failure to meet one or two of the standards for satisfactory.
Unsatisfactory	Failure to meet three or more of the standards for satisfactory.

2. Research: 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). Journal publications should be classified as "peer-reviewed" (most acceptable journals appear in Cabell's), 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. Complete copies (in the publication format) of all journal articles published in the past five-year period should be provided in each annual evaluation portfolio. Greater weight will be placed on peer-reviewed journal publications, but other publications will be considered. Faculty are encouraged to include (in their portfolios) any available information indicating the impact of their research.

Rating	Requirements
Exceptional	Multiple refereed journal articles or one in a high quality journal.
Exceeds Expectations	A peer reviewed journal publication or at least two other approved publications or activities related to the discipline that have a reasonable expectation of maintaining AQ/PQ status.
Satisfactory	Meets the college's standard for academically qualified (AQ) or professionally qualified (PQ) with documented proof of intellectual engagement in the year of review.
Needs Improvement	Meets the college's standard for academically qualified or professionally qualified but cannot demonstrate intellectual activity over the evaluation period.
Unsatisfactory	Does not meet the college's standard for academically qualified or professionally qualified.

3. 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 meeting minutes, committee reports, or other relevant documents.

Rating	Requirements
Exceptional	Exhibiting leadership and significant time commitment relative to rank.
Exceeds Expectations	Exhibiting leadership or significant time commitment relative to rank.
Satisfactory	Active engagement in service as measured by time and/or impact.
Needs Improvement	Lack of participation in service assignments as demonstrated by failure to attend meetings or fulfill other service responsibilities.
Unsatisfactory	Not engaged in service.

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 pre-tenure 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).

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, 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.

Criteria for Tenure

A complete discussion of the specific policies and procedures may be found in the 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 will need to maintain AQ status to be considered for tenure. However, simply maintaining AQ status may not be sufficient for a positive tenure decision. Additionally, at a minimum 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

Only faculty members holding terminal degrees, or the equivalent in training, ability, or 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, 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). At a minimum level, faculty will need to maintain AQ status to be considered for promotion.

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

Associate Professor - 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. 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 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 peer reviewed publications, applied research, 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. 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.