

Standards for Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

Department of Mathematics and Philosophy

As approved on September 29, 2011

Introduction

This document incorporates all of the rules and procedures detailed in the tenure and promotion policies for the College of Letters and Sciences, whether or not they are specifically cited or directly quoted below. However, it also contains policies that may be unique to the Department of Mathematics and Philosophy, including criteria that may exceed the minimal standards described in the college-wide document.

Promotion and Tenure

Promotion and Tenure Procedures

The tenure and promotion policies for the College of Letters and Sciences details approved university policies and procedures for applying for tenure and promotion. Faculty members should familiarize themselves with the details. In the event that changes to the policies for the university and the College of Letters and Sciences prove inconsistent with department policies and procedures, the policies for the university and the College of Letters and Sciences will prevail.

Requirements for Promotion and Tenure

In the evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure, three categories of activity will be considered:

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

It is expected that teaching activities will hold the first priority of all department faculty. To receive the department's recommendation for promotion and/or tenure, a candidate must exhibit satisfactory performance in all three areas and must have

- Demonstrated evidence of excellence and evidence of a commitment to the pursuit of excellence in two of three areas (one must be teaching) while holding her/his rank
- Demonstrated evidence of peer reviewed publication(s) in national or international peer-reviewed journals or peer reviewed proceedings or published book(s) by a respected academic or university press while holding her/his rank at Columbus State University.

Requirements for Promotion for Full-time, non-tenure track faculty

Teaching activities are the primary duties of lecturers in the department. Their teaching performance will be evaluated on the same departmental standards as tenure-track faculty. Lecturers are not eligible for the award of tenure. Lecturers who have served for a period of at least six (6) years at Columbus State University may be considered for promotion to senior lecturer. To receive the department's recommendation for promotion to senior lecturer, a lecturer must have demonstrated exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the university.

Annual Evaluations

Annual evaluations will be utilized to monitor the faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion. 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 increase. The Annual Performance Review may be appealed. A faculty dissatisfied with the evaluation should appeal his or her Annual Performance Review to the Dean. This appeal, accompanied by rationale and documentation of the exact nature of the complaint must be made in writing and must be made within ten working days of the completion of the departmental review process.

Criteria for Evaluating Teaching

Recent student evaluations are a required source of input for the assessment of teaching, but these will not serve as the sole basis for the evaluation; a predefined score will not be used to evaluate teaching. Student evaluations should be accompanied with evidence that the faculty member maintains rigorous academic standards and that substantial student learning has been achieved. Faculty should use the standardized evaluation form provided by the university and approved by the Faculty Senate. Faculty may use an alternate form, the structure of which to be agreed upon by the department chair prior to its use.

Faculty members must submit a teaching portfolio which includes at least the following.

- Grade distributions (provided to the chair by Academic Affairs)
- Course syllabi
- Number of courses taught; number of preparations
- Sample exams or graded exams and projects
- Student evaluations in all courses taught (courses with response rates less than 30% of the enrollments of the courses after the drop/add date and courses with fewer than six students may be excluded from the evaluation of teaching)
- Faculty self-assessment

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

- Class materials that would provide evidence of effective pedagogy
- Evidence that instructor has developed innovative course materials
- Peer evaluations of teaching by tenured faculty based on classroom observation for pre-tenure review, tenure or promotion applications
- Descriptions of new preparations; new course developments; new delivery methods
- Descriptions of faculty development activities in teaching such as teaching seminars and workshops; training or research related to alternative delivery methods; pedagogical enhancements; and maintaining currency in teaching field
- Evidence that the instructor has effectively assumed a difficult teaching assignment. The difficulty may arise from the subject matter, the audience involved, or both
- Evidence that the instructor has successfully directed a student research project or an independent study project of high quality, which resulted in a publication or presentation
- Evidence that the instructor has implemented one or more elements of the CSU Quality Enhancement Plan in a course
- Evidence that the instructor has prepared students for local, regional or national competitions
- Evidence that a part time instructor has participated in departmental efforts to assess and improve core courses with which the faculty member has been involved

Satisfactory. Meeting expectations in this category requires *all* of the following.

- Providing a suitable written response to widespread or significant concerns raised by student feedback, if appropriate. The department chair may require a written response to presented written evidence if it is deemed appropriate.
- Documenting that at least some students have responded enthusiastically to the instructor's teaching through evidence such as student evaluations or other written feedback from students
- Clear communication of course objectives, learning outcomes, policies, and grading criteria as demonstrated on course syllabi
- Participation in departmental efforts to assess major programs with which the faculty member is involved
- Evidence of assessment of student learning outcomes for each course (all common student learning outcomes must be assessed in core courses)
- Full-time faculty only: At least three office hours per week and adequate availability to students for assistance

Excellent. Meeting expectations in this category requires all criteria for the satisfactory rating along with other achievements which demonstrate evidence of excellence and evidence of a commitment to the pursuit of excellence in effective and quality classroom teaching.

Criteria for Evaluating Research, and Scholarly or Creative Engagement

All full time faculty members, including lecturers and senior lecturers, are expected to undertake continuous professional growth and development and to participate in appropriate faculty training activities. Appropriate activities should be established through consultation by the faculty member with the department chair and communicated yearly through a written professional development plan.

Satisfactory. The faculty member is expected to maintain a level of expertise sufficient to carry out his/her assigned work in a credible and competent manner. Tenured and tenure track faculty are expected to attend professional meetings, workshops or short courses on a biennial basis, while annually engaging in at least one of the following activities.

- Conducting ongoing research or acquiring and assimilating knowledge for a new research project
- Submission of a paper for publication in a discipline-related journal
- Submission of discipline-related book manuscript for publication
- Presentation of one's scholarly work at a professional meeting or in a colloquium
- Successful completion of professional exams
- Significant, independent study of a discipline-related subject outside one's established expertise
- Submitting an external grant proposal as a PI or co-Pi that will support research efforts or the teaching mission of the university
- Receiving the award of an internal grant as PI or co-Pi to support the faculty member's in-discipline research
- Receiving the award of an internal grant as PI or co-Pi to support the teaching mission of the university
- Editing work for a scholarly journal or publication¹
- Serving as a referee for a scholarly publication¹
- Scholarship that promotes and improves student learning and achievement in K-12 schools and in the university (Section 4.03.02 of the USG Academic AA Handbook).

Excellent. To obtain this rating, the faculty member must successfully engage in external, peer reviewed work. Examples of such activities include:

- Notification of acceptance for publication of an in-discipline manuscript from a peer reviewed journal or peer reviewed proceedings (notification of acceptance for publication must be included in documentation.)
- Publication of a book within one's discipline
- Significant awards for scholarly work done during the reviewed year
- Notification of the award of an external grant as PI or co-Pi to support the faculty member's in-discipline research

¹ Faculty members may choose this activity either for Research, and Scholarly or Creative Engagement category or for Service to the Institution, Profession and Community category, but not for both.

- Notification of the award of an external grant as PI or co-Pi to support the teaching mission of the university

Criteria for Evaluating Service to the Institution, Profession and Community

Satisfactory. In order to achieve a satisfactory rating in this category, faculty members must abide by committee charges, and policies and procedures when serving on departmental, college, or institutional level committees, and regularly participate in departmental meetings and sponsored events. Except for first year faculty, tenured and tenure track faculty are expected to engage in at least one of the following:

- Service on a College, Senate, or Institutional committee or task force
- Acting as Chair of at least one department level committee
- Conducting community outreach activities that involve the faculty member's expertise
- Serving as an officer or official departmental representative in a professional organization related to the discipline
- Working on a grant that would directly support the teaching mission of the university
- Providing support work for a grant that supports the teaching mission of the university
- Conducting workshops or seminars that substantially enhance teaching within the department
- Lead departmental efforts to assess major programs with which the faculty member is involved
- Lead departmental efforts to assess and improve multi-section courses with which the faculty member has been involved
- Collaboration with public schools to strengthen teaching quality and to increase student learning (see Section 4.03.02 of the USG Academic Affairs Handbook).
- Faculty advisor for an active student organization
- Editing work for a scholarly journal or publication²
- Serving as a referee for a scholarly publication²
- Review of text books

Excellent. In order to achieve an excellent rating in this category, faculty members must satisfactorily perform at least one of following roles:

- Chair of the CSU Invitational Math Tournament
- Coordinator of the math tournament tests
- Chair of an Institutional Committee
- Chair of a department search, curriculum, or personnel committee
- Coordinating curriculum developments that have a demonstrably significant impact on the academic program

² Faculty members may choose this activity either for Research, and Scholarly or Creative Engagement category or for Service to the Institution, Profession and Community category, but not for both.

- Taking major responsibility for developing new academic degree programs
- Other significant efforts that entail comparable commitments/achievements and are of value to the institution