

TSYS School of Computer Science Standards of Excellence for Faculty

The TSYS School of Computer Science adheres to three principal standards of excellence for guiding faculty development, annual evaluation of performance, and promotion and tenure: teaching, scholarship and research, and service.

The TSYS School of Computer Science views the education of our students as its most important task, and holds good teaching to be its primary standard of excellence. We are dedicated to supporting our students for success during their matriculation as well as post-graduation. This support extends beyond the traditional expectations of a faculty member in the categories of teaching, research, and service by embedding elements of high-impact practices (HIPs) in teaching, supporting student research, publicly engaged scholarship and experiential learning. Since all good teaching depends on the mastery of subject matter knowledge, the School promotes scholarship in its broadest interpretation as its secondary standard of excellence. This scholarship and research may include publications in journals, proceedings and conferences as well as active participation in research projects and grant-related activities. Our faculty must be versatile with a broad range of skills and maintain currency in their teaching and research. For this reason, we hold professional development as an important ingredient in their efforts to excel in both teaching and research. We are a School of service. This service encompasses faculty efforts to serve our students, the institution, the profession and the community. The School embraces service as our third standard of excellence.

Annual Performance Review of Faculty

At the end of each calendar year, faculty performance will be evaluated by the School Chair. Faculty will submit to the School Chair, by February 1 of each year, their portfolio covering the previous calendar year's accomplishments.

Areas of Review

1. Teaching
2. Scholarship and research
3. Service to the institution, profession, and community

Each of the three areas listed above will 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.

The Review Standards – Teaching

Faculty will summarize their notable teaching accomplishments in *Faculty Success* and will provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate teaching effectiveness and learner satisfaction. Supporting documentation may include: copies of syllabi, tests, sample projects, evidence of active learning, incorporation of technology, etc. In addition, faculty will include the syllabi and all student evaluation reports for courses taught during the calendar year in their portfolios. Additionally, 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. Courses used in this calculation should have at least ten registered students. For graduate faculty, a student evaluation report for at least one graduate course should be included. Course evaluation reports will be examined during the performance evaluation process and improvement plans will be made for any course in which the evaluation average is unacceptably low or reflects a significant decline from the previous years' evaluation for this course and instructor. To ensure that a minimum quality level is maintained across all courses, all of the student evaluations will be examined and addressed if needed. To assist with the evaluation of course rigor, the distribution of grades for all courses taught during the assessment period should be included in the portfolio.

The School Chair will consider all of the items listed below in their evaluation of overall teaching effectiveness. It is important to note that these items may not carry equal weights.

Faculty Teaching Performance Ratings	
Rating	Requirements
Exceptional	Meets all requirements for the rating of “Exceeds Expectations” and have extensive additional engagement in teaching as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Development of innovative instructional design, delivery or assessment method ● High overall teaching evaluation average accompanied by overall positive written feedback from students across all courses ● Engagement in more than two of the other similar activities listed below
Exceeds Expectations	Meets all requirements for the rating of “Satisfactory” and have additional engagement as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Workload, as reflected by total student credit hours and manual grading of assignments, projects and exams ● Evidence-based (e.g., QM certification) improvement in course design and delivery ● Professional development (e.g., completion of training, certification, participation in workshops) related to teaching ● Involvement in course and curriculum development and/or activities intended to improve program offerings and quality (e.g., involvement in curriculum committees, task groups). ● Relatively high teaching evaluations average ● Engagement in one to two of the other similar activities listed below
Satisfactory	Satisfies all of the following requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Compliance with the university system and university policies related to student attendance of classes, academic honesty, and class meetings ● Student evaluations that are satisfactory, given the discipline, course level, and rigor

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Course rigor appropriate for the course level (lower-division, upper-division, graduate) and type ● Actionable course learning outcomes and assessment activities aligned with the learning outcomes ● Clear weekly schedules, due dates, test dates and well-defined assessment and grading policies ● Grades distribution appropriate for the type and level of course ● Office hours published in course syllabi and follows the School's office hour policy ● Treating students in a respectful manner, including replying to student emails, voicemail and other communications in a timely manner, posting grades in a reasonable time, providing feedback to students to accompany their grades, and addressing any student concerns about the course or their performance by making themselves available to the students for discussions.
Needs Improvement	Failure to meet any one or two of the standards requirements for the "Satisfactory" rating.
Unsatisfactory	Failure to meet three or more of the standards requirements for the "Satisfactory" rating.

Other Similar Activities:

- Development and teaching of a new course
- Teaching two or more new preparations during the regular academic year
- Teaching four or more preparations during the regular academic year
- Application of innovative instructional methods
- Receipt of an external instructional grant
- Receipt of an internal instructional grant
- Being a finalist for a department, college or university level teaching award
- Winning a university-level or college-level teaching award, or being the college nominee for a university level teaching award
- Inclusion of collaborative assignments or projects in courses
- Mentoring of undergraduate research
- Teaching Independent Studies courses
- Supervision of internships
- Inclusion of a writing assignment in a course
- Supervision of graduate theses
- Mentoring of graduate capstone projects

The Review Standards – Scholarship and Research

**This criterion does not apply for teaching only faculty.*

Faculty will enter details of all their research and scholarly achievements and activities (to include published articles in journals or conference proceedings, grants and involvement in research projects) during the year of review in *Faculty Success*. Journal publications should be classified as "peer-reviewed", or "non-peer-reviewed". Complete copies (in the publication format) of all journal articles published during the annual review period should be included in the portfolio. Greater weight will be placed on peer-reviewed journal publications, but other publications will also be considered. The month and year of award of any grant and its duration should be included along with the proof of submission of any unsuccessful grant proposals.

Faculty Scholarship and Research Ratings	
Rating	Requirements
Exceptional	Meets all requirements for the rating of "Exceeds Expectations" and have extensive additional engagement in scholarship and research as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two or more peer-reviewed journal articles or papers in peer-reviewed professional conference proceedings • Involvement in more than two of the other similar activities listed below
Exceeds Expectations	Meets all requirements for the "Satisfactory" rating and have additional engagement as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A peer-reviewed journal paper or a paper in peer-reviewed professional conference proceedings during the year of review, or at least two such publications during the previous three years • Involvement in one to two of the other similar activities listed below
Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documented evidence of at least one research and scholarly activity during the year of review (may include evidence of journal or conference papers submitted, any internal or external grant proposal submitted, conference presentations). • Documented efforts that help maintain current knowledge in the discipline (serving as thesis examiners, invited speakers or panel members; participation in discipline-related continuing education or workshops)
Needs Improvement	Failure to meet one of the standards requirements for the "Satisfactory" rating
Unsatisfactory	Failure to meet both of the standards requirements for the "Satisfactory" rating.

Other Similar Activities:

- Award of a competitive external research grant
- Publication of a book within the discipline
- Publication of a discipline-related book chapter
- Work on a funded research project
- Completion of a research project
- Oral presentation of research findings at a professional conference
- Attend a discipline-related professional meeting
- Attend a continuing education course in the discipline and/or obtain professional certification
- Presentation of a paper at a colloquium

The Review Standards – Service

Faculty members will enter all service activities in *Faculty Success*. Service activities should be classified as "Service to the Department," "Service to the College," and "Service to the Community," "Service to the Profession", or "other." Any chair 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 may be included in the portfolio. Examples of supporting materials include meeting minutes, committee reports, or other relevant documents.

Faculty Service Ratings	
Rating	Requirements
Exceptional	Meet all requirements for the rating of “Exceeds Expectations” and have extensive additional engagement in service as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Exhibiting leadership and significant time commitment relative to rank ● Engaged in more than two of the other similar activities listed below
Exceeds Expectations	Meet all requirements for the rating of “Satisfactory” and have additional engagement as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Exhibiting leadership or significant time commitment relative to rank. ● Engaged in one to two of the other similar activities listed below
Satisfactory	Active engagement in service as measured by time and/or impact that can be demonstrated by. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Regular participation with active involvement in all assigned committees and meetings when appropriate as demonstrated by time committed and any accomplishments (e.g., involvement in a task group, special responsibility) ● Collaborate with university faculty, staff, and students in community outreach programs and recruitment events.
Needs Improvement	Lack of participation in service assignments as demonstrated by failure to attend meetings or reluctance to be actively engaged
Unsatisfactory	Not engaged in any service activity related to the discipline or the interests of the Department, College and University.

Other Similar Activities:

- Chairing a University committee
- Chairing a College committee
- Chairing a Department-level committee
- Contribution to regional professional activities related to the discipline
- Contribution to national professional activities related to the discipline
- Contribution to international professional activities related to the discipline
- Coordination of curriculum development that has a significant impact on an academic program.
- Mentoring of student clubs
- Mentoring of students for competitions
- Editorial work for a scholarly journal or publication related to the discipline
- Review of a scholarly publication including a conference proceedings paper
- Significant community service

Pre-Tenure Review

The Turner 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 the promotion and/or tenure application(s).

Post-Tenure Review

The Turner 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 the 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 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 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 the five-year probationary period required by the Board of Regents should not expect to be tenured.

At a minimum level, faculty will need to 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. The ratings in each area will be based on faculty performance during the previous five or more years during their appointment in the School of Computer Science. 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 necessarily 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 that extend beyond the 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 areas (one of which must be teaching) during the previous five or more years during their appointment in the School of Computer Science. A complete discussion of the specific policies and procedures may be found in the CSU [Faculty Handbook](#).

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

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

Associate Professor - Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is based upon actual performance as well as the 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 (1) research or creative activity; (2) university, public or professional service; (3) 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.

Annual Portfolio Submission and Review Procedures

The Turner College follows the timeline for annual reviews set by the University, usually from January to March. Faculty members will enter all activities in *Faculty Success*, and provide an annual portfolio that documents their effectiveness in teaching, scholarship and research, and service. Portfolios are usually due by February 1 of each year. Faculty members will submit their portfolios in *Faculty Success* for evaluation. The portfolio should document activities for the prior calendar year (January-December) including any supporting evidence. It should also describe their goals for the following year for each of the areas of teaching, scholarship and research, service.

The School Chair will evaluate portfolios based on the Standards of Excellence approved by the Department. The Chair will rate and provide a narrative for teaching, research and scholarship, and service for the faculty member. They will also review the faculty goals for the following year and provide feedback. The evaluation may be revised based on the faculty member's response to it and subsequent discussion between the faculty member and the Chair, before it is forwarded to the Dean.

Last revised on February 14, 2022

Faulty Signature Page

I have read the 2022 School of Computer Science Standards of Excellence policy document and I approve it.

Name	Signature
Lixin Wang	
Yesem Kurt Peker	
Yi Zhou	
Suk Jin Lee	
Rania Hodhod	<i>Rania Hodhod</i>
Hyrum Carroll	
Riduan Abid	
Alfredo J Perez	
Lydia Ray	
Jianhua Yang	
Rodrigo A. Obando	<i>Rodrigo A. Obando</i>
Linqiang Ge	<i>Linqiang Ge</i>
Elke Brumbaugh	<i>Elke Brumbaugh</i>

Anastasia Angelopoulou

Anastasia Angelopoulou

Neal L Rogers

Neal L Rogers

Patrick Aiken

Patrick Aiken
