

Department of Earth and Space Sciences

*Standards of Excellence (revised 2021-
2022; submitted Jan. 2022)*

Introduction

The Department of Earth and Space Sciences (ESS) in the College of Letters and Sciences is a multidisciplinary department that includes faculty with expertise in archaeology and anthropology, astronomy, atmospheric science, engineering, environmental science, geology, hydrology, physics, robotics, and science education. Faculty in these areas contribute to a number of programs, including: the BS Earth and Space Sciences degree with concentrations in Astrophysics and Planetary Geology, Environmental Science, Geology, and Secondary Education; a BS/MS Robotics Engineering degree; an AS Engineering Studies degree offered in tandem with the Regents Engineering Pathway Program (REPP); a Robotics Certificate; and minors in Anthropology, Astronomy, Environmental Science, Physics and Geology. Some faculty also contribute to the Environmental Science and Geoscience concentrations of the MS Natural Sciences; a BS/MS degree in Environmental Science; a collaborative program offered in the College of Letters and Sciences through the Departments of Chemistry, Biology and Earth & Space Sciences.

A number of ESS faculty have various administrative and outreach assignments established by the university (e.g. through the Coca-Cola Space Science Center and CSU's UTeach program). Expectations for teaching loads and other areas are therefore subject to the terms of these existing assignments. A faculty member may, for example, have a 50% teaching obligation to account for administrative duties, and therefore *Teaching Excellence* will be evaluated on that 50% workload.

The primary responsibility of the department's faculty is teaching, and emphasis is placed on *Teaching Effectiveness* when evaluating faculty performance. However, ESS also values faculty research and professional development, especially when performed in conjunction with undergraduate and graduate education; and therefore, faculty are also evaluated on *Research and Scholarly Activities*. ESS also recognizes the importance of faculty participation in departmental, college, university, professional and

community activities as a vital part of higher education, with *Service* making up the third component in evaluations of faculty performance.

Criteria (defined below) outlined in ESS Standards of Excellence are divided into three categories. **Basic criteria** are essential activities in which all ESS faculty should be engaged on an annual basis. Basic criteria, therefore, describes the minimum expectations of the department for every faculty member. Differences in faculty assignment (e.g. administrative roles as above) may justify deviations from these minimum criteria, but will be agreed upon in advance by the faculty member and chair/dean. **Meritorious criteria** describe faculty activities above and beyond those outlined as Basic criteria and demonstrate excellence while advancing the goals of the department, college, and university. It is important to note that annual evaluations and Tenure and Promotion decisions may reflect not only the number of criteria met or not met, but may also reflect the nature of the activity which meets any given criterion. Therefore, **Excellent criteria** describe faculty activities above and beyond those considered Meritorious. For example, several published articles or “equivalents” may be considered Meritorious, but a single published article in a top-tier journal may be considered Excellent. The relative weights of these criteria in tenure and promotion considerations are defined below.

Glossary of terms

- a. **Candidate** - The faculty member who is undergoing annual review or being evaluated for tenure, promotion or post tenure review.
- b. **Criteria** - These are the three levels of achievement that will be assessed during the annual review process. Examples include Basic, Meritorious, and Excellent (as defined below).
 - a. **Basic** - The essential activities in which all ESS faculty members should be engaged on an annual basis. Basic criteria, therefore, describes the minimum expectations of the department for every faculty member.
 - b. **Meritorious** - Describes faculty activities above and beyond Basic criteria that demonstrate evidence of additional work that advances the goals of the department, college, and university.
 - c. **Excellent** - Describes faculty activities that go far beyond the Basic criteria, and demonstrates evidence of work that exceeds the expectations of Basic and (some) Meritorious contributions that advance the goals of the department, college, and university
- d. **Ratings** - The assessment result that is applied separately to *Teaching Excellence*; *Research and Scholarly Activities*; and *Service* (see Table 1).
 - i. **Unsatisfactory** - the rating a faculty member receives if they meet fewer than 50% of the Basic criteria utilized for annual evaluation.
 - ii. **Needs Improvement** - the rating a faculty member receives if they meet greater than 50% but not all of the Basic criteria utilized for annual evaluation.
 - iii. **Satisfactory** - the rating a faculty member receives if they meet all of the Basic criteria but they do not meet Exceeds Expectations utilized for annual evaluation.
 - iv. **Exceeds Expectation** - the rating a faculty member receives if they meet all of the Basic criteria for annual evaluation, and has met at least two (2) Meritorious criteria, **or** one (1) or more Excellent criteria.

- v. **Far Exceeds Expectation** - the rating a faculty member receives if they meet all of the Basic criteria for annual evaluation, and has completed two (2) **or** more Meritorious requirements, **and** at least one (1) Excellent criteria.
- e. Peer-reviewed Publication - A peer-reviewed publication, as used in this document, refers to a scholarly work that has been subjected to the scrutiny of those within the discipline and has been accepted as a significant contribution to that discipline. Depending on the discipline, peer-reviewed publications may include:
- i. primary or co-authorship of an article in a peer-reviewed journal;
 - ii. primary authorship of a peer-reviewed, published abstract and corresponding presentation at a major conference;
 - iii. authorship of a discipline-related book published by a recognized academic publisher;
 - iv. research which leads to publication of a technical report under the auspices of a governmental agency, private entity, or nonprofit organization;
 - v. notable contributions to a published scientific dataset (e.g. astronomical catalog, geologic database) in combination with evidence that this dataset is of high impact to the scholarly discipline in question;
 - vi. Non-English language, peer-reviewed work published in nations other than the U.S.A.

Criteria for Annual Evaluation

Teaching Excellence

Teaching is the core mission of this institution and Columbus State University has a long history of excellence in teaching. The continued pursuit of excellence in Teaching Effectiveness is the primary goal of CSU and the Department of Earth and Space Sciences.

The Teaching Excellence of candidates will be evaluated annually based on several ranking criteria (listed below): **Basic** requirements (mandatory), **Meritorious** accomplishments, and **Excellent** contributions. These criteria will then be used to assess the candidate's overall rating for Teaching Excellence. A candidate can receive one of five possible ratings: Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Satisfactory, Exceeds Expectations, or Far Exceeds Expectations. These ratings are assigned based on the guidelines described in the Glossary of Terms and summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Basic, Meritorious, and Excellent criteria rules for the 5 level ESS evaluation rating system. To receive a rating of Satisfactory, Exceeds Expectations, or Far Exceeds Expectations faculty are required to successful completion of all Basic criteria.

	Criteria		
Rating	Basic	Meritorious	Excellent
Unsatisfactory	< 50% of criteria met	No criteria apply	No criteria apply
Needs Improvement	50 - 99% of criteria met	No criteria apply	No criteria apply

Satisfactory	All criteria met	No criteria met	No criteria met
Exceeds Expectations	All criteria met	≥ 2 criteria met	OR ≥ 1 criteria met
Far Exceeds Expectations	All criteria met	≥ 2 criteria met	AND ≥ 1 criteria met

Basic Criteria

1. Teaching their assigned workload in accordance with the departmental workload policy and their University contract. This includes promptly submitting syllabi that meet the requirements outlined in the faculty handbook for each course taught and entering midterm (if required) and final grades.
2. Demonstrating at least one item of continuous teaching improvement as described in the Teaching Narrative and/or class listings on *Faculty Success* (formerly *Digital Measures*), describing how the course(s) incorporated
 - a. new scholarly work in the discipline,
 - b. new teaching strategies, and/or
 - c. changes in response to student evaluations and peer observations.
3. Complying with university policies as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.
4. Being available to students and other faculty during a minimum of 3 regularly scheduled office hours per week and by appointment.
5. Arranging for peer observation of one's teaching for the purposes of obtaining written feedback, in keeping with university and COLS policy.

Meritorious Criteria

1. Further evidence of continuous teaching improvement beyond Basic criteria, including:
 - a. Being nominated by a colleague or student for a teaching award.
 - b. Receiving a written student testimonial that experience with the faculty member inspired a student to major in the discipline, or to pursue related advanced studies or professional activities.
 - c. Submitting grants to improve teaching instruction and curriculum development. Grants submissions/awards noted here should not be included in *Research and Scholarly Activities*. Discretion is left to each faculty member to determine what types of grants constitute *Research and Scholarly Activities* vs. *Teaching Effectiveness*.
 - d. Developing a new course that is subsequently approved for the CSU course catalog.
 - e. Making significant modifications in teaching materials (e.g., laboratory manuals, solution manuals, websites, class activities) that notably enhance a course.
 - f. Attending workshops and conferences directly related to teaching and curriculum development. Workshops and conferences noted here should not be included in *Research and Scholarly Activities*, as above.
2. Further evidence of commitment to undergraduate and graduate research and high-impact practices beyond Basic criteria, such as:
 - a. Directing an undergraduate research project.
 - b. Serving as a committee member for a graduate thesis, Honors thesis, etc.

Excellent Criteria

1. Further evidence of continuous teaching improvement beyond Meritorious criteria, including:
 - a. Receiving a teaching award.
 - b. Receiving grants to improve teaching instruction and curriculum development. Grants submissions/awards noted here should not be included in *Research and Scholarly Activities*, as above.
 - c. Developing **and teaching** a new course at CSU.
 - d. Preparing **entirely new** teaching materials (e.g., laboratory manuals, solution manuals, activity collections) that significantly enhance a course.
 - e. Demonstrating how the faculty member has incorporated material from workshops and conferences directly related to teaching and curriculum development to improve teaching of particular classes.
2. Further evidence of commitment to undergraduate and graduate research and high-impact practices beyond Meritorious criteria, such as:
 - a. Serving as a primary graduate research advisor.
 - b. Serving as the faculty advisor for undergraduate or graduate research presented at a conference, resulting in a thesis, or yielding a peer-reviewed publication.

Research and Scholarly Activities

Research and Scholarly Activities are vital and necessary for the continued success of all faculty. Therefore, faculty members are required to demonstrate an ongoing commitment to this area, performing the activities necessary to stay current and connected to the discipline. Columbus State University places emphasis on peer-reviewed publications (defined in Glossary of Terms) as a component of research and scholarship.

The Research and Scholarly Activity of candidates will be evaluated annually based on several criteria: **Basic** requirements (mandatory), **Meritorious** accomplishments, and **Excellent** contributions. These criteria will then be used to assess the candidate's overall rating for Research and Scholarly Activity. A candidate can receive one of five possible ratings: Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Satisfactory, Exceeds Expectations, or Far Exceeds Expectations. These ratings are assigned based on the guidelines described in the Glossary of Terms and summarized in Table 1.

Basic Criteria

1. One or more presentations at a professional meeting in oral or poster format, at professional conferences or as part of public colloquia, including at CSU.
2. Evidence of continuous progress leading to a peer-reviewed publication, including:
 - a. demonstrated progress on a peer-reviewed publication as described in the Research Narrative on *Faculty Success* (formerly *Digital Measures*).
 - b. contributions to a published scientific dataset.
 - c. demonstrated progress on submission of a grant proposal to an external funding agency and/or submission of a CSU-internal grant proposal.
3. Maintaining professional relationships, as evidenced by
 - a. active membership in one or more professional societies related to the discipline.
 - b. attendance at professional meetings

- c. evidence of membership in an active professional collaboration.

Meritorious Criteria

1. Further evidence of research and scholarly progress beyond Basic criteria, including:
 - a. Publication of one peer-reviewed work in a given year.
 - b. Receiving competitively awarded funding for scholarly work from internal (CSU) funding sources. Grant awards noted here should not be included in *Teaching Effectiveness*.
 - c. Attending research-related professional development workshops or short courses, and providing evidence of the use of the material in preparation of published work, grant applications, etc. Workshops and short courses noted here should not be included in *Teaching Effectiveness*.
2. Evidence of involvement of students in professional research activities, such as:
 - a. Co-authorship on undergraduate or graduate research that results in a student publication or presentation at a conference, public colloquium, or similar venue.

Excellent Criteria

1. Further evidence of research and scholarly progress beyond Meritorious criteria, including:
 - a. Publication of a peer-reviewed work in a journal considered “high-impact” in the judgement of the ESS Promotion and Tenure Committee, in collaboration with the chair and/or colleagues with expertise in the activity under consideration.
 - b. Participating in collaborative research with investigators from within and outside of CSU, governmental agencies, non-profit organizations, or private entities that results in one or more published works.
 - c. Receiving competitively awarded funding for scholarly work from external funding sources. Grant awards noted here should not be included in *Teaching Effectiveness*.
2. Serving as organizer, convener, chair or co-chair of a workshop, short course, symposium, theme session, or other event directly related to the discipline. Workshops, short courses, symposium, etc. noted here should not be included in *Teaching Effectiveness*.

Service

Service activities rendered by faculty play a vital role in the continuing operation and success of the department, college, university, profession, and community. The term “community” used here is considered broad in scope and incorporates diverse groups that may be local, regional, national, or international in nature. Service activities are considered a key element of faculty performance.

The Service efforts of candidates will be evaluated annually based on 3 criteria: **Basic** requirements (mandatory), **Meritorious** accomplishments, and **Excellent** contributions. These criteria will then be used to assess the candidate’s overall rating for Service. A candidate can receive one of five possible ratings: Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Satisfactory, Exceeds Expectations, or Far Exceeds Expectations. These ratings are assigned based on the guidelines described in the Glossary of Terms and summarized in Table 1.

Basic Criteria

1. Actively participating in two committees at the department, college, university, or USG level annually.
2. Actively participating in one campus or community outreach effort annually.
3. Providing evidence of engagement in annual departmental recruiting and retention efforts such as at least one of the following:
 - a. Participation in Visitation Days, Discovery Days, or similar orientation events.
 - b. Recruitment through other campus or community outreach events.
 - c. Serving as an academic advisor to ESS students (for programs with advisees).

Meritorious Criteria

1. Actively participating in **more than two** department, college, university, or USG, or discipline related professional committees annually.
2. Actively participating in **more than one** campus or community outreach effort annually; or providing professional expertise to a community organization.
3. **Chairing** a department, college, university, and/or USG committee.
4. Serving as a formally assigned mentor to a faculty colleague.
5. Serving as a faculty advisor for an active student organization.

Excellent Criteria

1. Serving as an officer in a discipline-related professional organization.
2. Serving as a reviewer of a peer-reviewed publication, including as a reviewer for abstracts/conference papers submitted for a professional meeting.
3. Serving as proposal reviewer for external funding agencies or granting organizations.
4. Serving on a thesis or dissertation committee at other colleges or universities in the U.S. or abroad.
5. Participating in professional service to a professional organization or government agency in the U.S. or abroad, specifically by holding a role as an officer or committee member at a regional, state, national or international level.

Criteria for Senior Lecturer

Faculty wishing to be considered for Senior lecturer must:

1. Meet all requirements for Senior Lecturer outlined in CSU's Faculty Handbook.
2. Achieve a rating of **Exceeds Expectations** or above in the area of *Teaching Effectiveness* for the purposes of Annual Evaluations for the majority of the years the faculty member has served as a Lecturer.

Criteria for Tenure

Faculty wishing to be considered for Tenure must:

1. Meet all requirements for tenure outlined in CSU's Faculty Handbook, as well as those established in the College of Letters and Sciences Standards of Excellence, in effect at the beginning of their "tenure clock" or more recent revisions if selected by the Candidate.

2. Achieve a rating of **Exceeds Expectations** (or above) in the area of *Teaching Effectiveness* and either *Research and Scholarly Activities* or *Service* for the purposes of annual evaluations for the majority of the years during the tenure-track period.
3. Achieve a rating of at least **Satisfactory Performance** in the remaining area of *Research and Scholarly Activities* or *Service* (*not included in 2 above*), for the purposes of Annual Evaluations for the majority of the years during the tenure-track period.
4. Successfully publish an authored, peer-reviewed publication (as defined in the Glossary of Terms) in the faculty member's discipline, during the tenure-track period.

Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Faculty wishing to be considered for Associate Professor must:

1. Meet all requirements for tenure stated in the ESS Standards of Excellence, outlined in CSU's Faculty Handbook, and established in the College of Letters and Sciences Standards of Excellence.
2. **Also** achieve a rating of Far **Exceeds Expectations** in either *Research and Scholarly Activities* or *Service*, for the purposes of Annual Evaluation for 2 or more years during the assessment period.

Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Faculty wishing to be considered for Professor must:

1. Meet all requirements for tenure stated in the ESS Standards of Excellence, outlined in CSU's Faculty Handbook, and established in the College of Letters and Sciences Standards of Excellence.
2. Achieve a rating of **Exceeds Expectations** or above in the area of *Teaching Effectiveness* and either *Research and Scholarly Activities* or *Service* for the purposes of Annual Evaluations for 50% or more of the years during the period since last promotion.
3. ¹Achieve a rating of at least **Satisfactory Performance** in the remaining area of *Research and Scholarly Activities* or *Service* (*not included in 2 above*), for the purposes of Annual Evaluations for 50% or more of the years during the period since last promotion.
4. Successfully publish a peer-reviewed, authored publication (as defined in the Glossary) in the faculty members discipline during the period since last promotion.

Criteria for Post Tenure Review

In order to achieve a rating of **Satisfactory Performance** for the purposes of Post-Tenure Review, faculty must:

1. Successfully meet or exceed all criteria to achieve a rating of **Satisfactory Performance** in the three areas of *Teaching Effectiveness*, *Research and Scholarly Activities* and *Service*, for the majority of years during the period being evaluated.

1

Standards of Excellent

February 9, 2022

- 2. Successfully develop a five-year professional development plan
- 3. Successfully publish a peer-reviewed, authored publication (as defined in the Glossary) in the faculty member's discipline, during the period being evaluated.

DocuSigned by:
 Name Dr. Clinton Barineau Date 2/13/2022 | 6:04 PM EST
 Clinton Barineau, Professor

DocuSigned by:
 Name Dr. Stacey Blersch Date 2/14/2022 | 12:32 AM EST
 Stacey Blersch, Associate Professor

DocuSigned by:
 Name Dr. Warren Church Date 2/12/2022 | 9:20 AM PST
 Warren Church, Professor

DocuSigned by:
 Name Shawn Cruzen Date 2/12/2022 | 8:42 PM EST
 Shawn Cruzen, Professor

DocuSigned by:
 Name Dr. Mohammad H Hasan Date 2/11/2022 | 8:33 PM EST
 Mohammad H Hasan, Assistant Professor

DocuSigned by:
 Name Zdeslav Hrepic Date 2/12/2022 | 1:37 AM EST
 Zdeslav Hrepic, Associate Professor

DocuSigned by:
 Name Mohammad Jafari Date 2/11/2022 | 6:15 PM EST
 Mohammad Jafari, Assistant Professor

DocuSigned by:
 Name Stephen Jessup Date 2/12/2022 | 9:18 AM EST
 Stephen Jessup, Assistant Professor

DocuSigned by:
 Name Dr. Troy Keller Date 2/12/2022 | 9:33 AM EST
 Troy Keller, Professor

DocuSigned by:
 Name Andrew Puckett Date 2/14/2022 | 8:40 AM EST
 Andrew Puckett, Associate Professor

DocuSigned by:
 Name Dr. Mahmut Reyhanoglu Date 2/12/2022 | 7:58 AM EST
 Mahmut Reyhanoglu, Professor

DocuSigned by:
 Name Dr. David Schwimmer Date 2/11/2022 | 6:27 PM EST
 David Schwimmer, Professor

DocuSigned by:
 Name Dr. Abiye Seifu Date 2/12/2022 | 2:38 PM EST
 Abiye Seifu, Professor

Standards of Excellent

February 9, 2022

DocuSigned by:
Name Kim Shaw
38A2924275E04C9...

Date 2/12/2022 | 9:49 AM EST

DocuSigned by:
Name Dr. Rosa Williams
E3A360B11F4F429...

Date 2/11/2022 | 7:31 PM EST

DocuSigned by:
Name Floyd Jackson
FB4D0778349F43E...

Date 2/11/2022 | 5:50 PM EST

DocuSigned by:
Name Annicke Yarber-Allen
38490E7759CD4EE...

Date 2/14/2022 | 2:46 PM EST

Kimberly Shaw, Professor

Rosa Williams, Professor

Floyd R. Jackson, Prof. & Chair

Annicke Yarber-Allen, Dean of COLS