

# Department of Computer Science

## Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Guidelines

Approved: 2013

# Policy on Promotion and Tenure

---

## Preamble

The *Faculty Handbook* allows for considerable latitude in the criteria that individual Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committees (AUPACs) use to make recommendations regarding promotion and tenure. The purpose of this policy is to define the criteria/standards used by the Computer Science AUPAC (CSPAC) when making such recommendations. As such, it is a supplement to the *Faculty Handbook*.

## Role of the AUPAC in Promotion and Tenure Decisions

The CSPAC makes an independent recommendation to the dean on all promotion and tenure decisions.

## Standards

In the evaluation of faculty members being considered for promotion in academic rank and/or tenure, the following standards apply:

Assistant Professor. At least satisfactory ratings in all three areas are required for promotion to assistant professor.

Associate Professor, Tenure. Significant effort devoted to either teaching or scholarly achievement, an excellent rating in either teaching or scholarly achievement and at least satisfactory ratings in the other areas are required for promotion to associate professor.

Professor. An excellent rating in two areas of significant effort and at least a satisfactory rating in the other area are required for promotion to professor.

## Criteria

The CSPAC uses judgment and discretion in making recommendations on promotion and tenure. Decisions are based on a variety of evidence, including evaluations, recommendations, research, publications, curriculum artifacts, personnel records and other relevant materials. CSPAC members will also exercise professional judgment in evaluating the dedication, collegiality, and effectiveness of applicants.

Generally, it is incumbent upon the applicant to present a case for promotion and/or tenure, and to provide adequate supporting evidence. The CSPAC may request additional evidence from the applicant or from the Department, subject to policies defined in the *Faculty Handbook*.

CSPAC recommendations are not based solely on annual evaluations. In addition, it is important to note the following specific differences between the criteria used for annual evaluations and the criteria used for promotion and tenure:

- Unlike in annual evaluations, in the evaluation of faculty members being considered for promotion in academic rank, the Computer Science Academic Unit Head (CSAUH) and CSPAC will look for a continuing and cohesive pattern of behavior.
- The CSPAC is only involved with appeals of annual evaluations. That is, unless a faculty member appeals the AUH's evaluation, the CSPAC is not involved in the annual evaluation process. Hence, the CSPAC may disagree with the AUH's annual evaluations. This disagreement may result from a difference of opinion about the interpretation of the criteria used for annual evaluations or from a difference of opinion about the way in which a faculty member's conduct impacted performance (either positive or negative).

## ***Teaching***

The following are expected of a faculty member in order to be judged Satisfactory.

- Have a consistent history of annual evaluations of teaching that are at least satisfactory.
- Have a consistent history of acceptable student evaluations of teaching.
- Prepare course curricula, syllabi and course materials (e.g., lectures, labs, assignments, and exams) that are effective, appropriate, and correct.
- Conduct classes in an effective manner, at the appropriate times and for the appropriate durations.
- Communicate effectively with students and peers, including addressing and interacting with students and peers in a professional manner.
- Provide a reasonable number of office hours and willingly meet with students at those times.
- Be willing to teach a fair share of courses in different programs (e.g., graduate and undergraduate courses), at different levels (e.g., 100, 200, 300 and 400 level; 500 and 600 level courses), and in different areas.
- Be willing to be a member of a fair share of undergraduate and graduate thesis committees.
- Make efforts to improve teaching through workshops, conferences, self-study, or other means.

The following are indicators of excellence in teaching. These are not *requirements* for excellence, but rather are representative indicators of excellence. This list is intended to set the standard of excellent performance in teaching, and is not intended to be exhaustive. The CSPAC may consider some or all of these factors, as well as other related factors.

- Have a consistent pattern of excellent annual evaluations of teaching.
- Have a consistent pattern of excellent student evaluations of teaching.
- Prepare and teach courses in multiple programs (e.g., graduate and undergraduate courses) and at multiple levels (e.g., 100, 200, 300 and 400 level courses; 500 and 600 level courses).
- Receive a teaching award from the University, a peer group, or professional organization.
- Develop new course materials that substantially revise and improve a course.
- Develop new courses and contribute to the development of new programs or substantial program revisions.
- Investigate and make appropriate use of emerging instructional technologies.
- Supervise independent studies, honors projects, and theses.
- Participate in workshops and meetings with a focus on improving teaching in general.
- Have strong recommendations and good peer evaluations from other faculty members.
- Receive significant funding that supports educational activities.
- Participate in mentoring activities (e.g., advise prestigious scholarship applicants and lead educational activities for student clubs).
- Have a consistent pattern of developing and offering special topics courses.

### ***Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications***

The following are expected of a faculty member in order to be judged Satisfactory.

- Have a consistent pattern of annual evaluations in this area that are at least satisfactory.
- Demonstrate involvement in scholarship and/or student research projects in Computer Science and related fields.
- Engage in professional development activities related to pursuits in Computer Science and related fields.
- Be a member of a community of scholars (e.g., apply for funding to support scholarly activities, serve as a referee/reviewer, and participate in scholarly panels).

The following are indicators of excellence in scholarly achievement and professional qualifications. These are not *requirements* for excellence, but rather are representative indicators of excellence. This list is intended to set the standard of excellent performance; it is not intended to be exhaustive. The CSPAC may consider some or all of these factors, as well as other related factors.

- Show a record of significant and original contribution as demonstrated by a cohesive record<sup>1</sup> of publication and/or grants. Such a record will demonstrate an ongoing contribution to the science and to the profession.
- Make consistently high quality contributions to student research projects.
- Receive consistent and significant funding that supports scholarly activities.
- Engage in systematic professional development that involves a substantial change in focus.
- Receive nominations or awards for scholarly achievement from recognized organizations outside of the University.
- Participate in scholarly/professional activities that bring recognition to the Department, College or University.

## ***Service***

The following are expected of a faculty member in order to be judged Satisfactory.

- Have a consistent pattern of annual evaluations in this area that are at least satisfactory.
- Actively participate in a fair share of activities at the University, College, and Departmental levels.
- Attend Department, College and University meetings (as appropriate).
- Attend student-focused activities (e.g., club meetings, talks by outside speakers, recruiting events).

The following are indicators of excellence in service. These are not *requirements* for excellence, but rather are representative indicators of excellence. This list is intended to set the standard of excellent performance; it is not intended to be exhaustive. The CSPAC may consider some or all of these factors, as well as other related factors.

- Participate in activities at more than one level within the University, be involved in a wide array of different activities, and have a demonstrated record of playing a significant role in these activities.
- Provide effective service to a professional organization (e.g., serve as an officer, serve as a conference/session organizer).

---

<sup>1</sup> A cohesive contribution is indicated by a series of works and achievements that focus on a common topic and that indicate progress towards a distinct objective. Though collaboration is valued, being one of the principal/primary authors for published works indicates a higher degree of accomplishment and originality.

- Play a significant role in recruiting activities.
- Play a significant role advising/supervising student clubs/activities.
- Advise undergraduate and/or graduate students.
- Make outstanding contributions to the development of other faculty in the Department, College, or University.
- Receive nominations or awards for service from recognized organizations outside of the University.
- Lead community service activities that bring recognition to the Department, College or University.
- Receive consistent and significant funding that supports non-scholarly activities (e.g., funding for teaching laboratories, scholarships, and recruiting).
- Accept an unusual teaching load at the request of the Department.

## **Related Documents**

The Department's policy on *Faculty Member Evaluation Criteria* describes the Department's process and criteria for annual evaluations.

The University's *Faculty Handbook* describes the University's process and criteria for annual evaluations and the University's process and criteria for promotion and tenure.