MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 27, 2023

FROM: Amir Dabirian, Ph.D.
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Temporary Use of DPS Pending Revisions Related to Narrative Word Limits

Very recent changes in UPS 210.000 (“Tenure and Promotion Personnel Procedures”), section II.B.4, allow for Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) narrative lengths of up to 1,500 words, i.e., an increased narrative length maximum. An audit of Department Personnel Standards (DPS) has revealed that many existing DPS explicitly maintain a 1,000-word limit on narratives for a candidate’s WPAF.

The CSUF Academic Senate passed resolution ASD 23-67 (“Resolution to clarify USP 210.000 regarding narrative length”). The resolution resolved that the permitted lengths of narratives be 1,500 words for all departments.

After consulting with Faculty Affairs and Records, I have determined that revisions of DPS are in order, if not already being worked on. Until those DPS revisions are formally approved, the currently approved DPS are in effect, except that the former, 1,000-word limits cannot be used (i.e., are out of compliance with campus policy).
According to Article 15.3 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement: Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the faculty unit employee no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term. Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the evaluation committee and the academic administrators prior to the commencement of the evaluation process. Once the evaluation process has begun, there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the faculty unit employee during the evaluation process.

According to University Policy Statement 210.002 (3/5/19 version), Section III.A.: • Each department shall develop standards for the evaluation of faculty members of that department. These standards… …shall indicate the specific range of activities and levels of performance necessary to meet requirements for positive retention, promotion, and tenure decisions. • Approved Departmental Personnel Standards are controlling documents in all personnel decisions. • All Departmental Personnel Standards require the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (Vice President for Student Affairs for counselor faculty). • Approved Departmental Personnel Standards shall be reviewed by the department as part of each program performance review. • Student Opinion Questionnaire forms must be included as an attachment to Departmental Personnel Standards.
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DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL STANDARDS
DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE

I. Preface

The Department of Computer Science (hereafter called the “Department”) is committed to establishing and maintaining quality programs that provide future computer scientists with state-of-the-art knowledge in their chosen field. Emphasis is on developing technical and professional skills that prepare students for successful careers and as productive citizens. The Department is also committed to the preeminence of learning and to providing an environment where learning and the expansion of knowledge are central to all activities. The Department recognizes that the key to quality programs is instructional faculty who demonstrate excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. It is the position of the Department that the maintenance and enhancement of high quality faculty requires clear communication with respect to personnel expectations and evaluation. Therefore, the Department proposes a personnel document, consistent with the University Mission and Goals and with UPS 210.002, which describes the criteria for assessing faculty productivity with respect to retention, tenure, and promotion.

II. Department Structure

The Department of Computer Science is led by a Department Chair. The Department offers Bachelor’s and Master’s degree programs in Computer Science and a Master’s degree program in Software Engineering as well as coursework that contributes to various specializations, professional credentials and certifications.

III. Scope of Document

The document summarizes policies and procedures with respect to the selection and function of the Department Personnel Committee, the preparation of a Prospectus, and the preparation of Portfolios. The document also describes criteria to be used in the evaluation of Portfolios during the retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process.

IV. Department Personnel Committee

A. Committee Functions

The Department Personnel Committee (hereafter called the “Committee”) shall make specific recommendations concerning faculty retention, promotion, and granting of tenure as specified in UPS 210.000.

B. Committee Structure

The Committee shall consist of three members and one alternate member, all of whom shall be tenured faculty. All Committee members shall have a higher rank of classification than those being evaluated. No person shall serve as a Committee member during the year in which he/she is being considered for personnel action. The alternate Committee member (or members) shall participate on the Committee in the event that a regular Committee member cannot complete the term, or a candidate under review is at same or higher rank than a regular Committee member. Should such a vacancy occur, a new alternate shall be elected by the Department faculty
within 10 business days.

C. Election of Committee Members
1. The Department shall elect the Committee by the end of the third week of classes in the fall semester each year. The election shall be by secret ballot. All tenured faculty who meet the requirements in IV. B. above are automatically on the slate of potential Committee members except the following: (a) the Department Chair, (b) those who are being considered for RTP action that year, (c) those who will be on any type of leave during the year of service, and (d) faculty who serve on the Faculty Personnel committee (FPC) during that year.

2. Each full time tenure track faculty member in the Department may vote (by secret ballot) for up to three Committee members. The three faculty members receiving the highest number of votes shall be elected as “regular” Committee members. The person with the 4th highest number of votes shall be the alternate. In the case of a tie, the last regular member and the alternate shall be decided by the flip of a coin (or by drawing names randomly, should the tie involve more than two people). Per UPS 210.000, if a department does not have enough tenured faculty for Committee membership (i.e., has fewer than three tenured faculty), the slate shall contain one or more tenured faculty from another department, which could include department chairs from other departments. If there are exactly three eligible, tenured faculty, they shall comprise the Committee and an alternate will be elected from another department.

3. The Committee shall elect its Chair for a one-year term.

D. Committee Responsibilities
1. The Committee shall review and evaluate Portfolios (including its Appendices) of faculty members involved in the retention, tenure, and promotion process.

Following a review of the Portfolio (including its Appendices), the Committee shall prepare a written composite evaluation describing the candidate’s performance (faculty being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion) or progress (if probationary faculty) under each of the evaluation areas--teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and professional, University, and community service--as described in Section VI. of this document.

2. The Committee’s evaluation for each area shall be based on information provided in the Portfolio (including its Appendices). Each Committee member utilizes his/her best professional judgment in assessing how well the established evaluation criteria have been met.

   a. **Probationary faculty being reviewed for retention:**
      The Committee prepares a written composite evaluation statement, which provides rationale for rating the probationary faculty member’s PROGRESS in each category as **excellent, good, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory**. The evaluation statement shall represent all points of view held by the Committee members.

   b. **Faculty being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion:**
      The Committee prepares a written composite evaluation statement, which
provides rationale for rating the faculty member’s PERFORMANCE in each category as excellent, good, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory. Criteria for each of these ratings appear in Section VI. The evaluation statement shall represent all points of view held by the Committee members.

3. After the Committee completes its evaluation, the Committee shall formulate a recommendation, which states in writing the reasons for the recommendation relative to retention, tenure, and/or promotion. All actions taken by the Committee shall be approved by a simple majority vote.

4. Committee members shall sign and date the evaluation document, the recommendation document, and the recommendation form in alphabetical order. The order of signatures shall not indicate the way individual members voted.

5. The Committee shall submit its evaluation and recommendation statements to the Department Chair and receive the Chair’s evaluation in accordance with the published timelines for the personnel action cycle.

E. Department Chair’s Responsibilities
According to UPS 210.000 the Department Chair has the responsibility to:

1. Communicate the standards and criteria for RTP to all Department faculty members.

2. Inform each new faculty member within two weeks after the assumption of official duties at the University of all personnel procedures including those covered by this document.

3. Provide guidance, advice, and support to assist new probationary faculty in preparing their Prospectus.

4. Provide the probationary faculty member with written feedback on the Prospectus prior to May 1.

5. Request a meeting, during the Spring semester, with each probationary member or faculty member who is eligible for a performance review during the following Fall Semester to ensure that the annual updating of the Portfolio has been initiated and that the compilation is proceeding according to the requirements of this document.

Tenured Chairs not seeking promotion have additional responsibilities that include reviewing and evaluating portfolios (see UPS 210.000 III. D., Responsibilities of Department Chairs). In situations where the Department Chair is ineligible to participate in the evaluation and review process, the Dean assumes these responsibilities (UPS 210.000 III.F).

F. Abbreviated Review Files for Third and Fifth Year Probationary Faculty
Faculty members deemed by the Provost to be making satisfactory progress in their full performance review during year 2 or year 4 shall, in the following year (year 3 or year 5, respectively), submit an “Abbreviated Review File.” The Abbreviated File comprises only three items: (1) an updated portfolio vita,
(2) statistical summaries of student opinion questionnaires, and (3) grade distributions for the period since the last full performance review. When subject to an Abbreviated Review, the file shall be submitted by the date provided by the University, review of which shall be completed by the date provided the University. The Committee, the Department Chair, and the College Dean shall provide a signed statement indicating that the Review File was received, reviewed, and evaluated. The faculty member shall receive a copy of the signed statement, and a copy shall be forwarded to Faculty Affairs and Records for placement in the faculty member’s Personnel Action File. The faculty member, the Department Chair, or the College Dean may request a consultation meeting to discuss the faculty member’s progress.

V. General Guidelines

A. Prospectus
According to UPS 210.000 Section III. A., “During the first year of employment in a tenure-track position, each probationary faculty member shall write a Prospectus that includes narratives for teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service, not to exceed 500 words each. These narratives shall describe the faculty member’s professional goals, areas of interest, resources required and accomplishments s/he expects to achieve in each of the three areas evaluated in order to meet the approved Departmental Personnel Standards, or, in the absence of such standards, UPS 210.002 for retention, tenure, and promotion. The Prospectus shall be due in the Department Chair’s Office by February 28. The Prospectus will have no formal approval process, but will be reviewed by the Department/Division Chair and the Dean (or equivalent) who will each provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the colleges, but prior to May 1. The Prospectus shall be included in the faculty member’s portfolio for all Full Performance Reviews.” However, as goals evolve and change over the probationary period, faculty may provide updated versions of the Prospectus if they so choose.

B. Portfolio Preparation and Submission
It is the responsibility of each faculty member seeking retention, tenure, and/or promotion to prepare the information required for the Portfolio and to deliver the materials to the Department Chair in accordance with the governing timetable. A general timetable for submitting the Portfolio is provided in UPS 210.000 I.K. Specific timetables for each year are posted by the Faculty Affairs and Records Office (FAR) early in the fall semester.

C. Portfolio Contents and Organization
According to UPS 210.000 Section II. B.,
1. The Portfolio, including its Appendices, is the sole basis for RTP evaluations, recommendations, and actions. The Portfolio and Appendices shall be submitted electronically (via the designated portfolio management system) or as defined by current Faculty Affairs and Records procedures.

For Probationary Faculty: The Portfolio and its Appendices shall be cumulative and representative of performance, covering the period from the beginning of probationary service to the deadline of the RTP submission of the fall semester of the academic year during which RTP action is to be considered. In cases where prior service credit was granted,
that time interval shall also be documented in the Portfolio and its Appendices.

For Tenured Faculty: The Portfolio and its Appendices shall be cumulative and representative of performance, covering the period since the submission of the file for promotion to Associate Professor to the deadline of the RTP submission of the fall semester of the academic year during which RTP action is to be considered.

2. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure the completeness of the Portfolio and Appendices.

3. In the Portfolio and Appendices, faculty members shall describe and document significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service for the period under review. Quality over quantity shall be emphasized; a more limited number of appropriately documented high-quality accomplishments is generally more compelling than a compendium of all activities. Note, however, that all accomplishments shall be listed in the Portfolio Vita (described in section II. B. of UPS 210.000). A clear connection between the narratives, the Table of Contents of the Appendix, the Portfolio, and the documents or artifacts in the Appendix shall be established. The Portfolio and accompanying Appendices shall be prepared following guidelines provided by the Faculty Affairs and Records office, also posted on the FAR website.

4. The Portfolio shall be organized as directed in UPS 210.000 Section II. B. 4.

VI. Criteria and Weighting for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

All tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated within three performance categories -- (1) teaching, (2) scholarly and creative activity, and (3) professional, University, and community service. High quality performance is expected of each faculty member in all three areas. However, in support of the “learning is preeminent” mission of the University, and in compliance with UPS 210.002, the primary emphasis in the retention, tenure, and promotion process shall be on teaching performance. Scholarly and creative activity, also an essential part of faculty activity, is the second most important performance category.

A. Teaching Performance

The Department expects that each faculty member shall demonstrate effective teaching (both in and outside of the classroom) at all levels of review. Students’ opinions of teaching are an important (though not decisive) means of assessing the quality of teaching. Also important are quality of instructional materials, documentation of student learning, rigorous but fair methods of evaluating and grading students, peer evaluations, and evidence of ongoing professional development both with respect to maintaining currency in the field and to pedagogical growth. In all cases, it is the responsibility of each faculty member to describe the quality of the teaching performance.

As stated in UPS 210.002, each level of review shall evaluate the Portfolio and Appendices according to the criteria that follow. Rather than relying largely on a single measure, written evaluations at all levels of review shall be based on
and include commentary on multiple indicators of teaching performance. These shall include the following mandatory indicators.

The following indicators and criteria are used in evaluating teaching performance:

1. **Mandatory Indicators**

To be included in the portfolio:

a. **Self-assessment (limited to 1000 words)** – This shall include a reflective discussion of the faculty member’s teaching philosophy and performance, as well as future goals and directions. The self-assessment statement shall include a discussion of teaching objectives, methods, and evaluation procedures (including grading distributions relative to academic standards). When areas of concern have been identified in previous RTP evaluations, the faculty member shall include in the self-assessment a discussion of specific strategies that have been used to address these concerns.

b. **Statistical summaries of student opinion questionnaires** - Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ) responses contribute significantly to the evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness. However, they shall not carry more than fifty percent of the weight in evaluation of teaching. The University-provided statistical summaries for all courses taught during the period of review shall be included. If data are missing, a written explanation shall be provided and verified by the Department Chair. Similar data shall also be provided for all service-credit years. If not available, a written explanation, verified by the faculty member’s former supervisor, shall be included.

Evaluations of teaching performance shall address student opinions of instruction contained in responses to questions on Student Opinion Questionnaires, as well as the subjective written comments on these forms. Either as part of the self-assessment or separately, the faculty may discuss what factors may have influenced the SOQ scores. Such factors may include number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the faculty member, the characteristics of the classes taught (size, level, required or elective, experimental or traditional pedagogy, etc.) It is the responsibility of the faculty to show how such factors may have influenced the scores, and the responsibility of the RTP reviewers to consider carefully such factors in their evaluation.

c. **Statistical summaries of grade distribution** - University-provided statistical breakdown of the grade distribution for each class shall be included. Faculty shall provide an explanation for grade distributions that fall below or above department norms, deviations which could be well-justified in special cases. Grade distributions for courses in the Department of Computer Science normally range between 2.0 – 2.8 for 100 level courses, 2.2 – 3.0 for 200 level courses, 2.5 – 3.3 for 300/400 level courses, and 3.0 – 3.8 for 500 level courses. However, the greater concern is that faculty assign grades based on sound and fair criteria, regardless of department norms.
To be included in the Appendix:

d. **Course syllabi and materials** - A sample syllabus and supplemental instructional materials shall be included for each course taught, preferably for the most recent course offering if the course has been taught more than once. Examples of supplementary instructional materials are course notes, worksheets and exercises, handouts, digital presentations such as PowerPoints, and other materials that indicate how the course was taught. Such materials should be uploaded in the designated portfolio management system or as defined by current Faculty Affairs and Records procedures as part of the Appendix. It is the responsibility of the faculty to assure that such materials will be readily accessible to RTP reviewers.

e. **Assessment materials** – A representative sample of student work showing how student assessment was accomplished must be included. These might include graded exams, lab reports, assignments, term papers, any other required work, and any rubrics or other tools (such as oral report evaluation form) used to evaluate and/or provide feedback to students. These shall include samples of good, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory work. Care should be taken to preserve student confidentiality.

f. **Individual student opinion questionnaires** - The original, raw data student-completed student opinion forms for each course shall be provided. If forms are missing, a written explanation shall be provided and verified by the Department Chair. Similar data, if available, shall also be provided for all service-credit years. Patterns of objective responses and written comments obtained in different courses over several semesters shall be considered more informative than isolated, individual comments.

2. **Additional Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness**

From the following sets of indicators, faculty may choose those indicators that they feel are appropriate and document them. More than one indicator may be chosen from the same set, and there does not need to be indicators from every set.

a. **Pedagogical Approach and Methods**

Faculty members may contribute to student learning by such activities as: 1) academic advising, 2) development of new courses/curriculum, 3) mentoring and/or supervision of internships and independent studies, 4) supervision of student theses/projects/ comprehensive exams, or 5) other indicators supporting teaching effectiveness, including teaching awards or recognitions.

b. **Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher**

Faculty may show on-going professional development as a teacher by such activities as attendance of pedagogical workshops, use of innovative approaches to teaching, fostering, and/or assessing student learning, such as development and/or use of instructional technology, membership in peer groups to foster teaching effectiveness.
c. **On-going Professional Development in the Discipline**
   Faculty may show that they are maintaining currency in the discipline by such activities as conference participation, participation in professional organizations, and/or other scholarly interaction with their colleagues.

d. **Classroom Visitations**
   Classroom visitations by Department colleagues can provide additional information regarding teaching effectiveness and interaction with students. All visitations and written reports of such visits shall conform with Article 15.14 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Reports shall address clarity of presentation, communication with students, student interaction, effective use of classroom time, and appropriateness of presentation methods. Assessment shall be in the context of the level and objectives of the course. Assessments by external evaluators may be included.

3. **Rating Criteria**

   **Overall teaching performance** - The overall rating for teaching performance effectiveness shall be based on a combination of: (1) student opinion ratings (SOQ data) and students’ subjective comments on SOQ forms, (2) evaluation of course materials and assessment materials, and (3) evaluation of other mandatory and any additional indicators. Based upon the total evidence provided in both mandatory and any additional indicators, the reviewers will rate the faculty member’s overall teaching performance as **excellent, good, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory**. It shall be noted that a faculty member’s teaching performance generally is rated according to the same criteria across all ranks. Reviewers shall use their professional judgment in evaluating the quality of all performance indicators.

   The following are some guidelines for use in evaluating first two indicators.

   **Student Opinion Questionnaires:**

   SOQ ratings and comments on SOQ forms shall not carry more than fifty percent of the weight toward an instructor’s overall evaluation. Not just the values of SOQ scores, but any trend over time shall be considered. The changes over time may be indicative of on-going development as a teacher. While the mean SOQ for a semester gives some overall indication, SOQs for individual courses should also be considered. As stated earlier, faculty may point out special circumstances that may have affected the SOQ ratings, and such factors, as well as the faculty member’s overall level of experience, should be carefully considered.

   A single comment on an SOQ shall not be assigned much weight, but repeated comments, especially over time, shall be considered. Comments that highly praise a faculty and span over years shall be given weight, as shall comments about specific problems that appear over the years without any effort by the faculty to correct the problem.
Course and Assessment Materials:

As stated in UPS 210.002, evaluation of teaching performance shall address those factors that contribute to effective pedagogy including the following: the appropriateness of the breadth and depth of course content to the level of each course taught; the currency of the topics and relevancy of the assignments; and the effectiveness and fairness of testing, other assessment, and grading procedures. The course and assessment materials shall be evaluated in view of these factors, and shall carry no more than fifty percent of the weight towards the overall evaluation. As in the case of SOQ’s later course materials may indicate on-going professional development as a teacher.

Examples of criteria for use in assigning the following ratings for Teaching are:

“Excellent” – clear and thoughtful self-assessment of teaching that addresses any shortcomings, and outlines definite future plans for improvement; an average rating of 3.5 or above on Student Opinion Questionnaires with overwhelmingly positive comments; documented evidence of high quality course materials and assessment materials for most courses taught; average grade distributions that fall within normal department ranges or are otherwise explained and justified; and documented evidence of excellence in at least three additional and different indicators of teaching effectiveness.

“Good” – self-assessment of teaching that identifies some shortcomings and outlines possible plans for improvement; an average rating of 3.0 - 3.49 on Student Opinion Questionnaires with mostly positive comments; documented evidence of good course materials and assessment materials for most courses taught; average grade distributions that fall within normal Department ranges or are otherwise explained and justified; and documented evidence of good quality in at least two additional and different indicators of teaching effectiveness by the time the faculty member is reviewed for tenure or promotion.

“Needs Improvement” – self-assessment of teaching performance without specific plans for improvement; an average rating of 2.7-2.99 on Student Opinion Questionnaires, with students’ written comments indicating some frustration with their learning experience; course materials and assessment materials for some courses do not indicate course and learning goals are being met; other indicators that are below the standard for a rating of “good”.

“Unsatisfactory” – self-assessment of teaching without any plans for improvement; an average SOQ rating that falls below 2.7, with students’ written comments indicating serious dissatisfaction with their learning experience; course materials and assessment materials for recent courses do not indicate course and learning goals are being met; additional indicators that are below the standard for a rating of “good”.
The average rating on Student Opinion Questionnaires is calculated based on all course sections taught during the period of time under review. The above is not meant to suggest that all criteria listed must be met for a particular rating. They are not prescriptive, but descriptive and meant to help reviewers. If one criteria can determine the rating, this would mean that the criteria has close to 100% weight, and this should not happen under the guidelines given. An SOQ rating of 3.2 matched with high quality course and assessment material for most courses and a reasonable grade distribution can indicate a rigorous, but effective teacher. Especially if backed by additional strong indicators (thoughtful self-assessment, evidence of on-going efforts at self-improvement, etc.), the total evidence would be rated as “Excellent”.

B. Scholarly and Creative Activities
Faculty members at every level are expected to engage in focused, ongoing scholarly and creative activity. It is the position of the University and this Department that such activity enhances the professional growth and teaching effectiveness of the individual faculty member, contributes to the advancement of the field, provides increased learning opportunities for students, and enhances the overall reputation of the Department and the University. The faculty member shall provide a 1000 word self-evaluation narrative statement describing: (1) his/her scholarly and creative agenda, (2) accomplishments during the period of review, (3) work in progress, and (4) future plans. The self-assessment shall be supported by appropriate documentation, with any collaborative work clearly described in terms of individual contributions.

The Department recognizes that scholarly and creative activity may be evidenced through (1) creation of new knowledge, (2) integration of knowledge, and/or (3) dissemination of knowledge. It is expected that over the period of review faculty members’ scholarly and creative endeavors shall result in high quality, peer-reviewed pieces of work -- i.e., peer-reviewed journal articles, peer-reviewed high quality papers published in conference proceedings, books, and book chapters, or other comparable works. Recognition will be given for engaging students in the faculty’s research and scholarly activities. External grants submitted, especially those awarded, shall strengthen performance in this category. Other indicators adding support to the faculty member’s scholarly and creative accomplishments are works in progress and non peer-reviewed publications and achievements.

It is expected that those evaluating the Portfolio shall consider the quality as well as the quantity of performance. When the scholarly or creative activity has made a major impact on the discipline or on professional practice, it may be appropriate to assign additional weight to it. In all cases, it is the responsibility of faculty members to describe and document the importance of their work.

Unlike most disciplines, Computer Science considers conference publication as the primary means of publishing research results. The Computer Science Department therefore accepts blind peer reviewed articles in high-quality conferences as equivalent to journal publications. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to justify the quality of the conference where an article has been accepted. Some indicators of high quality will be the sponsoring organizations, acceptance rates lower than 30%, the scope of the conference (regional, national, or international), and the quality of the program.
committees. ACM and IEEE sponsored conferences will be automatically considered high-quality.

It is the position of the Department, in line with the University Mission and Goals, that collaborative research/scholarly and creative efforts are of benefit to the institution as well as to the individual. **For tenure and/or promotion, the scholarly and creative category shall include at least three high-quality peer-reviewed publications, for one of which the author shall be the primary author, and for the other two at least a major author.** A major author is defined as a co-author who made major contributions to key aspects of the study and paper. It is the responsibility of co-authors to describe major contributions to the article (e.g., formulating the problem or hypothesis, structuring the experimental design, organizing and conducting the statistical analysis, interpreting the results, writing a major portion of the article) and to document such contributions through co-author disclosure statements from other authors. Note: For student co-authors working under the mentorship of the faculty member, the need for co-authorship disclosure of the faculty member’s contribution is waived. It is assumed that faculty supervision of student’s work reflects a major contribution. The order of the authors may not reflect actual contribution as it is common to place student names first and some list names in alphabetical order.

As with all evaluation categories, a faculty member’s scholarly and creative contribution shall be rated as **excellent, good, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory.** The following categorization of activities is presented as an example of several “hierarchical” indicators of performance. **Level I** includes the publication of one’s work in high-quality, peer-reviewed conferences, journals, books, or other comparable outlets, as well as obtaining major external grants. **Level II** includes accomplishments that are an important part of one’s scholarly agenda such as scholarly presentations, book reviews, and external grants, but generally are one step below that of **Level I.** **Level III** includes evidence of work in progress and on-going activity.

**Level I**

- Articles published or accepted for publication (as primary author or major author) in high-quality peer-reviewed conferences or peer-reviewed scholarly journals*
- Peer-reviewed high quality books/book chapters published or accepted for publication (as primary author or major author)
- Major externally funded grants (as Principal Investigator or equal Co PI). The faculty is responsible for establishing that the grant is major by such criteria as amount of funding ($75K or more), the institution giving the grant (NSF, NIH, etc.), the competitiveness, etc.
- Other works judged by peers to be of comparable significance with sufficient documentation, e.g., digital projects, software development, and patents being approved.

**Level II**

- Scholarly presentations at professional meetings
- Published peer-reviewed abstracts
- Papers published in peer-reviewed conference proceedings of less than high-quality
- Technical articles, notes, summaries (peer-reviewed)
• Published book reviews
• Articles/chapters/books (non peer-reviewed)
• Articles revised based on reviewer comments and undergoing second review
• Peer-reviewed publications (as a minor author)
• Peer-reviewed publications that do not qualify as Level I
• Grants received, with major grants qualifying as Level I indicators
• Other works judged by peers to be of comparable significance, e.g., digital projects, curriculum development, software development, invited articles, etc.

**Level III**

• Research in progress
• Papers published in non peer-reviewed conference proceedings
• Papers submitted for publication/presentation
• Posters presented in conferences
• Grant proposals submitted
• Other works judged by peers to be of comparable significance

*Although multiple indicators are listed in Level I, it shall be noted that peer-reviewed articles best represent the scholarly and creative work in the field and, thus, are expected to be part of a faculty member’s accomplishments at each level of review. It is also expected that faculty members will involve students in their research.

**For tenure and/or promotion, the scholarly and creative activity category shall include at least three peer-reviewed publications in journals or proceedings of high quality conferences, or comparable pieces of work, one of which shall be as primary author, and the other two as at least major author.** In all cases, the quality of the scholarly and creative work shall be considered in the evaluation process. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document the quality of his/her accomplishments. Examples of quality indicators are journal acceptance records, journal impact factor, publication distribution figures, the scope of the publication (regional, national, or international), the quality of the editorial board and review process (blind vs. non-blind), and the extent of the faculty member’s contribution in the case of co-authored work.

**Criteria for assignment of ratings for Scholarly and Creative Activity:**

**“Excellent”** – appropriate rating when a faculty member has four or more high quality indicators in Level I which must include at least three peer-reviewed publications in journals or proceedings of high quality conferences (at least one as primary author and the others as major author), two or more high quality indicators in Level II, and at least two high quality indicator in Level III, thus surpassing the requirements for a rating of “good.” One indicator in Level I may substitute for two indicators in Level II, but at least two indicators in Level III are mandatory.

A rating of **Excellent Progress** is appropriate when a probationary faculty has made sufficient progress toward achieving Excellent rating.
“Good” – appropriate rating when a faculty member has at least three high quality indicators in Level I which must include at least three peer-reviewed publications in journals or proceedings of high quality conferences (at least one as primary author and the others as major author), two high quality indicators in Level II, and at least one high quality indicator in Level III. One indicator in Level I may substitute for two indicators in Level II, but at least one indicator in Level III is mandatory.

A rating of **Good Progress** is appropriate when a probationary faculty has made sufficient progress toward achieving Good rating.

“Needs Improvement”—appropriate rating when a probationary faculty member in year two or year three is not making clear progress toward reaching the standard for a rating of “Good” or “Excellent” as described above.

“Unsatisfactory” – appropriate rating when a faculty member at year four and beyond has not met, or is not on track to meet, the standard for a rating of either “Good” or “Excellent” as described above.

**Note:**
Exceptions to the above ratings are possible. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to point out any such exceptions and to document why special consideration shall be given, such as when one or more indicators may be of such high quality that they should be given additional weight. An example might be if the faculty member has made a major breakthrough, and provides documentation through reviewer comments and letters from established researchers in the field attesting to its significance.

C. **Professional, University, and Community Service**
All faculty members are required to participate in appropriate professional, University, and community service activities. In the area of professional service, such activity is expected to surpass that of simply belonging to relevant organizations and attending conferences. As faculty members progress through their careers, it is expected that they increasingly will engage in continuous professional activities such as serving on professional committees, assuming leadership positions, serving as program planners, conducting seminars and workshops, and serving as professional consultants, on editorial boards, and/or as reviewers of scholarly/professional materials. Similarly, a faculty member is expected to actively serve the needs of the University and community by participating in a broad range of campus activities and in external community activities. All faculty members, after their first probationary year, are expected to increasingly make noteworthy contributions towards the work of the Department and University as it conducts its business and serves its community clientele. The following represents a sample breakdown of typical service activities into hierarchical categories.
Level I

- Chair of Standing Department Committees
- Academic program coordinator/lab or center director
- Undergraduate or graduate advisor
- National/regional officer of professional association
- Membership on the editorial board of a professional journal
- Chair of national/regional committees
- Conference Organizer, e.g. General Chair, Finance Chair and Treasurer, Program Chair, Publications Chair, Publicity & Public Relations Chair, etc. conference/workshop
- Chair, College/University/Department Committee
- Active membership on University Committees (e.g., Senate committees that meet regularly/weekly)
- Organizer of major professional meetings or community functions/workshops
- Honors, awards, or other evidence of outstanding recognition
- Extensive contributions to any one or more committees or projects
- Guest Editor of a professional journal
- Frequent reviewer (8 or more during the review period) of professional journals/conference papers/books

Level II

- Active membership on professional committees
- Reviewer of professional journals/conference papers/books
- Program planner, or session organizer at professional conferences
- Workshop/seminar coordinator
- Conference/workshop presentations
- Speaking to community groups
- Non-profit or community consultant activities
- Active membership on advisory boards/expert panels
- Active membership on College/Department committees
- Chair of Ad Hoc Department Committees
- Media interviews
- Faculty advisor for student associations/chapters
- Outreach activities
- Accreditation work

Level III

- Membership in professional organizations
- Attendance at conferences/workshops
- Membership on Ad Hoc Department Committee
- Volunteer academic/service activities

Criteria for assignment of ratings for three required service forms in Professional, University, and Community Service:

“Excellent” – appropriate rating when a faculty member has three or more indicators in Level I, three or more indicators in Level II, and at least one indicator in Level III. These indicators must cover Professional, University, and Community service, thus clearly surpassing the requirements for a rating of “good.”
A rating of **Excellent Progress** is appropriate when a probationary faculty has made sufficient progress toward achieving Excellent rating.

**“Good”** – appropriate rating when a faculty member has at least two indicators in Level I, several (three or more) indicators in Level II, and at least one indicator in Level III. These indicators must cover Professional, University, and Community service.

A rating of **Good Progress** is appropriate when a probationary faculty has made sufficient progress toward achieving Good rating.

**“Needs Improvement”** -- appropriate rating when a second or third year faculty member is not on track to meet the standards for a rating of either “Good” or “Excellent”.

**“Unsatisfactory”** – appropriate rating when a faculty member in the fourth year or beyond has not met (or is not on track to meet) the standard for a rating of either “Good” or “Excellent”.

**Note:** Many alternative indicators and exceptions to the above ratings are possible. For example, in any category it is possible that any one indicator may be so important (qualitatively or quantitatively) that it deserves as much weight as two or three indicators normally would. For example, work by a faculty on accreditation that required major time commitment (5 to 10 hours every week) and was judged as being vital to gaining accreditation may deserve as much weight as two Level II indicators or as one Level I indicator. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to point out any such exceptions and to document why special consideration shall be given.

**VII. Guidelines for Applying Evaluation Criteria in Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Decisions**

**A. Retention during Probationary Years**
A recommendation for retention is contingent upon making sufficient progress toward the requirements for tenure and promotion, which means achieving a rating of Excellent Progress, Good Progress, or Needs Improvement for 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} year faculty. Fourth year faculty must receive a rating of Good or Excellent relative to their progress towards meeting tenure requirements, otherwise a full performance review (instead of abbreviated) in their fifth year will be recommended.

**B. Tenure Requirements**
A person recommended for tenure shall be evaluated as “Excellent” in either teaching or scholarship and at least “Good” in the other categories.

**C. Promotion to Associate Professor**
Promotion to Associate Professor is automatic with the granting of tenure.

**D. Early Tenure and Early Promotion to Associate Professor**
According to UPS 210.002, “early tenure requires that all expectations for the entire probationary period have been met and that performance in Teaching and Scholarly
and Creative Activity exceed the expectations stated in UPS 210.002 and the Department Personnel Standards.” Specifically, early tenure and/or early promotion to Associated Professor require a rating of “Excellent” in all three areas of Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Service, and performance in Teaching and Scholarly and Creative Activity exceeds minimum requirements of “Excellent” rating in both categories. Early tenure requirements apply to both probationary Assistant Professors and probationary Associate Professors.

E. Promotion to Full Professor
The decision to grant promotion to the rank of professor shall be based on a record of sustained growth and commitment to high quality performance in all categories. At a minimum, a person recommended for promotion to Full Professor shall be evaluated as “Excellent” in two categories with no less than “Good” in the third category. This applies for both tenured Associate Professors and probationary Associate Professors.

F. Early Promotion to Full Professor
According to UPS 210.002, “early promotion to Professor requires that the faculty member has displayed excellence and sustained vitality in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service that promise future potential growth.” Performance in all three areas of review shall be at the level of “Excellent.” and performance in Teaching and Scholarly and Creative Activity exceeds minimum requirements of “Excellent” rating in both categories. This applies for both tenured Associate Professors and probationary Associate Professors.

VIII. Appendix

A. Computer Science Department SOQ form
1. Student Opinion Questionnaire

The results of this Student Opinion Questionnaire are one factor in the University’s decision for retention, promotion, granting tenure and personnel evaluation, and are reviewed by the instructor only after final grades have been recorded.

Please indicate how strongly you agree (or disagree) with the statement, where “A” indicates strongest agreement and “E” indicates strongest disagreement. If you do not have enough information to give an opinion (for example, you never went to see the instructor during posted office hours), do not mark any boxes; leave the statement blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 The instructor demonstrated knowledge of the subject.

1.2 The course was consistent with the course objectives and learning goals given in the course syllabus or outline.

1.3 The instructor was prepared for class and utilized class time productively.

1.4 The instructor demonstrated effective communication skills.

1.5 The instructor established and followed an objective grading policy.

1.6 The instructor provided feedback on student work within a reasonable time frame.

1.7 The instructor encouraged student participation.

1.8 The instructor was available for consultation during posted office hours.

1.9 Overall, I evaluate this instructor’s teaching as excellent.

Continue on Page 2
2. Comments

2.1 Your instructor would like to know if there is something you believe he/she has done especially well in his/her teaching of this course.

2.2 Your instructor would also like to know if you wish to suggest any specific things you believe might be done to improve his/her teaching of this course.

2.3 Additional Comments:
1. Student Opinion Questionnaire

The results of this questionnaire are one factor in the University's decision for retention, promotion, granting tenure and personal evaluation, and are reviewed by the instructor only after final grades have been recorded.

A = Outstanding  
B = Very Good  
C = Average  
D = Marginal  
E = Poor  
BLANK = Insufficient basis to evaluate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 I feel I have met the learning objectives for the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 In this course, I had the opportunities to be actively engaged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in activities and discussions pertinent to the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 This course contributed to my development as a professional.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 The instructor encouraged multiple perspectives and respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 The instructor communicated course content effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 The instructor was knowledgeable about course content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 The instructor helped facilitate my learning of the course content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 The instructor fulfilled the course objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 The instructor was responsive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10 The instructor encouraged me to be responsible for my own learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11 Course content and materials were readily available and accessible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 I was given opportunities to participate in the online discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using email, EBoard or any other means.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Overall, I evaluate this instructor's teaching as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please complete both parts of the form.
2. General Comments

2.1 Your instructor would like to know if there is something you believe he/she has done especially well in his/her teaching of this course.

2.2 Your instructor would also like to know if you wish to suggest any specific things you believe might be done to improve his/her teaching of this course.

2.3 Additional Comments: