

PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

**DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE
AND COMPUTER ENGINEERING
University of Arkansas**

Passed by faculty vote: September 13, 2011

PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

Evaluative Criteria, Procedures, and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Promotion, Tenure, and Annual Review of Faculty and for Appointment and Annual Review of Non-Classified Staff

Department of Computer Science and Computer Engineering

This document governs the Department of Computer Science and Computer Engineering in the selection, reappointment, promotion, granting of tenure to, and evaluation of faculty, effective November 2, 2010. It has been approved by the faculty and Department Head of the Department of Computer Science and Computer Engineering, the Dean of the College of Engineering, the Provost, the Chancellor, and the President of the University of Arkansas, as indicated by the signatures below.

These policies are required to be consistent with policies of the College as set forth in the College of Engineering Personnel Document and policies of the University as set forth in three campus policy statements, those on (1) University Professorships, (2) Distinguished Professorships, and (3) Evaluative Criteria, Procedures, and General Standards and Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Promotion and Tenure, and a Board of Trustees policy, 405.1. In case of conflict, the board policy, the campus policy, the College policy, and the Department policy will have authority in that order. Copies of the campus and board policy documents are available on-line, as referenced in the Faculty Handbook and care should be taken to consult the current document. A copy of the current Faculty Review Checklist is also contained in the Faculty Handbook.

It is the policy of the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville to provide equal employment opportunity to all qualified persons; to prohibit discrimination against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, sexual orientation, marital or parental status, veteran's status, or disability, and to promote the full realization of equal employment opportunity through a positive, continuing program of affirmative action.

APPROVALS

Chair of Faculty Unit Committee Date

Provost Date

Department Head Date

Chancellor Date

Dean Date

President Date

INTRODUCTION

The principal responsibility for implementing this personnel document and formulating department recommendations rests with the Department Head and the Dean of the College of Engineering. However, Board of Trustees policy and campus personnel policies also assign important roles to the faculty of the College, including providing input through college and department-level personnel committees and development of a written department personnel document delineating specific criteria and procedures.

The Department personnel document shall be subject to the provisions of the College personnel document as well as campus and University policies, and shall be subject to the approval of the Department Head, the Dean, the Provost, the Chancellor and the President.

The elected Department Personnel Committee (DPC) (sometimes referred to as the Unit Committee or Promotion and Tenure Committee) in the Department of Computer Science and Computer Engineering will serve to advise and make recommendations the Department Head on personnel matters. The DPC consists of 3 tenured faculty members. Each representative is elected by the entire tenured and tenure-track faculty and serves a 3-year term. The department's representative to the College of Engineering Promotion and Tenure committee will serve as one of the three committee members. -Department heads are ineligible to serve on the committee. The chair of the committee will be elected from its membership for a one year term with the election being conducted during the first meeting of the committee in each academic year.

CSCE Representative to the College of Engineering's Promotion and Tenure Committee

The representative to the College of Engineering P&T committee will be elected by the faculty for a three year term. He/she will be selected from the tenured faculty in CSCE.

DPC Election

Elections will be held in the fall of each academic year. All tenured faculty not currently on the committee are eligible, except for the outgoing committee member (who is ineligible for a period of one year. Each eligible faculty member will be contacted by the Head and asked if he/she is willing to serve. All faculty members who agree to serve will be added to a ballot which will be voted on by all tenured and tenure-track faculty. The faculty member with the most votes will be added to the committee.

Term of Service

The committee members will be elected for a term of 3 years, staggered so one member is up for replacement each year. At the first meeting of each academic year, the committee will select a chairperson from among the members. If a member steps down, for any reason, during their 3 year term, a by-election will be held to replace them for the remainder of their term.

Duties

The DPC is responsible for developing and updating, along with the Head, the evaluation criteria used in annual faculty reviews. The DPC is consulted annually by the Head regarding the reappointment of untenured faculty and the evaluation of tenure-track and tenured faculty.

PROVISIONS

The following provisions describe the evaluative criteria, procedures, and general standards for initial appointment, successive appointments, promotion, tenure, and annual review of faculty and for appointment and annual review of non-classified staff.

I. INITIAL APPOINTMENT

A. *Criteria for Recommending Initial Appointment*

The Department of Computer Science and Computer Engineering adopts the criteria for recommending initial appointment to tenure-track, tenure for initial appointments, non-tenure track, and professional positions as outlined in the College of Engineering Personnel Document.

B. *Procedure for Recommending Initial Appointment*

1. Non-tenure Track Appointments

The Department of Computer Science and Computer Engineering will review a full curriculum vitae for all applicants and will review them for relevant teaching and/or research experience and breadth of knowledge. The Department Head and Associate Head, and Chair of the DPC will make a recommendation for appointment and forward that recommendation to the Dean along with the applicant's appropriate documentation.

2. Tenure-track/Tenured Appointments

The Department of Computer Science and Computer Engineering adopts the procedure for recommending initial appointment to tenure-track, tenure for initial appointments, non-tenure track, and professional positions as outlined in the College of Engineering Personnel Document.

II. EVALUATION OF FACULTY

A. *Annual Reviews*

1. Criteria for Annual Reviews

The Department of Computer Science and Computer Engineering adopts the criteria and standards for annual review and reappointment of faculty as outlined in the College of Engineering Personnel Document. Criteria for faculty performance evaluation are listed in Appendix A.

2. Procedures for Annual Reviews

As part of the annual faculty review process:

- The DPC will review each faculty member's Annual Report along with summary data, if any, produced by the Head.
- The DPC will provide feedback in the form of short narrative comments for each faculty member in the areas of Research, Teaching, and Service
- Each DPC member will provide these comments for other members of the committee but will excuse themselves from discussion of their own packet.
- DPC comments will be provided to the department Head as one of many factors used in each faculty member's annual review
- Faculty members will see the DPC comments as an appendix to the annual review document provided by the Head

The Dean will see only the final ratings and comments from the Head.

B. *Third Year Critical Review*

The Department of Computer Science and Computer Engineering adopts the process for the Third Year Critical Review as outlined in the College of Engineering Personnel Document.

C. *Post-Tenure Review*

The Department of Computer Science and Computer Engineering adopts the process for Post-Tenure Review as outlined in the College of Engineering Personnel Document.

III. PROMOTION AND TENURE

A. *Criteria and Standards for Promotion and Tenure*

The Department of Computer Science and Computer Engineering adopts the criteria and standards for Promotion and Tenure as outlined in the College of Engineering Personnel Document.

B. *Procedures*

The Department of Computer Science and Computer Engineering adopts the procedures for Promotion and Tenure as outlined in the College of Engineering Personnel Document.

C. *Reappointment of Non-Tenure Track Faculty*

The Department of Computer Science and Computer Engineering adopts the process for Reappointment of Non-Tenure Track Faculty at a Higher Rank as outlined in the College of Engineering Personnel Document.

IV. APPOINTMENTS TO UNIVERSITY AND DISTINGUISHED PROFESSORSHIPS

The Department of Computer Science and Computer Engineering adopts the criteria and procedures for Appointments to University and Distinguished Professorships as outlined in the College of Engineering Personnel Document.

V. APPEAL PROCEDURES

A faculty member having a grievance should refer to the appropriate section of the University of Arkansas Faculty Handbook for procedural instructions and information regarding appeal procedures.

VI. ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES: NON-CLASSIFIED STAFF

The Department of Computer Science and Computer Engineering adopts the criteria and procedures for Annual Evaluation of Non-classified Staff as outlined in the College of Engineering Personnel Document.

VII. REVIEW OF PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

The Personnel Document, including the faculty personnel policies and criteria and standards for annual review of faculty performance, promotion, and tenure, shall be reviewed at least every three years by the Department Personnel Committee and the Department Head. The purposes of such periodic reviews are to insure that the provisions of the document are consistent with the College of Engineering's mission and University of Arkansas policies and procedures. All amendments to this document shall be submitted to the faculty for approval and in turn approved by the Department Head, the Dean, the Provost, the Chancellor, and the President.

APPENDIX A: FACULTY PERFORMANCE CRITERIA
Computer Science and Computer Engineering Department
University of Arkansas

OBJECTIVE

The *College of Engineering Personnel Document* describes the purpose of faculty evaluation, stipulates that faculty shall be evaluated annually, and specifies that faculty performance will be rated **Excellent**, **Good**, **Acceptable**, or **Unsatisfactory** in the areas of **Teaching**, **Research** and **Service**. This document defines the criteria and typical measurements used to assess faculty within each area.

TEACHING -- EVALUATION CRITERIA

Excellent

An *Excellent* rating in teaching recognizes significant leadership impact and activities that are visible outside of the department. External visibility is evidenced by indicators such as but not limited to:

- Teaching awards and/or recognition from student organizations, the Department, the College, or the University, or from external peers in professional or academic organizations
- *Excellent* course evaluations when factoring in considerations such as class size, course level, whether the course is required, etc. (as determined by the Department Personnel Committee)
- Exemplary record of mentoring and graduating PhD, Masters and Bachelors honors students
- Publishing or revising a textbook. and/or publishing articles related to teaching and pedagogy in selective journals or conferences
- Significant leadership and innovation in curriculum development
- Competitive external teaching grants and/or significant levels of external funding for teaching

Good

A *Good* teaching rating indicates that the faculty member is meeting all requirements of *acceptable* teaching performance and is providing additional quantity or quality above normal teaching expectations as evidenced by indicators such as but not limited to:

- *Good* course evaluations when factoring in considerations such as class size, course level, whether the course is required, etc. (as determined by the Department Personnel Committee)
- Content and pedagogy that is innovative and strengthens the students learning experience such as interactive learning materials, online lectures, new laboratory experiences, and significant updates to the department's core lecture
- Preparation and teaching of new elective courses that enhance the department's core requirements and/or carrying an additional teaching load such as directed readings and independent studies
- Above average record of graduating and mentoring PhD, Masters and Bachelors honors students
- Publishing teaching articles in second tier refereed journals or regional conferences

Acceptable

An *Acceptable* teaching rating indicates that the faculty member is performing basic requirements for any faculty member. Achieving adequate teaching performance requires all of the following:

- Effective teaching of assigned course load
- Ensuring that class content covers all major components shown on the syllabus
- Supervision of graduate students
- Adherence to all University, College, Department and Campus Council guidelines (including following guidelines on discrimination, sexual harassment and ethical behavior).

Unsatisfactory

Unsatisfactory performance indicates the faculty member is not meeting the minimum *acceptable* teaching performance criteria.

RESEARCH -- CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

Excellent

An *excellent* rating in research indicates that the faculty member has achieved or is achieving a national reputation as a scholar in their discipline. This achievement is based on a research program with impact or impact potential, and accompanied by a record of scholarship that compares favorably to faculty members at highly regarded research institutions. *Excellent* research is evidenced by indicators such as but not limited to:

- National or international recognition or awards for research excellence by a scholarly association (e.g. ACM/IEEE fellow, best paper awards).
- Publication in top tier peer reviewed journals or conferences¹ central to the faculty member's discipline
- Writing or editing a scholarly book or book chapter published by an acknowledged academic publisher that makes an intellectual contribution to the field of computing and that is not intended to be a textbook
- Significant competitive external research funding and expenditures from government agencies such as NSF, DARPA, or SBIR or from industry.
- Other indicators of impact such as citations, invited talks, keynote speeches

Good

A *Good* rating in research indicates that the faculty member is a strong contributor to the department's research mission. Evidence of *good* research performance includes:

- Publications in selective journals and proceedings (e.g. ACM, IEEE)
- Presentations at national or regional scholarly meetings
- Competitive external research grant awards

Acceptable

An *Acceptable* rating in research indicates that the faculty member is meeting the requirements deemed acceptable for any faculty member, as evidenced by indicators such as:

- Publications at peer reviewed conferences
- Presentations at scholarly meetings
- Acceptable activity in seeking external research funding

Unsatisfactory

Unsatisfactory research performance indicates the faculty member is not meeting the minimum *acceptable* research performance criteria. Performance at this level suggests that the faculty member is not engaging in enough scholarly activity to maintain an acceptable level of knowledge in the computing field to be an effective contributor to the department.

¹ Note on Journals vs. Conferences: see CRA document [Evaluating Computer Scientists and Engineers For Promotion and Tenure](#) which argues that conferences are very important in computing in contrast to many other fields which value journal papers highly and devalue conference papers.

SERVICE -- CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

Excellent

An *Excellent* rating in service indicates that a faculty member is significantly impacting the Department, College, University, or profession. Excellent service is evidenced by indicators such as::

- Formal recognition of exceptional service by the College, University or a professional group
- Holding a major office in a national professional organization
- Significant administrative responsibilities for university centers
- Organizing significant professional meetings, conferences, or workshops
- Active service on one or more editorial boards of major journals
- Chairing one or more major committees or task forces in the Department, College or University or serving on especially time-consuming committees or task forces
- Active service impacting economic development aimed at building a knowledge-based economy (e.g., entrepreneurship in commercializing faculty member's research)

Good

A *Good* rating in service indicates that the faculty member is meeting all requirements of *acceptable* service performance and is engaging in additional responsibilities to the University or Profession. Good service is evidenced by indicators such as:

- Active participation on significant committees or task forces at the Department, College or University level
- Serving as a technical program committee member or acting as a reviewer for professional journals, conferences or external granting agencies
- Holding an office in a regional academic organization
- Active service on public commissions or advisory boards related to the computing profession

Acceptable

An *Acceptable* rating in service performance indicates that the faculty member is performing basic requirements of service that are the minimum deemed acceptable for any faculty member, including those listed below and a few of those listed in the *good* category.

- Maintaining adequate office hours
- Regularly attending departmental meetings
- Participating on at least one committee if asked to serve
- Representing the Department at College or University functions if asked to serve

Unsatisfactory

Unsatisfactory service performance indicates the faculty member is not meeting the minimum *acceptable* service performance criteria.

CONSIDERATIONS RELATED TO FACULTY EVALUATION

Faculty Workload

The *COE Personnel Document* specified that faculty evaluation depends on defined workloads. The default faculty workload is **40%-40%-20%** for **teaching-research-service**. Faculty can negotiate alternative workloads with their department head.

How Faculty Rank Factors In

The *COE Personnel Document* describes criteria for a faculty member to progress in rank (Assistant, Associate, Full, University Professor, Distinguished Professor). Faculty rank is taken into consideration in the evaluation process.

Form of the Evaluation

During the annual evaluation period, the Department Personnel Committee will produce a paragraph description emphasizing strengths and areas for improvement for faculty in each of the areas of teaching, research and service. These evaluations will be delivered to the department head for further review and rating assignment. The CSCE faculty will see these comments as part of their review.