

Department of Computer Science

Policies and Procedures

(Revised and Adopted 1-18-08)

Table of Contents

1. Reappointment, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review, and Promotion	1
2. Office Hours.....	6
3. Web Sites	7
4. Syllabi	7
5. Student Evaluations	8
6. Departmental Meetings.....	8
7. Voting	8
8. Summer Teaching	8
9. Non-Instructional Assignments & Workloads.....	9
10. Advising.....	9
11. Individual Study.....	9
12. Cooperative Education / Internship	9
13. Senior Project Participation	10
14. Grading	10
15. Final Assignments.....	11
16. Office Assignments.....	11

Department of Computer Science

Policies and Procedures

(Revised and Adopted 4-2-04)

The policies and procedures specific to the Computer Science Department are described below. For other information containing policies and procedures relevant to faculty, please refer to:

- Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) – found on the Assistant Vice President for Faculty Affairs web page (www.cwu.edu/~avpfa).
- College of the Sciences Policy Manual (COTS) – found on the COTS Faculty Forms web page (www.cwu.edu/~cots/facultyforms.html).
- The CWU Policies Manual – found on the President’s policy web page (www.cwu.edu/~pres/policies).

1. Reappointment, Tenure, Post-Tenure Review, and Promotion

Departmental policies and criteria are aligned with and supplement University and COTS policies and criteria. They are intended to articulate computer science specific standards and have been reviewed and approved at the College and University level. Indeed, space has been reserved in COTS policies to list these criteria as section 7.2.4. The numbering that follows is consistent with that document.

7.2 Departmental Standards

University-approved standards guide evaluation of each faculty member by the department personnel committee and the department chair. These are developed in accordance with 20.1.1 of the CBA, and require approval of the dean and the office of the provost.

7.2.1 Departmental standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and for post-tenure review shall align with the university and college standards.

7.2.1.1 The department will ensure that its personnel policy document is consistent with, and in no case less stringent than college and university provisions.

7.2.1.2 Periodic revision may be required.

7.2.2. Modification of approved criteria for reappointment, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review for an individual position may sometimes be warranted. A split appointment between science education and a discipline department is a typical example. The modified criteria are agreed upon by the faculty member, the department chair in consultation with the department personnel committee, and the dean; and approved in advance by the provost. Approval at all levels must be in writing (Collective Bargaining Agreement, section 27.3) and the modification must be stipulated in documents such as the initial contract letter or subsequent letters of agreement.

7.2.4 Department of Computer Science

In addition to the standards detailed in the University Faculty Performance Standard and in

section 7.1 above, the department also believes the values and goals jointly developed annually by a faculty member and the evaluation committee in concurrence with the Dean should be the main guide for developing expectations of the faculty member. Among other things such goal development and review provides consistency of evaluation throughout the review period, provides for the opportunity for peer feedback on both successes and shortcomings, and can help identify faculty resource needs to aid in carrying out their goals – all components necessary for professional growth. It is intended that these goals be used as a component in the reappointment, tenure, promotion and post-tenure reviews.

Currently the department carries out this evaluation during the Spring Faculty Development Day. The evaluation consists of two pieces: a peer-review of teaching (described in more detail in the following section) and a goals review and setting. Both pieces are peer-reviewed by the committee of the whole. In the goals review, each faculty member states the current year's goals, accomplishments and a self-evaluation. In the goal setting, each faculty member proposes goals for the next year that are reviewed, by the committee and the Dean, for appropriateness for professional development and appropriateness to departmental, college and university mission. The Department also believes that this is an appropriate time for faculty to propose filling a particular niche or role within the department. As with the goals, the committee and the Dean review such proposals for appropriateness for professional development and appropriateness to departmental, college and university mission.

7.2.4.1. Instruction: Standard and Evaluation

The department requires faculty participation in the annual peer-review of teaching. Here each faculty member will conduct a thorough review of one class (or perhaps a pair of sequenced classes). Each faculty member is asked to prepare a complete portfolio for the class (or classes). [Different classes are to be presented each year until the department has reviewed the entire curriculum.] The purpose of the review is two-fold. The first purpose is to review the current professional instructional development of each faculty member. The second purpose is to provide another tool for our curriculum review. Portfolios include the following information: textbook, syllabus, objective, notes, slides, other materials including web-based, programming projects, exams, and samples of student work.

In addition to activities listed in the CBA, the University Faculty Performance Standard and in section 7.1 above the department also encourages participation in the following activities: incorporation of technological, instructional, or evaluative innovations; receipt external teaching recognition; development and/or maintenance of interdisciplinary links and curricula; delivery of visiting class presentations, in and outside the department; and maintenance of contacts with other educational institutions related to teaching.

7.2.4.2. Research and Scholarly Activity: Standard and Evaluation

In addition to activities listed in the CBA and the University Faculty Performance Standard and in section 7.1 above the department also categorizes the following activities:

Category A:

Peer-reviewed conference proceedings with national or international distribution.
Rationale: Since the review and publication process for computer science journals is

between two and three years, the only way for researchers to publish in a timely manner is to publish in conference proceedings. In computer science, the proceedings of these conferences are widely and easily accessible and referred to by all major computer science bibliographic and citation research tools. In particular, this category includes conference proceedings that meet the following requirements:

- Submitted complete papers, not abstracts, are blind peer-reviewed by two or more independent reviewers.
- The conference has national or international distribution.
- There is a significant rejection rate at the conference. [Unfortunately, there are conferences with a nearly 100% acceptance rate. Such conference publications are clearly not Category A.] Two overviews of the acceptance/rejection ratio for many national/international computer science conferences can be found at www.adoptivebox.net/research/bookmark/CICON_stat.html and www.cs.ucsb.edu/~almeroth/conf/stats.

The department also values collaborative activity within the department, with colleagues from other departments, and with professionals outside of the university. Scholarly products resulting from such collaborations, in cases where the faculty member has made substantive contributions to the authorship and intellectual merit of such products, are as valued as contributions resulting from individual effort. In this context, substantive contributions that establish the faculty member as a co-PI are those that (1) are regarded as essential to the project design and execution, and (2) include responsibility for project oversight and reporting.

Category B:

software products – disseminated and in use outside the department;
editing books;
papers and posters presented at professional conferences not otherwise covered in Category A;
peer-reviewed published abstracts;
applied research, e.g. consulting work available for evaluation such as reports;
web-based publications available for evaluation; and
invited seminars and other forums.

7.2.4.3. Service: Standard and Evaluation

In addition to activities listed in the CBA and the University Faculty Performance Standard and in section 7.1 above the department also encourages participation in the following activities: service awards, other recognition; “advisor to / supervisor of / sponsor of” student activities; and offices held in professional societies.

7.2.4.4. Discipline specific standards for title, rank and tenure

Standards for title of Lecturer.

There are currently no additional departmental standards for the title of Lecturer.

Standards for title of Senior Lecturer.

There are currently no additional departmental standards for the title of Senior

Lecturer.

Standards to hold rank of Assistant Professor.

There are currently no additional departmental standards for the title of Assistant Professor.

Standards to earn or hold rank of Associate Professor.

Associate professor status is awarded concurrent with tenure unless it has been previously granted. The specific minimum criteria are the same as those for tenure and can be found below.

Standards to earn or hold rank of Professor.

Full professor status requires a broad range of significant contributions in the three essential areas of teaching, scholarship and research. In addition to the standards detailed in the University Faculty Performance Standard and in section 7.1 above, the department expects that the candidate's contribution in one of the three evaluation areas will go significantly beyond the standard performance expected of faculty. The department also expects that this contribution will be have duration. In addition, it is expected that the candidate will remain active in scholarship and as a general rule averaging one Category A accomplishment every other year.

Benchmarks to tenure and/or standards for reappointment.

Expectations: Reappointment

First year – minimum expectations

Teaching

1. Course development – as this represents just one quarter's work, design and teach courses for this first term.
2. Course content evaluation that reflects departmental criteria for content, assessment and teaching consistent with departmental philosophy.
3. Peer review - positive peer review of at least one class.
4. General availability to students.
5. Advising: work with another faculty member to develop a set of advising procedures and files, develop an understanding of departmental programs.
6. Develop a set of goals for teaching activities.

Scholarship

Develop a set of goals for a program of scholarly activity, based on the candidate's experience and interests, which are consistent with the goals and missions of the department.

Service

1. Attend department and general university meetings.
2. Participate in the departmental curriculum committee.
3. Develop a set of goals for service activities.

Second and third years – minimum expectations

Teaching

1. Continued refinement and development of courses that will serve the needs of the department and fit into the long-term goals of the department. This may or may not include the addition of new courses to the curriculum.
2. Same as 2 – 5 above in first year – teaching.
3. Advising: move to independently advise students and take on an average advisee load.
4. Review progress toward goals from the prior year, evaluate strengths and weaknesses, and develop goals for the next year based upon this evaluation.

Scholarship

1. In the second year begin implementation of the proposed program of scholarly activity.
2. The third year should see substantial work toward a particular program outcome, perhaps as part of a larger project. It is generally expected that in addition to other accomplishments, the candidate's record will include at least one Category A accomplishment.
3. Review progress toward goals from the prior year, evaluate strengths and weaknesses, and develop goals for the next year based upon this evaluation.

Service

1. Same as 1 and 2 above in first year – service.
2. Participate in at least one other department, college or university committee.
3. Review progress toward goals from the prior year, evaluate strengths and weaknesses, and develop goals for the next year based upon this evaluation.

Fourth and fifth years – minimum expectations

Teaching

1. Same as 1 – 3 above in second and third years - teaching.
2. At least two of the following by the fifth year (viewed cumulatively).
 - Incorporate technological, instructional, or evaluative innovations
 - Receive external teaching recognition
 - Develop new departmental courses / program
 - Develop / maintain interdisciplinary links and curricula
 - Give visiting class presentations, in and outside the department.
 - Contact with other educational institutions related to teaching.
 - Other specific accomplishments as planned through the candidate's goals.

Scholarship

1. The fourth and fifth years should see continued substantial work toward a particular program outcome. It is generally expected that in addition to other accomplishments, the candidate's record will include at least two (total) Category A accomplishments.
2. Review progress toward goals from the prior year, evaluate strengths and weaknesses, and develop goals for the next year based upon this evaluation.

Service

1. Same as 1 and 2 above in second and third years – service.
2. At least two of the following by the fifth year (viewed cumulatively).
 - Participate in national / regional professional organization.

- Serve as an advisor to avocational groups.
- Review for publications and or granting agencies.
- Serve on an editorial board.
- Other specific accomplishments as planned through the candidate's goals.

Tenure – Minimum Expectations.

It is expected that the candidate will continue to meet the general requirements describe in reappointment.

Teaching

At least three of the following:

- Upgrade teaching technological, instructional, or evaluative innovations, or through participation in activities such as training and seminars.
- Receive external teaching recognition
- Develop new departmental courses / program
- Develop / maintain interdisciplinary links and curricula
- Give visiting class presentations, in and outside the department.
- Contact with other educational institutions related to teaching.
- Other specific accomplishments as planned through the candidate's goals.

Scholarship

The six-year record of the candidate should demonstrate substantial work in the area of scholarship with the promise of future contributions. It is generally expected that in addition to other accomplishments, the candidate's record will include at least three (total) Category A accomplishments.

Service

At least two of the following.

- Participate in national / regional professional organization.
- Serve as an advisor to avocational groups.
- Review for publications and or granting agencies.
- Serve on an editorial board.
- Other specific accomplishments as planned through the candidate's goals.

Considerations and standards for post-tenure review.

As noted above, the department believes that it is healthy for all faculty members to undergo annual review. To this end tenured faculty members will undergo an annual peer review after they have been tenured. There are no specific minimum standards beyond those listed in the University Faculty Performance Standard and in section 7.1 above, instead the objective is to focus on the candidate's professional development through goal setting for the future and a review of previous goals. It is also intended that as part of this process, roadblocks to successful completion of goals will be identified along with the resources necessary to attain those goals. Faculty members will also participate in the third year evaluations described in the CBA.

2. Office Hours

Faculty members are expected to post and be available for a minimum of three office hours per week. Office hours should be given in course syllabi, posted on office doors, and on-file with the department secretary.

Faculty are also encouraged to be available at other times, if not on a drop-in basis, then by appointment.

3. Web Sites

Being a computer oriented discipline with students who expect to find information via the internet, faculty members are expected to maintain a professional web page linked to the department's web page. It is suggested that this web page include the following information:

- contact information
- weekly schedule
- links to current class web pages
- links to a current (perhaps abbreviated) curriculum vita

4. Syllabi

Individual differences in the construction of syllabi are to be expected. There are however certain basic components that the university feels should be included for consistency. These are outlined in the Undergraduate Academic Policy Manual (5-9.4.29) and are reprinted here for convenience.

5-9.4.29 Syllabi. Instructors will provide each student with a written or electronic syllabus at the beginning of a course. The syllabus will contain information about, but not be limited to, the following:

5-9.4.29.1 Title, time, and location of the course;

5-9.4.29.2 Name, campus address, e-mail address, telephone number, and office hours of instructor;

5-9.4.29.3 Objectives of course and expected student learning outcomes;

5-9.4.29.4 Type of instruction, I.e., lecture/discussion, lab, studio, etc., and any special conditions or requirements associated with the style;

5-9.4.29.5 Required books and materials;

5-9.4.29.6 Method of evaluating student performance in the course;

5-9.4.29.7 Instructor's policy on students' attendance;

5-9.4.29.8 Tentative schedule including dates when papers or other assignments are due as well as dates of examinations;

5-9.4.29.9 Instructor's policy on late work, make-up, extra credit, and other issues unique to the class.

Syllabi for *core courses* should be consistent with approved course outlines. These are on file in the department office in the Curriculum Manual. Copies of syllabi will be collected for all regularly scheduled courses each term and kept on file in the department office.

5. Student Evaluations

All regularly scheduled courses with more than five students will be evaluated each term using the university's Student Evaluation of Instruction form (SEOI). Instructors should arrange for an evaluation of their courses with the department secretary. This evaluation should normally take place during the last week of classes.

6. Departmental Meetings

The Chair will call department meetings as required. Generally, there should be at least one meeting per quarter. The Chair should attempt to provide ample notice of an upcoming meeting so that a convenient meeting time for all members of the department may be found. In quarter's without regular weekly meetings, any faculty member of the department may request that a department meeting be called and the Chair will arrange for such a meeting at the earliest convenient time. Any faculty member of the department may request that an item be added to the agenda of a future meeting. Robert's Rules of Order govern the process of the meeting except where they differ from the procedures listed in this document.

7. Voting

With the exception of amending the policies and procedures of the department, decisions are made with the approval of a majority vote of the full-time faculty who are present and voting. The chair may vote on all issues.

Any full-time faculty member may propose amendments to these policies and procedures. All amendments will be adopted when approved by a majority of the full-time faculty.

8. Summer Teaching

The summer session is funded on a self-support basis; the combined offerings of the department are expected to generate sufficient revenue to cover the costs associated with items such as salaries and overhead. The department will schedule one to two classes for faculty at their request in consultation with the chair. There are however no guarantees. Classes that do not draw sufficient enrollment may, in consultation with the department chair, the associate dean, and continuing studies and with the agreement of the faculty

member, have salary prorated or be canceled using criteria consistent with university and college policy.

9. Non-Instructional Assignments & Workloads

The following positions will be filled by faculty members of the department. These positions will contribute to the calculation of the service portion of a faculty member's workload.

Faculty Senator and Alternate Faculty Senator
Personnel, Curriculum and Search Committee Members
Departmental Library Representative
Student Mentors
Faculty Advisor to the Student Chapter of the ACM

10. Advising

Advising is critical to the success of our programs. Indeed the department believes that each major should be advised each term so that academic progress and potential problems will be reviewed in a timely fashion. To this end, the department will admit students to major classes only with the approval of the chair. All full-time faculty members are expected to participate in advising. Advising assignments are made in consultation with the chair.

11. Individual Study

Individual studies courses are courses that include study of topics that are not offered as an existing course. A faculty member willing to supervise an individual study course and a student wishing to register for it should outline the study area and develop specific learning outcomes and an assessment plan. Students should have an individual study permit filled out and obtain signatures of the supervising faculty member, the chair and the associate dean. Workload units for faculty will be assigned in accordance with the formula described in the CBA.

12. Cooperative Education / Internship

The department strongly urges students to include a cooperative education or internship experience as part of their academic program. Students seeking such an experience must have a faculty supervisor. These experiences are defined and coordinated by the supervising faculty member in consultation with the chair and the Career Services office. Requirements for defining a cooperative education or internship experience can be found in the university catalog or at the Career Services office. Workload units for faculty will be assigned in accordance with the formula described in the CBA.

13. Senior Project Participation

An important part of the computer science curriculum is the senior project – a capstone experience for our students. This project covers the courses CS 480 and 481. CS 480 will be presented and coordinated by a single faculty member. Load points for this class are calculated using the standard formula for a regularly scheduled class. In CS 480/481, students are divided into teams with a faculty supervisor with whom they complete the implementation of their project. With a growing enrollment and an increasing number of graduating seniors, it is expected that all full-time faculty members will supervise some of the student teams. Every effort will be made to distribute the workload evenly among the faculty. Workload units for faculty will be assigned in accordance with the independent study formula described in the CBA.

14. Grading

As a faculty, we are aware of the issue of *grade inflation*. It is the position of the Department of Computer Science that in grading we are attempting to provide honest and accurate feedback to students concerning their accomplishments in our courses. The following is taken from the university catalog.

A "C" grade indicates that a student has made substantial progress toward meeting the objectives of the course and has fulfilled the requirements of the course. The grades above "C" are used for those students who have demonstrated some degree of superiority. The highest grade, "A," is reserved for those students who have excelled in every phase of the course. The "B" grade is for students whose work is superior but does not warrant the special distinctiveness of the "A." The "D" is a grade for those students who have made progress toward meeting the objectives of the course but who have fulfilled the requirements only in a substandard manner. The "F" is reserved for students who have failed to meet or have accomplished so few of the requirements of the course that they are not entitled to credit.

The university catalog provides the following information relative to incomplete grades.

An "I" means the student was not able to complete the course by the end of the term, but has satisfactorily completed a sufficient portion of it and can be expected to finish without having to re-enroll in it. To earn a grade, work of the course must be completed as prescribed by the instructor on forms filed in the appropriate department office. If it is not completed within one calendar year, the "I" will convert to an "F."

All incomplete changes exceeding the one calendar year limit, including extensions, must be submitted to Registrar Services for approval.

Students may not re-register for a course in which they have received a grade of incomplete. If a student re-registers in an incomplete through his/her own initiative, and the student remains registered in the course beyond the sixth day of the quarter, no refund will be given. The action, although usually unintentional, simulates an actual course repeat in which full fees are assessed.

15. Final Assignments

When scheduling programming and other assignments toward the end of the quarter, faculty will keep in mind the necessity for students to have adequate time to study for finals.

Therefore, whenever possible, assignments should be due no later than 5:00 p.m. on the last day of classes.

16. Office Assignments

Selection of offices will be based upon seniority, except for the office designated for the Chair.