

PROGRAM PERSONNEL STANDARDS

APPROVAL FORM

Discipline: Computer Science

Gynthia J. West
RTP Committee Chair Date

Dawn Neuman
Provost Date

11/10/2010

Computer Science

Program Personnel Standards

INTRODUCTION

The Computer Science Program is committed to excellence in teaching, student learning, scholarship, and University development within a culture of collective responsibility. The Program encourages peer collaboration and review, faculty experimentation and assessment, and continuous evaluation of academic quality. Consistent with the mission of the University, the Program places a high value on interdisciplinarity and innovation, and recognizes the importance of aligning resources with Program goals.

This document provides guidelines for the retention, tenure and promotion process for Computer Science Program faculty members. Faculty members should also review the current *University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Policy and Procedures* document and the *CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement* before beginning the review process. Nothing in this PPS is intended to contradict these superseding documents.

This PPS document shall be revised every five years or earlier at the request of the University President or by simple majority vote of the Computer Science full-time tenure-track faculty. This document will go into effect when approved by the University RTP Committee and the VPAA. If the PPS changes during the faculty member's probationary period, the faculty member under review may choose to be evaluated by the new PPS or the one in effect at the time the faculty member's Professional Development Plan (PDP – see Section D) was approved.

1. A Program Personnel Committee shall be constituted:

- A. A 3 or 5 member Program Personnel Committee (PPC) shall be elected in the first full month of the Fall semester of each year. The PPC shall consist of at least three tenured members of the Computer Science Program faculty. If three tenured members are not available, then tenured faculty from other disciplines may be elected to the PCC.
- B. Members of the PPC shall be elected by simple majority vote of the full-time, tenure-track Program faculty. In promotion considerations, PPC members shall have a higher rank than those being considered for promotion.
- C. This document applies to all Computer Science tenure-track faculty members.

- D. The Program Chair will conduct a separate review of the faculty member's file as part of the review sequence and will not serve on the PPC.

A. TEACHING

Evaluation of Computer Science faculty members for retention, tenure and/or promotion shall be based on the following criteria:

Required Element

1. Appropriateness of instructional methods and materials demonstrated through course materials, including but not limited to syllabi, assignments, projects, and other supplementary materials provided by the candidate, and the candidate's narrative on teaching.
 - A. Methods are appropriate to the respective course content and objectives.
 - B. Materials selected are appropriate for the topic and reflect current issues or scholarship in the field.
 - C. Syllabi include outcomes, course requirements, class schedule, assignments and grading policies.

Required Element

2. Peer Review of Teaching demonstrated by written evaluation by a tenured member of the faculty of CSUCI at least once per academic year. Evaluations will assess the pedagogical effectiveness of teaching methodology, course materials and classroom presentation, and offer constructive suggestions for improvement as appropriate.

Required Element

3. Students' Evaluations of Teaching.

A. Student evaluations recognize the candidate's ability to successfully organize, present, and assess the content of the course, to communicate effectively, and to engage students in the concepts and issues under discussion.

B. Special conditions should be explained in the teaching narrative, particularly for courses with unique circumstances, unusual difficulties, experimental teaching methods, and for courses offered for the first time.

Additional Element

4. Additional Teaching Elements

A. Teaching and/or advising awards, success of students in contests, post-graduate endeavors, or other recognition/communication from students.

B. Materials should demonstrate a pattern of persistent improvement or consistent excellence in teaching.

C. Evidence of involvement in student groups, computer club, regional or national contests, or student projects and colloquia.

Additional Element

5. Participation in curriculum development and assessment of student learning may be demonstrated by the creation of new courses and/or the significant revision of existing courses, curricula, or Programs; development or utilization of assessment tools; syllabi developed; materials presented to Curriculum Committee; listings in catalogs.

A. Courses developed show alignment with the Computer Science Program and/or the University mission; e.g., the courses take an interdisciplinary, multicultural, service-learning, student-centered, and/or international focus.

B. When appropriate, curriculum utilizes technology to enhance the effectiveness of course activities and materials to provide different perspectives on the curriculum, and/or to improve communication among course participants.

Additional Element

6. Utilizes modern or advanced software techniques for teaching purposes, such as open-source software; uses software tools that enhance students' learning experience and increases their value to potential employers.

Additional Element

7. Utilizes laboratory facilities and equipment to support and enhance teaching methods, informing and educating students in a laboratory setting.

Additional Element

8. Continual effort to improve teaching demonstrated by the teaching narrative, attendance at various professional development events and workshops, consultation with colleagues, involvement with the Faculty Development Office, and/or development of grants designed to improve teaching effectiveness.

A. Candidates participate in activities designed to improve their teaching.

B. Candidates work with colleagues in formal and/or informal ways to implement ways to increase teaching effectiveness.

B. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

Evaluation of Computer Science faculty members for retention, tenure and/or promotion shall be based upon the following criteria:

1. Engage in an ongoing program of scholarship activity that demonstrates intellectual and professional growth; produce scholarship achievements that contribute to the advancement, application or pedagogy of the discipline or interdisciplinary studies and disseminate scholarly work to appropriate publications and audiences.
2. Examples of Evidence of Performance:

Required Elements

- Publication in refereed journals or refereed conference proceedings, and/or
- Publication of peer reviewed books, book chapters, or other peer reviewed media.

As a general guideline, the candidate should have at least 3 such publications in a 5 year period.

Additional Elements

- Publication of book chapters, books, films, videos, CD ROM, DVD or other electronic media
- Publications and presentations at professional conferences.
- Development of widely disseminated Software Applications or Hardware Systems.
- Development and dissemination of laboratory manuals.
- Reports of consulting assignments that contribute to teaching and/or to scholarship.
- Creating, editing or reviewing articles/cases/chapters/course materials for academic journals and publications.
- Earning patents or establishing copyrights.
- Appearances on media that contribute to the advancement of teaching and/or scholarship.
- Reports of applied research.
- Preparing applications grants, commissions, fellowships, prizes, other awards.
- Awarded peer reviewed grants.
- Awarded grants.
- Participation in colloquia, seminars, symposia, conferences – including leading sections.
- Significant leadership of professional organizations.
- Performance of post-doctoral work.

3. Professional growth shall be measured in terms of consistent progress towards new and ongoing goals, as reflected in the PDP.

C. PROFESSIONAL, UNIVERSITY, AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

1. Faculty members are expected to participate regularly in shared governance through service on Senate Committees and Task Forces and/or University Committees and Task Forces.
2. Faculty are expected to participate regularly in Program-related activities, such as serving on the Program Personnel Committee, participating in developing new courses, minors, or degree Programs, serving as academic advisor, or other areas of Program service.
3. Faculty are encouraged, but not required, to participate in service to the community beyond the University in such ways as giving public talks, readings or performances, serving as members or on Boards of Directors of community groups or not-for-profit organizations, or other activities.

D. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

1. A Professional Development Plan (PDP) is the faculty member's agenda for achieving the professional growth necessary to qualify for retention, tenure and promotion. The plan shall address standards reflected in this document, the University RTP Policies and Procedures, and the Collective Bargaining Agreement
2. The initial PDP shall normally be prepared, reviewed, and approved (by the PPC, program chair, and the Dean) by the end of the faculty member's first year of appointment.
3. The PDP shall describe the activities and intended outcomes the faculty member expects to achieve during the evaluation period.
4. These narratives shall describe the faculty member's
 - a. professional goals,
 - b. areas of interest,
 - c. resources required, and
 - d. expected accomplishments in the three evaluation areas to meet the Program Personnel Standards for retention and tenure.
5. The PDP will be reviewed by the PPC, the program chair, and the Dean, each of whom will provide written feedback on a timetable to be determined by the Division of Academic Affairs but prior to the end of the faculty member's first full year of service. The PDP shall be included with the self-assessment narratives in the faculty member's portfolio that is submitted for retention review during the second year in the tenure track position.
 - a. In the event the PPC, the program chair, or the Dean does not approve the PDP, the faculty member shall revise it and resubmit it within two weeks.

-
- b. After re-submittal, if the PPC or the Dean makes further suggestions for modifications, the faculty member may, within two weeks, submit a revised PDP.

E. PORTFOLIO

1. The preparation of the Portfolio is the sole responsibility of the faculty member. The current *University Retention, Tenure, & Promotion Policy and Procedures* document provides specific Portfolio guidelines. The faculty member should be sure that the Portfolio is current and complete before submission to the PPC. Evaluations, recommendations, and rebuttals, if any, are added at the various levels of review. The portfolio shall contain the following:
 - a. a concise self-assessment of accomplishments in the three areas of evaluation;
 - b. teaching assignments for period under review: list of classes with briefly described relevant information, including new preparations, etc.;
 - c. a minimum of one peer review of classroom teaching from each probationary year;
 - d. statistical summaries of student evaluations; it is highly recommended that student evaluations be included from all classes taught.
2. If material documenting a substantial change in the status of an activity contained in the Portfolio becomes available after the Portfolio is declared complete, this new material may be added with permission from the appropriate level of review.
3. When weaknesses have been identified in earlier review cycles, the faculty member must address these weaknesses explicitly and show appropriate improvement.