JMU Computer Science AUPAC Policies and Procedures

V. 1.0, 4/17/2023

Preamble

The role of the JMU Faculty Handbook is to "outline the duties, rights and responsibilities of faculty members and to be a guide for the relationship between the faculty members and the university." In some areas, the Faculty Handbook allows, or requires, the establishment of policies at the level of the academic unit. This document contains a collection of policies and procedures established within the JMU Computer Science department. Each individual policy has been approved by the computer science faculty. The policies related to evaluation criteria and procedures have also been approved by the AUH, dean, and provost as required by the Faculty Handbook (III.E.1.f.).

AUPAC Responsibilities and Composition

1. ## Purpose and Responsibilities

The role of the AUPAC is to advise the Department Head and make recommendations on personnel matters with the Computer Science Department, to hear appeals of faculty evaluations, and to offer guidance to faculty members preparing for tenure and promotion. The AUPAC will operate in accordance with Section III of the Faculty Handbook.

2. ## Composition & Roles

   2.1. The AUPAC will include all active full-time instructional faculty having a primary appointment in the department, except the Department Head.
   2.2. An Administrative and Appeals Subcommittee (AAS) will be elected each year consisting of four members other than the Assistant Academic Unit Head, one of whom must not have tenure if possible. This subcommittee will be responsible for managing all business to come before the AUPAC. It will also hear appeals of faculty evaluations, lead the review and revision of policies and procedures, arrange for intermediate evaluation of any faculty member upon request of that faculty member, and handle other AUPAC business as needed.
   2.3. The chairperson will be elected by the AAS. If the Subcommittee cannot do so, the chairperson will be elected by the AUPAC. Votes will be carried by a majority of (non-abstaining) votes cast.

3. ## Promotion and Tenure Recommendations

   3.1. Only tenured AUPAC members will vote on tenure recommendations.
   3.2. Only AUPAC members at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor will vote on recommendations for promotion to Associate Professor.
   3.3. Only AUPAC members at the rank of Professor will vote on recommendations for promotion to Professor.
   3.4. No individual will vote on his or her own case. Active faculty members who are away will have the opportunity to vote by proxy. A member of the AUPAC may abstain from any vote if unable to vote or if s/he feels it is in the best interest of the department to abstain.
   3.5. Each case will be discussed openly by those eligible to vote, followed by an open vote to recommend or not. All votes will be carried by a majority of (non-abstaining) votes cast, except that a minimum of three votes must be cast. If fewer than three faculty members are eligible and willing to vote on any case, then the AUPAC will conduct a special election to temporarily add the minimum number of required voters to the panel for that case only, from among AUPAC members otherwise not eligible to vote.

Approved 11/2016

AUPAC Procedures and Processes

Promotion and Tenure Cases

The applicant will submit one copy of her/his materials to the Administrative and Appeals Subcommittee (AAS).

The Chair of the AAS will arrange to have copies of the materials made; the copies will be kept in a secure location in the Departmental Office.

The Chair of the AAS will inform the members of the AUPAC that an application has been submitted and schedule a meeting of the AUPAC to consider the application. If multiple applications will be considered at a single meeting, applications for Associate Professor will be considered first, applications for Tenure will be considered second, and applications for Professor will be considered last (so that members of the AUPAC who are not eligible to review the latter cases can leave the meeting).

Prior to the scheduled meeting, all members of the Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC) will sign-out a copy of the materials, review it, and return that copy to the Departmental Office.

Members of the AUPAC will discuss each applicant individually and come to a decision about its recommendation. The AUPAC will make exactly one recommendation; the AUPAC "speaks with one voice". **The deliberations of the AUPAC will be confidential; members of the AUPAC must not discuss the deliberations with anyone, including the applicant.**

Appropriate members of the AAS will draft a letter of recommendation and circulate it to the appropriate members of the AUPAC.

Members of the AUPAC will provide feedback to the AAS on the letter of recommendation. In the event of significant/substantial feedback, the Chair of the AAS will schedule a meeting to discuss the letter of recommendation.

After the letter of recommendation is finalized, it will be signed by the Chair of the AAS on behalf of the entire AUPAC.

The Chair of the AAS will submit the letter of recommendation as required by The Faculty Handbook.

Second/Fourth Year Reviews

Currently, the *Pre-Tenure Review Policy* states that "*The PAC shall evaluate pre-tenure faculty members at the end of the second year, or at the midpoint of the pre-tenure period, whichever is earlier. At the option of the faculty member, the PAC may also perform a second pre-tenure review at the end of the fourth year.*"

Review materials should be delivered to the Chair of the AAS within three months after the end of the second year, or midpoint of the pre-tenure period, whichever is earlier.

The Chair of the AAS will arrange to have copies of the materials made; the copies will be kept in a secure location in the Departmental Office.

The Chair of the AAS will inform the members of the AUPAC that one or more such requests have been made and schedule a meeting of the AUPAC to consider them

Prior to the scheduled meeting, each member of the Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC) will sign-out a copy of the materials, review them, and return that copy to the Departmental Office.

Members of the AUPAC will discuss each case individually and come to a decision about its evaluation. **The deliberations of the AUPAC will be confidential; members of the AUPAC must not discuss the deliberations with anyone outside of the meeting.**

Appropriate members of the AAS will draft an evaluation report and circulate it to the appropriate members of the AUPAC.

Members of the AUPAC will provide feedback to the AAS on the draft report. In the event of significant/substantial feedback, the Chair of the AAS will schedule a meeting to discuss the evaluation.

After the evaluation report is finalized, it will be signed by the Chair of the AAS on behalf of the entire AUPAC.

The Chair of the AAS will present the report to the requestor as detailed in the *Pre-Tenure Review Policy.*

Revised 1/17

Policy on Promotion and Tenure for Tenure Track Faculty

Preamble

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

Role of the AUPAC in Promotion and Tenure Decisions

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

Standards

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

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

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

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

Criteria

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

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

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

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

Teaching

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

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

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

- Have a consistent pattern of excellent annual evaluations of teaching.
- Have a consistent pattern of excellent student evaluations of teaching.
- Prepare and teach courses in multiple programs (e.g., graduate and undergraduate courses) and at multiple levels (e.g., 100, 200, 300 and 400 level courses).
- Receive a teaching award from the University, a peer group, or professional organization.
- Develop new course materials that substantially revise and improve a course.

- Develop new courses and contribute to the development of new programs or substantial program revisions.
- Investigate and make appropriate use of emerging instructional technologies.
- Supervise independent studies, honors projects, and theses.
- Participate in workshops and meetings with a focus on improving teaching in general.
- Have strong recommendations and good peer evaluations from other faculty members.
- Receive significant funding that supports educational activities.
- Participate in mentoring activities (e.g., advise prestigious scholarship applicants and lead educational activities for student clubs).
- Have a consistent pattern of developing and offering special topics courses.

Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

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

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

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

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

---

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

Service

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

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

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

- Participate in activities at more than one level within the University, be involved in a wide array of different activities, and have a demonstrated record of playing a significant role in these activities.
- Provide effective service to a professional organization (e.g., serve as an officer, serve as a conference/session organizer).
- Play a significant role in recruiting activities.
- Play a significant role advising/supervising student clubs/activities.
- Advise undergraduate and/or graduate students.
- Make outstanding contributions to the development of other faculty in the Department, College, or University.
- Receive nominations or awards for service from recognized organizations outside of the University.
- Lead community service activities that bring recognition to the Department, College or University.
- Receive consistent and significant funding that supports non-scholarly activities (e.g., funding for teaching laboratories, scholarships, and recruiting).
- Accept an unusual teaching load at the request of the Department.

Related Documents

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

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

Approved 1/30/2013

Faculty Member Annual Evaluation Criteria

Preamble

The purposes of faculty member evaluation are to encourage performance at the highest levels, to indicate areas where improvements are needed, and to provide a factual basis for making personnel decisions (including decisions about promotion, tenure, allocation of merit pay increases, continuation of employment, and initiation of post-tenure review). This document supplements the JMU Faculty Handbook by stating explicit criteria to be used by the Computer Science department in conducting faculty member evaluations.

Criteria are stated in the categories of teaching, professional service, and scholarly achievement and professional qualifications. Different criteria may be established in any category for purposes of evaluating an individual faculty member by mutual agreement of the department head and that faculty member. It would be prudent to make such an agreement in advance of the activity and record it in the faculty member's anticipated activity report.

In some categories the criteria for achieving a rating of satisfactory or excellent are expressed in terms of necessary and sufficient conditions. For example, to receive an excellent rating in service, one activity from the Quality group is necessary and two are sufficient. In this case, the determination of whether a single activity is adequate will depend on the effort and impact associated with that activity. Since these determinations are potentially subjective, faculty members are encouraged to resolve ambiguities in advance by consulting with the unit head during the preparation of the anticipated activities document.

Faculty members are encouraged to write a short summary placing their efforts in the three categories in context and arguing how what they have done is sufficient for a satisfactory or excellent rating in each category.

I. Teaching

For a **satisfactory** rating, **all** the following activities are **necessary and sufficient**.

A. Satisfactory Group

1. Produced syllabi that clearly stated course objectives, content, texts, schedule, and student evaluation procedures
2. Produced up-to-date materials and assigned work appropriate to the course level and content
3. Prepared for class meetings thoroughly
4. Held classes and started on time
5. Used effective teaching methods
6. Posted and kept sufficient office hours
7. Answered students' inquiries promptly
8. Showed concern and respect toward students
9. Graded objectively and returned graded assignments promptly
10. Interacted with students and peers in a professional manner
11. Advised students about curricula, schedules, and professional preparation
12. Received satisfactory student teaching evaluations

For an **excellent** rating, **three** of the following activities are **sufficient** provided **at least one** of them is from the Quality Group. **One** activity from the Quality Group is **necessary**.

B. Effort Group

1. Supervised one or more independent studies, honors theses, or masters theses
2. Played a major role in developing new courses or significant program revisions
3. Attended teaching workshops or participated in other teacher development activities
4. Applied for a government or foundation grant, award, or contract to fund teaching or course, curriculum, or program development
5. Supported teaching-related activities beyond regular teaching load (directed student learning, comprehensive exams, reader for theses/projects)
6. Adopted new teaching techniques or significantly improved course materials based on peer feedback or evidence in the research literature

C. Quality Group

1. Received an excellent evaluation from a peer review committee
2. Received an award or special recognition for teaching
3. Received significant funding to support educational activities
4. Received excellent student teaching evaluations

II. Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

For a **satisfactory** rating, **two** of the activities from the Effort Group (or comparable activities) are **necessary and sufficient**.

For an **excellent** rating, **one** of the activities from the Quality Group (or a comparable activity) is **necessary**. **Two** of the activities from the Quality group are **sufficient**.

A. Effort Group

1. Presented or served on a panel at a professional conference
2. Published in a non-refereed professional forum
3. Attended some scholarly gathering, such as a conference or tutorial
4. Presented research results at a faculty seminar or colloquium
5. Reviewed monographs, books, or articles for publication
6. Served on a grant review panel for a national professional organization (e.g., NSF, DoD, etc.)
7. Submitted a proposal for a government, corporate, or foundation grant, award, or contract to support research
8. Consulted outside the university in a way that increased the faculty member's expertise
9. Produced artifacts demonstrating professional or scholarly expertise such as technical reports, questions for national standardized tests (e.g., the GRE), or fielded software products
10. Produced evidence of work in progress that will likely culminate in a scholarly contribution to the discipline or its pedagogy
11. Served as Principal or Co-Principal Investigator on a continuing grant

B. Quality Group

1. Published a monograph or book in the past two years
2. Received a government, corporate, or foundation grant, award, or contract to fund research
3. Published a book review, book chapter, or encyclopedia article
4. Published an article in a refereed journal, conference, or workshop, or in some other refereed forum
5. Received a professional achievement or special recognition award
6. Presented an invited lecture or published an invited paper outside the university
7. Created and delivered a professional tutorial or workshop that required creation of material or creative synthesis of existing material

III. Professional Service

For a **satisfactory** rating, **all** the following activities are **necessary and sufficient**.

A. Satisfactory Group

1. Actively participated in departmental service
2. Attended Department, College and University meetings (as appropriate)
3. Attended a reasonable number of student-focused activities (e.g., club meetings, talks by outside speakers, recruiting events)
4. Satisfied faculty obligations as stated in the faculty handbook
5. Provided satisfactory service in a leadership position in the department (only if applicable)

For an **excellent** rating, **one** of the following activities (or a comparable activity) is **necessary.** Two **are sufficient.**

B. Quality Group

1. Played a significant role in department, college, or university committees, task forces, etc.
2. Held a leadership position in a major professional organization
3. Provided excellent service in a leadership position in the department
4. Received a government, corporate, or foundation grant, award, or contract primarily to fund instructional equipment or software for laboratories
5. Performed a leadership activity for a major professional conference or meeting
6. Served as an editorial board member of a professional journal
7. Delivered an established professional tutorial or workshop
8. Actively served as a faculty advisor to a student group (e.g., ACM, UPE, etc.)
9. Played a major role in an effort to increase departmental, college, or university resources
10. Played a major role an effort to enhance scholarship or pedagogy in the department, college, university, or profession
11. Provided support for mission critical department or university functions, such as server support, course scheduling, etc., in addition to regular duties
12. Provided state-of-the-art computing advice or support outside the department
13. Provided significant help with public relations events or student recruiting
14. Accepted service tasks that constituted an inconvenience or hardship (such as teaching an uncompensated overload course)

Approved 4/20/2022

Process for the Review of an Appeal of an Annual Evaluation

Pursuant to §III.E.4.g of the *Faculty Handbook* (2019), a faculty member has the right to appeal an annual evaluation before it is submitted to the Dean. The Department of Computer Science has designated the Administrative and Appeals Subcommittee (AAS) of the Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC) as the body that will hear such appeals. This document describes what is required of the individual making the appeal and the process that will be used by the AAS.

Requirements of the Individual Making the Appeal

Pursuant to §III.E.4.g of the *Faculty Handbook* (2019), the faculty member has a maximum of seven days following receipt of the official written evaluation to make the appeal in writing. Failure to file a timely written appeal will result in the evaluation being sent forward to the dean, and no further appeal rights are available.

The faculty member making the appeal must transmit a letter to the chair of the AAS that describes:

1. The part or parts of the annual evaluation that are being appealed.
2. Why each part of the evaluation is thought to be incorrect.

The faculty member making the appeal should **not** transmit either the Faculty Activities Report (FAR) or the supporting materials submitted along with that report to the AAS.

Criteria to be Applied During the Review

As described in §III.E.4.h of the *Faculty Handbook* (2019), the reviewing body should consider:

- "[W]hether all relevant information was objectively reviewed by the AUH in accordance with evaluation criteria established by the academic unit."
- "[W]hether the AUH evaluated similar achievements among similarly situated academic unit members using the same standard of judgment."

Review Process

Upon receipt of the appeal, the AAS will:

- Identify 2-3 similarly situated members of the academic unit.
- Ask the Academic Unit Head (AUH) to supply them with the FAR of the faculty member making the appeal and the 2-3 similarly situated members of the academic unit.
- Determine whether or not the FAR was objectively reviewed by the AUH.
- Determine whether or not same standards of judgment were used by the AUH.
- Provide a written recommendation (to either uphold or modify the evaluation) to the AUH (with a copy to the faculty member making the appeal and the Dean).

The AAS must complete this process by the deadline specified in §III.E.4.h of the *Faculty Handbook* (2019).

Approved 10/14/20

Mid-Tenure Review Policy

According to the faculty handbook "The AUPAC and AUH must independently review the accomplishments of tenure track faculty at the midpoint of the probationary period, typically during the third year of candidacy" (III.E.4.m.) These evaluations become a matter of the college's record and are filed in the office of the dean.

In the computer science department, the required evaluation will take place at the end of the fourth semester, or at the midpoint of the pre-tenure period, whichever is earlier. At the option of the faculty member, the PAC may also perform a second pre-tenure review at the end of the eighth semester. The PAC's evaluation report for the optional second review is the confidential property of the faculty member, and no copies shall be retained by the PAC or filed with the college.

Faculty members may provide to the PAC whatever documentation they think relevant in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarly achievement. This documentation may include a current curriculum vitae, a summary of class evaluations, copies of annual evaluations, annual activity reports, and a listing of relevant accomplishments.

For evaluations taking place during the spring semester, the faculty member's dossier must be provided to the PAC by February 28th. The evaluation will be shared with the faculty member, the AUH and the dean by April 15th. For evaluations taking place during the fall semester, the dossier must be provided to the PAC by October 1st. The evaluation will be shared by November 15th.

Approved 10/07 (PAC Evaluation of New Hires)

Revised 1/17

Revised 10/2022

Early Promotion and Tenure Policy

Definitions

Early tenure refers to a tenure application/decision that is made prior to the penultimate year of the probationary period.

Early promotion refers to a promotion application/decision that is made before completing five years in academic rank.

Background

As per the Faculty Handbook, early promotion will only be awarded if the candidate presents a "compelling case" and early tenure applications will only receive favorable review if "compelling evidence of accomplishment" has been presented.

Criteria

Case materials that would lead to promotion/tenure on a normal schedule are not sufficient for early promotion/tenure. Instead, early promotion and/or tenure will only be awarded to applicants who have met the tenure/promotion criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service and exceeded the tenure/promotion criteria in at least two of teaching, scholarship or service. In addition, early promotion and tenure will only be awarded if there is strong evidence that the high level of achievement in scholarship, teaching and service will continue.

Rationale for the Criteria

Under ordinary circumstances, early promotion and tenure are not in the best interest of a candidate or of the institution. Hence, the Department of Computer Science believes that early promotion and tenure applications should only be made in extraordinary cases.

Approved at the Faculty Meeting of 16 March 2011

Merit Pay Algorithm

Merit Rating: Each faculty member in the Department of Computer Science is evaluated annually for overall performance and in each of the three standard categories: teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service. Overall performance is evaluated as unsatisfactory or satisfactory. Performance in the three standard categories is evaluated as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or excellent. Associated with each of the performance ratings will be a numerical value: unsatisfactory= -1, satisfactory= 0, excellent= 2. In addition, associated with each of the three performance categories is a relative weight, determined at the beginning of the academic year as indicated in the department's policy on annual evaluation. A faculty member's merit rating (MR) for a year is computed by multiplying each of the three performance category values by their respective weights, then summing the three products. (Example: if a faculty member was evaluated as excellent, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory in teaching, scholarly activity, and service and those categories had weights 70%, 15%, and 15% respectively, the merit rating would be 2*70% + 0*15% +(-1*15%) = 1.25.)

Total Merit Dollars (TMD): Total merit dollars (TMD) is the amount of money provided to the Department for merit raises.

Overall Department Raise Percentage: The overall department raise percentage (ODRP) is the percentage obtained by TMD by the total of the current salaries of all faculty that can be considered for merit raises (newly hired faculty are not typically included).

Base Merit Percentage (BMP): The base merit percentage (BMP) is calculated as 0.75 x ODRP. Example: if the department received a merit pool of 4%, the merit raise for each faculty member evaluated as satisfactory overall in their annual evaluation would include a base amount of 3.0% of their current salary.)

Base Merit Increase (BMI): All faculty evaluated as satisfactory overall in their annual evaluation receive a base merit increase (BMI) amount which is a percentage of their current salary calculated as BMP x current salary.

Additional Merit Percentage (AMP): The additional merit percentage (AMP) available is .25 x ODRP. In the current example, this would be .25 x 4% = 1%.

Additional Merit Dollars (AMD): The additional merit dollars (AMD) is calculated as AMP times the sum of the current annual salaries of all faculty in the Department (not counting salaries of those newly hired).

Average Merit Rating (AMR): An average merit rating (AMR) over the last four years is computed for each faculty member by averaging the yearly merit ratings.

Overall Department Merit Rating (ODMR): An overall department merit rating (ODMR) is calculated as the sum of the AMRs for all eligible faculty.

Merit Percentage: An average department merit rating (ADMR) for each is calculated as ODMR/(# faculty eligible). A faculty member's merit percentage (**MP**) is calculated as AMR/ADMR.

Additional Merit Increase: An "additional merit increase" (AMI) is calculated as follows:

For each eligible faculty member, an additional merit increase (AMI) is calculated[2] as follows:

AMI = MP * current salary*AMP

Total Raise: A faculty member's total raise is

Total Raise = BMI + AMI

Approved at the March 21, 2007 Faculty Meeting

---

[2]AMI may possibly be adjusted slightly to make up for differences in faculty member salaries and percentages that result in either slightly less or slightly more than the total dollar pool being allocated. However, this is normally not a problem because the college can cover small differences in the total (e.g., <$30).

Peer Reviews

Purpose

The purpose of a peer review is to make suggestions to help faculty members improve their teaching by providing a frank and confidential assessment of their teaching.

Review Initiation Process

A faculty member may at any time during a fall or spring semester ask the PAC to arrange a peer review of one or more of the faculty member's courses. The PAC will then form an ad hoc committee of three faculty members one of whom, at most, may be from another department. The PAC will then charge the review committee to perform a peer review. Oversight by the PAC ends at this point.

Peer Review Process

The peer review process will consist of the following steps:

1. The review committee and the reviewed faculty member meet to discuss the course syllabus, including course objectives, organization, policies, content, assessment tools, and pedagogy. Class sessions observed by one or more reviewers are scheduled and the specific objectives and pedagogy of the classes are discussed.
2. Each review committee member observes one or more class sessions or some period of online interaction.
3. The review committee prepares a written report and delivers it to the reviewed faculty member.
4. The reviewed faculty member may submit the report to the department head as part of his or her annual activities report or as part of his or her tenure and promotion package.
5. The review committee destroys all material collected in the course of its work.

Confidentiality

Peer review committee members are obliged to keep the results of their peer reviews confidential. Evidence and observations known to the review committee may not be confided to anyone except the reviewed faculty member, nor be used in any faculty evaluation process, except at the explicit request of the reviewed faculty member.

Approved 1/17/07

Office Hours Policy

Computer science faculty members must hold "office hours" each week when classes are in session (excluding exam week). Office hours must be at published regularly scheduled times and be held in a manner that allows for synchronous interaction. The office hours must meet the following requirements:

- Full-time faculty: at least five hours of office hours per week.
- Part-time faculty: at least 30 minutes of office hours per on-campus credit hour taught.

Full-time faculty must be available in person at an on-campus (e.g. office, lab) location for at least 50% of the required office hours. Faculty required to hold three or more office hours per week must spread those office hours over two or more days. Outside the published office hours, all faculty should exercise reasonable effort to be available by appointment. Faculty teaching computer science courses that have primary responsibility in another department shall be governed by the office hours policy of that other department.

Approved 10/10

Policy for Conducting Student Evaluations

Goals of the policy:

Given that student course evaluations play a role in faculty evaluation, it is important to ensure a reasonable degree of consistency in how evaluations are conducted. The goal of this policy is to maintain consistency within a system that is flexible enough to accommodate a range of course schedules and needs.

Requirements for conducting student course evaluations for in-person courses:

- Student evaluations must be conducted in-class during the last two weeks of the regular semester. Faculty must set aside at least ten minutes of class time for students to complete the evaluations. Faculty must leave the classroom while students complete evaluations.
- Course evaluations must remain open for at least 48 hours after in-class evaluations are completed.

Requirements for conducting student course evaluations for online courses:

- Student evaluations must be made available during the last two weeks of the regular semester.
- The instructor must clearly communicate the time period for completing evaluations.
- Course evaluations must remain open for at least 48 hours.

Requirements for all courses:

- There must be no extra credit or other rewards for completing course evaluations.
- Student course evaluations must include only the standard departmental questions.

Approved 9/2022