



COMPUTING SCIENCES

Department of Computing Sciences Faculty Evaluation Guidelines for Annual Activity

This document describes the guidelines used for annual evaluation of faculty. All faculty will be evaluated on teaching and service. Tenure-track and tenured faculty will also be evaluated on their scholarly activity and their mentoring of graduate students. Unless otherwise noted, evaluations will be based on a three-year running average, using the year for which the faculty member is being evaluated plus the previous two years. In some cases, there will be requirements for *annual* achievements, and these will be noted. Administrative releases will be counted the same as teaching load (i.e., a person with a one-course-per-semester release and 2:2 teaching load will be evaluated the same as a person with a 3:3 teaching load).

Faculty are expected to adequately document their achievements in the three areas of evaluation in digital measures. The annual review will be based upon a faculty activity report from digital measures on the day updates are due, generally February 1. These are general guidelines and circumstances may allow for an activity to carry more, or less, weight. For example, an extremely high-quality journal will count more than a lower quality regional publication. A department teaching award would count less than a national or statewide teaching award.

I. Ratings:

- *Unsatisfactory -1 Does not meet expectations.*
- *Standard – 2 Meets expectations.*
- *High – 3 Exceeds expectations.*
- *Excellent – 4 Greatly exceeds expectations.*

Note: Overall rating must *exceed* 2.0 for consideration for merit raise. Overall rating will be computed from a weighted average based on research / teaching / service. Any item failing to meet the “Standard” rating level will be considered “Unsatisfactory” (rating of 1).

II. Research

Publications will be counted in the year of their citations (so *e.g.* if in citing the article, an author uses 2017 in the citation, that article will count in 2017). Ratings may be fractions of the stated number, depending on the level of the conference where presentations are made, the level of the journal in which the publications appear, or the source of the external funding. The level of publication will be based on the reputation of the journal or the impact factor for lesser-known journals.



COMPUTING SCIENCES

Faculty in a probationary appointment (non-tenured assistant professor) will have lighter expectations in their first 2 years since they will not have had three years to average over.

There are four factors that will go into evaluation of research and they will carry different weights. They are:

- Journal Articles (40%) – a publication in a high quality journal. The reputation of the journal or impact factor may allow for a fractional value.
- External Grants (40%) – funds from an external funding source to support your research agenda. The expectation is that you are funding student work. A grant is counted as active for every year the grant is active (a two-year grant will count as two active grants, as long as both of the years are in within the last 3 years).
- Other research contributions (10%) – This would include conference proceedings based on a paper, a conference/workshop presentation based on an abstract, a book chapter, etc. The level of the conference/workshop, the acceptance rate, what the acceptance was based on (full paper, abstract, invited, etc.) will affect the value of this contribution.
- Grant proposal submissions (10%) – It is expected that research faculty are submitting quality grant proposals.

Note: Internal grants (both active and proposal) will count towards *standard rating only*. A large external grant (supporting multiple students, may count extra). Also, doctoral faculty are expected to have publications with students as first authors.

1. MS Faculty (3:3 teaching load)

Standard: .5 journal articles (1 every 2 years), .333 active grants (1 active grant every three years), .5 other publications (1 every 2 years), .5 proposals (1 every 2 years).

High: 1 journal article, .666 active grants (2 years active every three years), 1 other publication, .666 proposals (2 every three years)

Excellent: 1.5 journal articles, 1.333 active grants, 2 other publication, 1.333 proposals

2. PhD Faculty (2:2 teaching load or lower)

Standard: 1 journal articles, .666 active grant, 1.333 other publication, 1 proposals.

High: 1.5 journal article, 1 active grants, 2 other publication, 1.333 proposals

Excellent: 2 journal articles, 1.666 active grants, 2.666 other publication, 2 proposals

III. Teaching



COMPUTING SCIENCES

Faculty that support a graduate program will have graduate student mentoring (committee involvement) as 40% of their teaching rating. All other considerations will be the same for all faculty. Many measurements such as number of courses, number of credit hours taught, etc. are normalized to an FTE and are noted below.

1. Student mentoring and graduation – tenure-track only.

Mentoring of graduate students is an important role for tenure track faculty. Annual reviews will be based primarily on graduate committee participation. Faculty get 1 point for serving as a committee member and 4 points for serving as either a chair or co-chair of a committee, and 2 points for serving as chair of a graduate project. No more than half of the points required for a level can come from either serving on committees outside of the department, or for just committee membership (not chair or co-chair). For MS students, the points are awarded in the year the student graduates. **Note:** Points in this section are the total over 3 years.

MS faculty (3/3 or less loads)

Standard: 5 points COSC, 3 points GSEN

High: 9 points COSC, 5 points GSEN

Excellent: 13 points COSC, 7 points GSEN, with at least one during the current year (and two in last two years) MS students graduating where the evaluated faculty member was either chair or co-chair.

PhD faculty (2/2 or less loads)

PhD faculty are expected to support the appropriate MS program. They are expected to achieve at least the standard level above for MS faculty for MS committees and the following for doctoral students.

Standard: 5 points

High: 9 points, as either chair or co-chair of at least one doctoral student advancing to candidacy or graduating.

Excellent: 13 points, as either chair or co-chair for at least one graduating doctoral student.

2. Teaching Evaluation

Faculty are generally expected to support the undergraduate program, through teaching a course every three years and involvement in curriculum and faculty advising of students,



COMPUTING SCIENCES

for ABET requirements. Teaching of required courses and teaching at times outside peak hours (early morning and evening courses) is based upon program and student needs, not on seniority, rank, or faculty preference. Graduate faculty are expected to support the graduate programs through teaching graduate courses, involvement in curriculum, and through student committees.

Standard: To achieve a standard rating, faculty are expected to:

- have Student Evaluation of Teaching scores that are not significantly below program/department average with student comments mostly positive,
- be active in faculty mentoring of students (ABET mentoring),
- perform effective assessment activities by deadlines, and
- be active in course improvement (it is expected that courses are being improved to keep up-to-date, a course will typically have a full update every 5 years, or several minor updates).

High: To achieve a high rating, faculty are expected to achieve everything in standard plus provide evidence of increased teaching effectiveness or effort. Examples are (but not limited to):

- teaching awards
- attending teaching/education workshops
- large number of new preps
- large number of different courses
- much higher SCH than department average
- large class size
- more classes outside of peak times
- increased course improvement efforts
- new course design

Excellent: To achieve a high rating, faculty are expected to achieve everything in standard plus provide evidence of greatly increased teaching effectiveness or effort. See the list of examples of increased effectiveness above.

IV. Service

Faculty that are not teaching a 5/5 teaching load are expected to perform service activities. Service loads typically are 10% for tenure track faculty and 20% for professional track. For a 9-month contract 10% is .9 months (or 3.9 weeks), and for 20% is 1.8 months (or 7.8 weeks). Service activities are separated into 6 areas which are:

- *Professional* – activities associated with professional journals, academic societies, or other national or international scientific organizations. Examples include: reviewing for journals, books, grants for funding; unpaid consultancies; service on editorial boards or editorship of professional journals; membership or chairing of



COMPUTING SCIENCES

- standing committees or boards of professional societies. Professional service is primarily for tenure track faculty.
- Program or Department – service to the program or department which includes membership on standing or ad hoc committees, Island Days, hosting visitors, etc.
 - School or College – service to the school or college, primarily serving on school or college committees.
 - University – service to the university, primarily serving on university wide committees or bodies, even when representing the program, department, or college.
 - Outreach – this includes services that happens primarily off campus. Examples include recruiting visits to area high schools, community service such as elementary science fairs.
 - Assigned tasks from chair – Specific tasks assigned by the chair.

Faculty are expected to maintain quality service, which includes attending all meetings for committee service; when appropriate representing the needs of the program, department, school, or college; when appropriate reporting items of interest to the chair or to the faculty of the program, department, school, or college. Note that for those at the rank of Assistant the expectation is full participation. Those at the rank of Associate, the expectation is for some leadership roles. For those at the rank of Full, the expectation is leadership roles.

Tenure Track faculty (MS and PhD)

Standard: To achieve a standard rating, faculty are expected to provide evidence of quality service in professional service, serving on at least 1 program or department committee, performing assigned tasks.

High: To achieve a high rating, faculty are expected to achieve the standard level and in addition have extra service in the professional and program or department categories, and in addition have service in one of the remaining three categories (School or College, University, or Outreach).

Excellent: To achieve an excellent rating, faculty are expected to achieve a high rating and in addition provide evidence of quality service significantly above the high level.

Professional Track faculty

Professional track faculty have a 20% service load, and that load will generally have a primary service activity and assigned by the chair.



COMPUTING SCIENCES

Standard: To achieve a standard rating, faculty are expected to perform their assigned service activity as well as provide evidence of quality service on at least 1 program or department committee (above assigned tasks) and service in a least one other category.

High: To achieve a high rating, faculty are expected to achieve the standard level and in addition have extra service in the program or department categories, and in addition have service in one of the remaining categories (above standard)

Excellent: To achieve an excellent rating, faculty are expected to achieve a high rating and in addition provide evidence of quality service significantly above the high level.