Department of Computer Science
Procedures and Criteria for Tenure and Rank Advancement

(03/31/2011)

Introduction

This document and its appendix have been approved by the faculty in the Computer Science Department. Should any part of this document conflict with UVU Policy 637 (*Faculty Tenure*), of UVU Policy 632 , *Assignment and Advancement in Rank*, the policies shall prevail.

Criteria for Tenure and Rank Advancement

The three *categories* of faculty evaluation are *teaching*, *scholarship*, and *service*. Because the primary mission of Utah Valley University is teaching, emphasis will be placed on the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

The Computer Science Department accepts the broad interpretation of scholarship as set forth in *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Ernest L. Boyer, Jossey-Bass, 1997), as follows:

1. The *Scholarship of Discovery*, which is purely investigative, and in search of new information.
2. The *Scholarship of Integration*, which includes putting isolated facts into perspective, and making connections across disciplines.
3. The *Scholarship of Application*, which seeks ways that knowledge can solve problems and serve both campus and community.
4. The *Scholarship of Teaching*, which recognizes the work that goes into the mastery of knowledge and the means of transferring that knowledge to others.

These four areas of scholarly activity are considered of equal importance.

The criteria for evaluating faculty contributions in teaching, scholarship, and service are set forth in detail in the spreadsheet entitled "Computer Science Department Tenure and Rank Criteria: Sources of Evidence", which accompanies this document as Appendix A. The numerical rankings and computations in Appendix A reflect the relative importance of various faculty contributions and enable objective evaluations of faculty free from bias and partiality. Since, per University policy, promotion to Associate Professor is coincident with receiving tenure, the criteria for receiving tenure are precisely those listed under the category of Associate Professor in Appendix A. The criteria in Appendix A clearly differentiate the levels of expected performance for tenure (i.e., Associate Professor) vs. promotion to the rank of Professor.

Academic Credentials

The academic credentials required for receiving tenure or advancement to the rank of Professor shall be one of the following:

1. An earned doctorate in Computer Science, or a closely-related discipline*, in which the candidate teaches.
2. An earned doctorate in another discipline with additional qualifying coursework in the discipline in which the candidate teaches, or a significant body of refereed published work in the discipline being taught.
3. A masters degree in the discipline in which the candidate teaches or a closely related discipline, plus at least one of the following, recognized by the candidate's department, indicating the candidate's professional qualification in and the ability to make scholarly contributions to the field in which the candidate teaches:
   a) Fifteen or more semester hours of related course work beyond the master's degree.
   b) Five or more years of significant professional level work in the field in which the candidate teaches.
   c) A major intellectual contribution to the candidate's field such as a book published by a commercial publisher or academic press, a series of published articles in major trade journals, a series of refereed journal articles in discipline-specific journals, a major commercial or open-source software product, patents, etc.

*Closely related disciplines include Computer Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Information Systems, Information Technology, Mathematics, Mechanical Engineering and Physics.

Granting tenure at the time of hire is based on University policy and also on meeting the requirements of Associate Professor found in this document and its appendix.

Guidelines for the RTP Committee

Receiving tenure or the rank of Professor requires that a candidate show proficiency in the categories of teaching, scholarship, and service. In addition, a candidate must exceed expectations in at least one of these categories. The numerical computations in Appendix A are designed to enforce this requirement.

The criteria set forth in Appendix A use a combination of weights and scores. The *weight* for each *activity* (line item) represents the relative importance or significance of that activity within the general category. The *score* represents the candidate's achievement for an activity over the course of the evaluation period, and is supported by evidence presented in the candidate's portfolio. For each activity, the weight will be multiplied by the score to yield a *weighted score*. The weighted scores are then totaled for each category to yield a *category weighted score*.

The following are the "Standard Scoring Criteria" mentioned in Appendix A to be used in many of the areas of faculty evaluation. Chairs, supervisors, and peers are urged to use similar language when documenting their reviews of a candidate.

   0 – Candidate never met the expected level of performance in this area

1 – Candidate rarely met the expected level of performance in this area
2 – Candidate often failed to meet the expected level of performance in this area
3 – Candidate consistently met the expected level of performance in this area
4 – Candidate consistently met and often exceeded the expected level of performance in this area
5 – Candidate consistently exceeded the expected level of performance in this area

For some activities, scores are further defined as described in Appendix A.

In order to receive tenure or promotion to Professor, a candidate must meet or exceed four *thresholds*. The candidate's weighted scores for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service must meet or exceed the category thresholds for the rank of Associate Professor (for tenure), or the rank of Professor (for promotion) in each of these categories. In addition, the *sum* of the category weighted scores must meet or exceed the *overall threshold* for Associate Professor or Professor, as applicable. The overall threshold is greater than the sum of the category thresholds. Thus, in order to qualify for tenure or promotion, candidates who are qualified in all three categories must present additional evidence in at least one category to meet the overall threshold. Threshold values are specified in Appendix A.

As part of the preparation for submitting the faculty portfolio, the candidate will use Appendix A to perform a self-evaluation. For each activity for which that candidate claims a non-zero score, the candidate will provide relevant evidence in the faculty portfolio.

The Review Process

The RTP Committee will consider the self-evaluation scores and corresponding portfolio, consider other evidence as necessary, and establish the final scores. During the midterm review for tenure, the RTP Committee will write a detailed report indicating whether or not the candidate is recommended for continuation in tenure track. During the final review, the RTP Committee will write a detailed report indicating whether the candidate is recommended to be awarded or denied tenure. Midterm or final reports, along with the candidate's portfolio, constitute the candidate's *tenure review portfolio*, which will pass from the RTP Committee through multiple levels of review as specified in the applicable UVU Policies (637 or 632). After the decision in either case, a copy of the complete tenure review portfolio is returned to the candidate. Candidates who feel they have evidence of grounds for appeal may file an appeal pursuant to the provisions of UVU Policy 646: *Faculty Appeals for Retention, Tenure and Promotion*.

Guidelines for Candidates

To facilitate the evaluation process, the portfolio should meet the requirements specified in UVU Policy 637 or 632, whichever applies, and be organized according to the structure of the Sources of Evidence spreadsheet in Appendix A. See the "Examples" column of Appendix A for suggestions on the types of evidence that may be presented in the portfolio. To assist the committee in evaluating the portfolio, the candidate will perform a self-evaluation by entering scores into the Sources of Evidence spreadsheet for each specific activity for which evaluation is desired. Those activities should be cross-referenced to the documentation in the portfolio. The RTP Committee shall not be obligated to evaluate portfolios that fail to meet these prescribed guidelines.

Exceptions

Under unusual circumstances, a candidate may petition the RTP Committee to modify a weight for his or her application. The RTP Committee may also determine that a weight should be

altered. Such exceptions do not apply to the other candidates being considered in that year. If such modifications are allowed by the RTP Committee, the Committee must provide a written justification that is distributed by email to all department faculty, the Department Chair, and Dean for approval The petition must be submitted to the RTP Committee Chair at least 15 calendar days prior to the portfolio submission deadline.

Each category includes a specific activity labeled "Other." A candidate may use the "Other" activity to recommend a score and a weight for consideration when he or she has been recognized for exceptional effort that is not otherwise addressed in existing activities for that category. For example, a candidate who has a singular achievement not covered in the criteria in Appendix A, such as having received national recognition in teaching, scholarship or service, might wish to recommend that the RTP Committee reward such outstanding recognition under the "Other" activities for Teaching, Scholarship or Service, rather than petitioning for higher weights, as described above. It should be noted, however, that the "Other" activity is for significant contributions and is not intended as a repository for minutia.

Faculty serving in administrative positions, such as department chair, during the probationary period may not be able to meet all the requirements in these guidelines. It is preferable for only tenured faculty to hold such positions, but allowance must be made when necessary so that faculty can make themselves available for administrative service and still quality for tenure. A commonly accepted guidebook for evaluating faculty states:

"Most institutions with tenure try to avoid giving new faculty in tenure-line positions specific assignments that may constrain their ability to devote time to the more traditional activities of research and publication. There are instances, however, in which both new and experienced faculty are asked or even required to participate in special projects. Serving on these projects will affect the nature of the documentation the candidate provides to the [RTP] committee. Special assignments might include serving as department chair, the development of new courses or programs, the development of reports for accreditation or certification, or an administrative assignment that is essential to the health of the department. In a number of cases these activities may be viewed as meeting the necessary criteria to be considered as scholarly in the review process." (Diamond, Robert, *Serving On Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Review Committees*, Anker Publishing, 2002, p. 14).

Faculty serving in administrative positions during the probationary period shall also receive appropriate consideration and credit in both the Scholarship and Teaching categories under "Other" as agreed upon by the RTP committee and the faculty member at the commencement of the administrative assignment.