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Preamble

The purpose of this document is to enhance and clarify the guidelines provided by the Dean of Letters and Sciences, the Provost, and the SUNY Board of Trustees as they apply to the department of Computer Science. The procedural aspects of all personnel decisions will be governed by the guidelines provided by the Provost regarding Academic Policy/Practice on Department APT Committees and Procedural Requirements for Academic Personnel Decisions. It is expected that this document will be revised periodically by the Department with the approval of the Dean. It is understood that activities at this professional level cannot be judged in a completely quantified manner and that they will require the reasoned professional judgment of all persons involved in the process. Each candidate is expected to be evaluated individually taking into consideration all relevant factors.

Assumptions

The Computing Accreditation Commission (CAC) of ABET currently accredits the Advanced Computing Track of the Computer Science major. Maintaining this accreditation is a matter of highest priority for the department. The department plans to seek CAC accreditation of the Information Systems track of the major in the near future. CAC guidelines require that full-time faculty members maintain currency in the field and make regular scholarship contributions. Their guidelines also place limits on the teaching and advisement loads.

The typical appointment pattern for tenure-track faculty at Assistant Professor level with no prior experience is 3-3-1. Reviews will occur during the second, fifth, and sixth years. The review in the fifth year will be for a one-year reappointment. The review in the sixth year will conclude with either a commitment to tenure at the end of the seventh year, or a one-year terminal appointment for the seventh year. If promotion is combined with tenure (as will be typical), the promotion will take effect at the beginning of the seventh academic year. The appointment pattern for a renewable Lecturer (Q.A.R.) position will normally be in renewable three (3) year contracts. The evaluation for renewal will take place in the early Fall Semester of the second year of appointment.
The regular teaching load in Computer Science for tenure-track faculty in the first three years of service is fifteen (15) teaching credit hours per year, as established by an agreement with CAC of ABET. Other tenured and tenure-track faculty will have a standard teaching load of eighteen (18) teaching credit hours per year. Faculty who fail to maintain an active program of scholarship will be expected to assume additional teaching responsibilities or major service responsibilities, as approved by the Dean. Faculty serving as Lecturer will have a teaching load of 24 teaching credit hours per year.

Some of the courses taught by the department include a weekly laboratory session, meeting for an hour-and-a-half or longer. Each such course assignment will be considered as equivalent to 1½ of a course for the purpose of computing an instructor’s teaching load. It may not be possible to keep the workload for all faculty at exactly the assigned level for the given academic year. The actual workload may vary as much as by plus or minus three hours, with the understanding that the balance will be carried over beyond the year for suitable adjustment in later years.

Appropriate and timely advisement is crucial to long-term student success. The department will appoint one faculty member to serve as the Advisement Coordinator each year. This Coordinator will be responsible for providing all levels of advising – including representing the Department at Fall and Spring final registration, meeting with all majors to provide guidance during the pre-registration period, providing advisement to all second majors, representing the department at Saturday Information Sessions, Admission’s Open House events, etc., coordinating and communicating with the Academic Advising regarding articulation agreements.

Many service duties remain fairly stable from year to year. Other duties, such as curriculum revision, upgrading of teaching/laboratory facilities, program assessment and accreditation, will demand larger commitments in some years than in others. Hence, the quality and the quantity of contributions in scholarship and service will vary from person to person and, for each person, will vary from year to year over a person’s career. It is expected that all faculty will contribute their fair share to the departmental service obligations.

**Policies and Procedures of the Personnel Decision Process**

Personnel decisions relating to term renewal, continuing appointment and promotion will be based on a rigorous evaluation of the faculty member’s contribution in teaching, scholarship and service. The Calendar of Personnel Processes published every year by the Vice President for Academic Affairs will govern the schedule.

It is the responsibility of each full-time faculty to know and understand the terms of his/her appointment and the deadlines, policies, procedures and personnel decision processes for term renewal, continuing appointment and/or promotion. It is the responsibility of the individual seeking personnel action to prepare a complete and
organized package of material supporting his/her request. Faculty members must study all sections of this document. In addition faculty should read the following documents:

- the department plan for Mentoring New Faculty Members,
- the Guidelines for Departmental Committees,
- the Faculty Guide to Academic Practices and Policies at Brockport,
- the guidelines provided by the SUNY Board of Trustees.

To assure both academic rigor and equity in review, all recommendations regarding personnel decisions must be made by the chair of the department and a duly formed committee of peers. The guidelines for constituting departmental APT committees are described in the College Senate Resolution of April 2, 2001, which is available at the SUNY Brockport Academic Affairs web site.

Requests by full-time faculty, to be considered for term renewal, continuing appointment and/or promotion, are to be made in writing to the Chair of the Department, with a copy to the Chair of the APT Committee, in accordance with the deadlines published by the Provost.

The candidate should prepare one three-ring application binder containing the essential items outlined below:

- the request for personnel action,
- names of the APT Committee member and the student representative to serve in the ad-hoc committee for evaluation of teaching effectiveness,
- names of at least 15-20 students who may be contacted for assessment of teaching effectiveness. It is suggested that the list include some students who are currently enrolled in the College, and some who have graduated,
- a comprehensive bio-data,
- a two-page summary of highlights of teaching, research and service,
- a statement of teaching philosophy,
- a tabular summary of Student Reaction to Instruction (SRI) scores, in the global questions for most of the courses taught during the period under review,
- a statement of scholarship focus and summary, and
- a year-by-year listing of service contributions.

The three-ring application binder may also include:

- names of internal/external faculty/staff/experts who can be contacted for an assessment of teaching, scholarship and service contributions, and
- testimonials and letters of support obtained by the candidate.

In addition, the candidate must prepare and submit one or more three-ring binders containing annual reports, including chair’s comments and signature page, for all years of
service under review, and documentation relating to teaching, scholarship and service contributions as outlined in the three sections below on Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.

The Department of Computer Science has always considered teaching the primary responsibility of the faculty. The Chair of APT Committee will constitute the Ad-hoc Committee for Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness, as part of term renewal, continuing appointment and promotion decisions. This committee’s evaluation will be based on a teaching portfolio, and the final report of teaching effectiveness will be submitted to the APT Committee for further action. The ad-hoc committee for evaluation of teaching effectiveness will include:

- one member of the APT Committee selected by the faculty member applying for term renewal, continuing appointment and/or promotion. The APT Committee member will be the Chair of the ad-hoc committee,
- one student representative selected by the faculty member applying for term renewal, continuing appointment and/or promotion, and
- one other faculty member with continuing appointment or on tenure-track, chosen by the Chair of the APT Committee.

The Chair of the APT Committee may also contact internal/external faculty/staff/experts suggested by the candidate for an assessment of teaching, scholarship and service contributions of the candidate. The Chair of the ad-hoc committee will contact students whose names were suggested by the candidate for letters of assessment regarding teaching effectiveness. The Chair of the ad-hoc committee may also contact other students who are able to provide input to the evaluation. The ad-hoc committee will perform a rigorous evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of the candidate and submit its report at least a week ahead of the deadline for the APT Committee to make its recommendation.

When making personnel decisions, the weight given to each category will be in the following proportion: Teaching: 60 – 65%, Scholarship: 20 – 25%, and Service: 15 – 20%.

As a rating device, the APT Committee and the Chair may use a numeric scale of 0 through 4, for each of the three categories, as follows: poor (4), fair (3), good (2), very good (1), and excellent (0). ‘Excellent” should be used for truly exceptional performance. Examples are: in the category of teaching, receiving SUNY Chancellor’s award or a recognition at an equivalent level; in the category of scholarship, sustaining scholarship activities equivalent or close to the expectation at research institutions; in the category of service, demonstrating significant and lasting contributions to the department, college, university or to the professional community, and having received recognition on/off campus for the achievement. The rating of “Good” is assigned for performance at the level indicated as “minimum expectation” in the guidelines to follow. The other extreme, “Poor” is used for performance falling short of the minimum expectation described in the guidelines. For personnel actions, ratings in the individual categories
will be viewed in light of the above expectation to arrive at a final recommendation regarding the personnel action. A “Good” rating is necessary in all three categories for positive recommendations. It should be recognized that simply meeting the “minimum expectation” specified in the guidelines, is not sufficient to guarantee positive personnel actions. Reiterating an earlier statement, it is understood that activities at this professional level cannot be judged in a completely quantified manner; each candidate must be evaluated individually taking into consideration all relevant factors.

The APT Committee will provide the candidate a copy of its written recommendation as per the Calendar of Personnel Processes before forwarding the same to the Chair of the Department. The primary purpose is to allow the candidate to provide additional clarification, if necessary, or use his/her option to withdraw the request for personnel action.

The candidate’s application materials will be circulated to all full-time, tenure-track faculty members for their review. A sign-out procedure will be followed to ensure that the faculty have reviewed the appropriate material in advance of the voting. The chair of the APT committee will then conduct a vote, by secret ballot, to determine the recommendation of the department as a whole regarding the personnel action. All full-time, tenured and tenure-track members of the department will participate in this vote, with the exception of the candidate in question. The results of the vote will become part of the candidate’s application. A reasonable effort will be made to allow voting in absentia for faculty on leave, or in other exceptional circumstances. The precise tally of votes will be reported to the Chair to be included in the candidate’s application as it continues to the Chair and the Dean. The vote tally will be reported to the candidate and to all participating eligible voters.

The Chair of the Department will perform an independent assessment of the candidate and write his/her own recommendation. He/she will also provide the candidate a copy of his/her recommendation as per the Calendar of Personnel Processes before forwarding the same to the Dean of the School of Letters and Sciences. Again, the primary purpose is to allow the candidate to provide additional clarification, if necessary, or use his/her option to withdraw the request for personnel action.

**Evaluation of Teaching**

Teaching will be evaluated based on a **teaching portfolio**. The candidate is expected to provide the following documentation:

- list of courses taught, their variety and nature,
- course material such as first day handouts (including course outlines and syllabi), classroom handouts, programming and non-programming assignments, laboratory assignments, mid-term and final examinations, etc., at least for the last five years or length of service at SUNY Brockport,
samples of graded student work in assignments, written reports, and tests, which include some excellent, some average and some poor work, at least for the last two or three semesters,

course enrollment and grade distribution statistics,

written statement of teaching philosophy,

Student Reaction to Instruction (SRI) summary ratings, and

students’ written comments in the departmental supplement to the SRI.

The candidate may also optionally provide the following:

• course material, samples of graded student work, course enrollment and grade distribution statistics, etc., related to teaching in summer/winter sessions,

• work accomplished with students in independent and directed studies, and

• solicited/unsolicited written comments from students and others addressing teaching effectiveness.

The evaluation of the ad-hoc committee will take into consideration all the documentation provided by the candidate. In addition, it will include:

• classroom observation reports by committee members,

• interview with the candidate regarding his/her teaching philosophy,

• written letters of assessment of teaching effectiveness sought from students whose names were provided by the candidate as part of this assessment, and

• written letters of assessment of teaching effectiveness sought from internal/external faculty/staff/experts whose names were provided by the candidate.

It is suggested that faculty members routinely maintain a three-ring binder for each course they teach, containing the material listed above for the most recent semester of teaching, and submit the same for personnel actions. Faculty members must clearly provide appropriate credit to the sources of material presented that has not been developed by them. It is recognized that collecting graded student work requires considerable preplanning. Hence, it is acceptable if graded student work is provided for just the courses taught in the last two or three semesters.

A candidate will be judged a competent and successful teacher, if the documentation provided demonstrates the following:

• he/she has taught a number of different fundamental courses and/or courses in subject areas of his/her specialty,

• for each course taught, the course syllabi, outline, objectives, texts, and reading lists are current and appropriate,

• for each course taught the assignments, tests and graded work are at the appropriate level, demonstrate student learning, and meet the expectation and the mission of the department,
• the syllabi specify meaningful grading standards and the enrollment, retention and grade distributions suggest adherence to those stated standards, and
• the SRI scores, written students’ comments and the classroom observations of teaching evaluation committee members show satisfactory levels of classroom performance and interaction.

Evaluation of Scholarship

Scholarship will be measured in terms of peer-reviewed products reflecting discovery, integration and application. Examples of peer-reviewed products include:

• published (or accepted for publication) technical papers in respected, refereed, widely circulated Computer Science (or in a closely related discipline) journals,
• publication of a scholarly book or monograph, which may or may not contain original contributions to the field,
• publication of a full paper in the proceedings of a refereed conference,
• creation of significant, innovative, and widely available new software/hardware that has been subject to peer review,
• publication of a textbook,
• successful patents,
• products developed as an outcome of application of discipline-based knowledge to solve problems in public or private sector (consultant work); the products must be subject to peer review (see Faculty Roles and Rewards document),
• substantially large successful grants obtained from off campus sources,
• reviews of articles, books, etc. that have been solicited from the candidate, and
• invited talks to external groups.

Note that a thesis or a dissertation submitted for a degree/diploma will not be considered as one of the products, though any products that may be a result of the dissertation will qualify. The APT Committee members and the Chair of the Department cannot be expected to be experts in the candidate’s areas of expertise. Therefore, candidates are required to provide a written scholarship focus and summary. The candidates must also provide as much additional documentation as possible to justify their claims of importance and quality of their scholarship activities. These may include:

• citations in literature,
• acceptance rate for journals/conferences,
• comments from referees,
• awards, grants, and contracts,
• solicited/unsolicited letters from experts on/off campus,
• invitations to referee/review books and conference/journal articles,
• invitations to chair or present papers at conferences, invitations to write journal papers, book chapters, etc.
The quality of the scholarly activity, the reputation of the journal/conference/publisher, the degree of innovation, etc., will be considered, allowing appropriate trade-off between scholarship quality and quantity.

**Evaluation of Service**

Service will be measured in terms of activities that encompass governance of the department, the school, the college or the university, and discipline-based or college mission oriented contributions to the profession or community. Suggested documentation include:

- description and evaluation of academic advisement,
- work on behalf of student recruitment/admission/retention,
- description of committee activities,
- specific contributions of the individual,
- copies of products or outcomes of service activities, and
- letters of evaluation addressing service contributions.

Routine academic advisement for course planning and scheduling is the responsibility of the Advisement Coordinator, but all faculty are expected to provide informal counseling regarding career opportunities and the possibility of graduate school.

For contribution to the profession or service to the community, the candidate should include a statement indicating the relationship of activities to one’s area of professional competence and the mission of the college.
Guidelines for Renewal of Lecturer (Q.A.R.) Positions

Faculty in Q.A.R. positions have a higher proportion of their workload focused on teaching. Therefore the expectations for their contributions in the areas of scholarship and service are correspondingly lower.

Teaching:

The candidate is expected to have demonstrated his/her ability as a competent teacher. The candidate is expected to have demonstrated that his/her teaching remains current with the field, and that he/she is capable of teaching a variety of courses.

Scholarship:

The candidate is expected to demonstrate that he/she remains current in the field. There are a variety of ways that the candidate can demonstrate scholarly activity. In addition to the traditional products described in the section on “Evaluation of Scholarship”, the following will also be considered:

- teaching a course never previously taught at Brockport,
- teaching a course not previously taught in that faculty member’s career,
- substantially re-designing a course. Examples of a significant change would include a change in the programming language, platform, or paradigm used,
- implementation of a substantial change in pedagogy. Examples of a significant change would include designing and teaching a course using the SUNY Learning Network (SLN),
- organizing or presenting at a workshop or seminar,
- invited talks for external groups,
- consultant work,
- presentations at un-refereed conferences (e.g., Scholar’s Day),
- attendance at conferences and workshops,
- review of articles, books, software, etc.

Service:

The candidate is expected to actively participate in assigned departmental activities. Usually this will consist of: participation in college-wide functions such as Academic Convocation, Spring Honors and Awards Ceremony, Commencement, etc., serving as a member of the curriculum committee and one or two other department or College committees, and various other activities as assigned by the Chair. As the period of residence at Brockport increases, the degree of contributions is also expected to increase, as the candidate participates in more committees and makes broader contributions to the College as a whole.
Guidelines for Renewal of Term Appointment -- First Renewal

For beginning tenure track faculty, this evaluation will take place in the early Fall Semester of the second year of appointment. The review shall include all activities up to the time of the evaluation, though it is understood that activities since the time of appointment to Brockport will be given primary consideration over earlier activities. The candidate should show evidence of steady progress towards satisfying the criteria for receiving continuing appointment (tenure) in each of the three areas of evaluation. There must be evidence that the candidate will in all likelihood be able to satisfy the criteria for tenure within the remaining available time.
Guidelines for Renewal of Term Appointment -- Second Renewal

For beginning tenure track faculty, this evaluation will take place in the Fall Semester of the fifth year of appointment. The review shall include all activities up to the time of the evaluation, though it is understood that activities since the time of appointment to Brockport will be given primary consideration over earlier activities. The candidate is expected to make substantial contributions since coming to Brockport. This review is carried out only one year prior to the tenure review process, and therefore the candidate is expected to show that it is highly likely that he/she will be able to meet the criteria for tenure within one more year.

The minimum expectation for each of the three main areas of evaluation (teaching, scholarship, and service) is given below.

Teaching:

The candidate is expected to have demonstrated his/her ability as a competent teacher. The candidate is expected to have demonstrated that his/her teaching remains current with the field. The candidate is expected to have demonstrated an ability to teach a range of different courses in the field.

Scholarship:

The candidate should have at least two peer-reviewed products of which he or she is the sole or senior author of at least one. At least one of these products must have been completed while in residence at SUNY Brockport. The candidate should have enough products completed or in progress to show that it is highly likely that he/she will be able to meet the criteria for tenure within one more year.

Service:

The candidate is expected to actively participate in assigned departmental activities. Usually this will consist of: participation in college-wide functions such as Academic Convocation, Spring Honors and Awards Ceremony, Commencement, etc., serving as a member of the curriculum committee and one or two other department or College committees, and various other activities as assigned by the Chair. Untenured faculty members are not expected to assume leadership roles in these committees during the first several years at Brockport. Participation in professional societies is highly desirable.
Guidelines for Continuing Appointment (Tenure) and Promotion to Associate Professor

For beginning tenure track faculty, this evaluation will take place in the Fall Semester of the sixth year of appointment. The review shall include all activities up to the time of the evaluation, though it is understood that activities since the time of appointment to Brockport will be given primary consideration over earlier activities. The candidate is expected to make substantial contributions since coming to Brockport.

The minimum expectation for each of the three main areas of evaluation (scholarship, teaching, and service) is given below.

Teaching:

The candidate is expected to have demonstrated his/her ability as a competent and successful teacher. The candidate is expected to have demonstrated that his/her teaching is in a continuous state of improvement, and remains current with the field. The candidate is expected to have demonstrated mastery of the discipline and an ability to teach a range of different courses in the field at both the upper and lower levels.

Scholarship:

The candidate should have four peer-reviewed products, on at least two of which the candidate was sole or senior author. At least two of these products should have been authored while the candidate was in residence at SUNY Brockport. A minimum of one technical journal paper demonstrating an original contribution to the field is required. Other scholarly activities will not be considered as equivalent substitutes in fulfilling this journal paper expectation. The expectation for scholarship for an Associate Professor also includes the evidence of scholarly activity beyond the research done for the doctoral dissertation and in new areas of investigation.

Service:

The candidate is expected to actively participate in assigned departmental activities. Usually this will consist of: participation in college-wide functions such as Academic Convocation, Spring Honors and Awards Ceremony, Commencement, etc., and serving as a member of the curriculum committee and one or two other committees, and various other activities as assigned by the Chair. Some participation in school or college level committees, and in professional societies is highly desirable. Some assumption of committee leadership is highly desirable.
Guidelines for Promotion to Professor

The review shall include all activities up to the time of the evaluation, though it is understood that activities since the time of appointment to Brockport will be given primary consideration over earlier activities. The candidate is expected to make substantial, continuous contributions since coming to Brockport.

The minimum expectation for each of the three main areas of evaluation (teaching, scholarship, and service) is given below.

Teaching:

The candidate is expected to have demonstrated his/her ability as a competent and successful teacher. The candidate is expected to have demonstrated that his/her teaching is in a continuous state of improvement, and remains current with the field. The candidate is expected to have demonstrated an ability to teach a range of different courses in the field at both the upper and lower levels. In addition, the candidate should have provided leadership with the introduction of new courses or similar activity, such as the establishment of new and improved environments and equipment for student use.

Scholarship:

The candidate should have sufficient number of peer-reviewed products considered as equivalent to eight refereed journal publications. The candidate is expected to show continuous scholarly activity. Therefore, at least four products must have appeared since the time of the previous promotion (or appointment), and the candidate must have been sole or senior author of at least two. Furthermore, at least one of these two products must be a technical journal paper demonstrating an original contribution to the field. Other scholarly activities will not be considered as equivalent substitutes in fulfilling this journal paper expectation. The expectation for scholarship for a Professor also includes the evidence of scholarly activity beyond the research done for the doctoral dissertation and in new areas of investigation.

Service:

The candidate is expected to have undertaken an increased complexity of duties and have undertaken successful leadership roles at any of these levels: departmental, college, university, and/or in service to the profession/community. The candidate is expected to have demonstrated leadership and successful contributions as a representative of the department.
Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review

After tenure has been granted, faculty are expected to maintain continued successful contributions in all areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Tenured faculty are expected to maintain an active program of scholarship, except in the unusual case where that faculty member has major or multiple service responsibilities.

Faculty members who have achieved tenure have already thoroughly demonstrated an ability to produce traditional scholarly products, under the Carnegie model of “scholarship of discovery”, “scholarship of integration”, and “scholarship of application”. Yet not all scholarly activities result in a defined product. These activities are nevertheless of value to continued professional development and ongoing mastery of the discipline. Such activities will also be considered as contributing to a continued program of scholarship, but will be given a lower weight than activities that produced an externally peer-reviewed product.

The post-tenure review process will be performed periodically for each tenured faculty member. The exact schedule of when each faculty member will be reviewed will be determined by the department chair, with the goal of spreading this process out evenly over the years. The faculty members to be evaluated in the up-coming academic year will be informed of this fact by the Department Chair no later than May 31 of the preceding academic year. The evaluation will be completed by the Department Chair, in consultation with the APT Committee, and forwarded to the Dean. If a faculty member has not maintained an active program of scholarship, then the department will recommend that he/she be given one year to demonstrate renewed activity in scholarship. Faculty who fail to maintain an active program of scholarship will be expected to assume additional teaching responsibilities or major service responsibilities, as approved by the Dean. In any academic year, a faculty member may submit a plan for a renewed active program of scholarship, and his/her workload may be adjusted accordingly.

The Advanced Computing track of the Computer Science major is currently accredited by ABET. Its accreditation guidelines specifically state that no faculty member should be assigned four different preparations in a semester. Maintaining this accreditation is of the highest priority for this department, as it demonstrates our commitment to student success and quality. Therefore, no faculty member will be assigned four different preparations in the same semester.
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