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The College at Brockport
Department of Computer Science

Departmental Guidelines for Personnel Actions
(Revised by Department on December 3, 2013; Accepted by Department on December 6, 2013)

Preamble

The procedural aspects of all personnel actions will be governed by the guidelines provided by the College regarding departmental APT committees and their operation. 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. It is expected that this document will be revised periodically by the Department with the approval of the Dean.

Assumptions

The Computing Accreditation Commission (CAC) of ABET currently accredits the Advanced Computing Track of the Computer Science major and the Computer Information Systems major. Maintaining this accreditation is a matter of highest priority for the department. 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. Hence, the Department of Computer Science has very carefully crafted several processes for curriculum revision, student engagement, program assessment, and student advisement. These processes ensure that we not only meet ABET expectations but also provide quality academic and social experience to our majors. Many decisions are made collectively by the departmental faculty members. The intent is to have a fair and equitable distribution of workload and responsibilities that allows us to work as a collegial team and achieve the shared goals.

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 to the Associate Professor rank 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 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 whose
contributions are deemed to be not “performing at rank” will be expected to assume additional 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 laboratory teaching assignment will be considered as equivalent to 1½ credits for the purpose of computing an instructor’s workload. It may not be possible to keep the workload for all faculty members 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. As established by an agreement with CAC of ABET to ensure that all students receive timely, consistent, and accurate advisement, 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 routine course advisement – 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, communicating with newly admitted transfer students to help with their course registrations, and communicating with Academic Advisement regarding articulation agreements. Further, all faculty members are expected to provide guidance towards career choices and graduate education when students approach them. To facilitate more interaction between faculty members and students and expose students to internship and research opportunities, the department regularly organizes informal mixers and Career Link days to which professionals from local industry are also invited.

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 and that everyone’s effort will be valued.

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

Recommendations related to personnel actions such as 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 College will govern the schedule.

It is the responsibility of each full-time faculty member to know and understand the terms of his/her appointment and the deadlines, policies, procedures and personnel action 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 members 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, and
- the guidelines provided by the SUNY Board of Trustees.

To assure both academic rigor and equity in review, all recommendations regarding personnel actions must be made by the Chair of the Department and a duly formed department APT committee. The guidelines for constituting departmental APT committees are described in the College Senate Resolution of April 2, 2001.

Requests by full-time faculty members, 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 College.

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

- the request for personnel action,
- 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 curriculum vitae,
- a two-page summary of highlights of teaching, research and service,
- a statement of teaching philosophy; the teaching philosophy statement should highlight the candidate’s approach to student engagement,
- a tabular summary of Instructional assessment system (IAS) scores, in the global questions for most of the courses taught during the period under review,
- a statement of scholarship focus and summary; the scholarship focus should not only address the significance of the research but also the specific contributions made by the candidate,
- a year-by-year listing of service contributions; the list should carry a self-assessment of the level and quality of the service contributions, in particular to student advisement and the program assessment and accreditation activities of the department,
- copies of the APT, Department Chair, and Dean’s recommendation letters from the previous review (if applicable), and
- a statement commenting and reflecting on shortcomings identified in the most recent review, if any.

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.

The Department of Computer Science views its term renewal, continuing appointment, and promotion processes to be clear and rigorous, and considers the judgment of senior faculty members in the department to be adequate in making these recommendations. Hence, external review of a candidate’s dossier is considered not necessary. In case testimonials are solicited from external experts, the solicitor must request the person providing such documents to include a brief write up of their own credentials. This allows the departmental committee to weigh the testimonial suitably when arriving at its recommendation.

In addition to the three-ring binder mentioned above, 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 the APT committee, or their representative, will contact students whose names were suggested by the candidate for letters of assessment regarding teaching effectiveness. The Chair of the APT committee, or their representative, may also contact other students who are able to provide input to the evaluation. The APT committee will perform a rigorous evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of the candidate, based on the candidate’s teaching portfolio and prepare a report on Teaching Effectiveness. This report will be provided to the faculty member evaluated, after suitable redaction to remove confidential material and letters regarding teaching effectiveness provided by students.

The Chair of the APT Committee may contact internal/external faculty/staff/experts for an assessment of teaching, scholarship and service contributions of the candidate. When making personnel recommendations, 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” or better 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 letter, together with the Report on Teaching Effectiveness, 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. This report is for internal department purposes only, and will not be forwarded outside the Department.

The Chair of the APT committee will conduct a vote, by secret ballot, whereby the department (as a committee of the whole) will vote on its agreement or disagreement with the APT committee’s recommendation. All full-time, tenured and tenure-track members of the department will participate in this vote, with the exception of the candidate in question. A reasonable effort will be made to allow voting in absentia for faculty on leave, or in other exceptional circumstances. The candidate’s application materials will be circulated to all full-time, tenured and tenure-track faculty members for their review. A sign-out procedure will be followed to ensure that faculty members have reviewed the appropriate material in advance of the voting. 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 Science and Mathematics. 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 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 in General Education, lower-division, upper-division required and upper-division elective courses, together with the candidate’s reflection on this data,
• written statement of teaching philosophy,
• efforts undertaken to improve quality of teaching,
• reflection on feedback received during the previous personnel action (if applicable),
• Instructional Assessment System (IAS) summary ratings,
• students’ written comments in the departmental supplement to the IAS, and
• evidence of contribution to the Department of Computer Science program assessment if applicable.

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, projects, theses, and research, and
• solicited/unsolicited written comments from students and others addressing teaching effectiveness.

The evaluation by the APT 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, and
• written letters of assessment of teaching effectiveness sought from internal/external faculty/staff/experts.

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. It is expected that the teaching
A portfolio constructed by the faculty member will provide ample evidence of academic challenge and rigor in courses, practice of high-impact learning activities that drive students to actively engage in learning, and judicious use of program assessment results for continuous improvement of teaching and student learning.

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,
- he/she has provided timely and appropriate feedback to students,
- the syllabi specify meaningful grading standards and the enrollment, retention and grade distributions suggest adherence to those stated standards,
- the IAS scores, written students’ comments and the classroom observations of teaching evaluation committee members show satisfactory levels of classroom performance and interaction,
- he/she demonstrates a commitment to actively and continuously improving his/her teaching skills, and
- he/she participates in program assessment activities, as appropriate.

**Evaluation of Scholarship**

Scholarship will be measured in terms of peer-reviewed products related to the discipline of computing, reflecting discovery, integration, application, and teaching. Examples of peer-reviewed products include:

- published (or accepted for publication) papers in journals,
- scholarly books or monographs, which may or may not contain original contributions to the field,
- full papers in the proceedings of a refereed conference,
- significant, innovative, and widely available new software/hardware that have been subject to peer review,
- textbooks,
- 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), and
- successful grant applications that resulted in substantial funding from competitive off-campus sources, notwithstanding the purpose of funding.
Additional evidence faculty may provide to demonstrate an active on-going program of scholarship includes:

- poster presentations,
- contributions to student research and thesis supervision,
- reviews of articles, books, etc., and
- invited talks.

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, and their contribution, in case of collaborative work. 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 includes:

- description and evaluation of contributions towards program assessment and accreditation,
- description and evaluation of academic advisement, career and graduate school guidance,
- description and evaluation of work done for internship and job placement,
- contributions to advancing computing education in the K-12 setting,
- 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.) Position

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,
- 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, participating in assessment activities, and serving on 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. For at least one of these two, the candidate must be the sole author or major contributor. At least one of these products must have been completed while in residence at Brockport. The other product may be from prior work that is no more than 5 years old from the date of initial appointment at 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, participating in assessment activities, and serving on 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. For at least two of these four, the candidate must be the sole author or major contributor. At least two of these products should have been authored while the candidate was in residence at Brockport. The other two products may be from prior work that is no more than 5 years old from the date of initial appointment at Brockport. The expectation for scholarship for an Associate Professor also includes the evidence of scholarly activity beyond the research done for the doctoral dissertation, which has led to at least one peer-reviewed product.

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, participating in assessment activities, and serving on 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 mastery over the discipline and 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 eight peer-reviewed products. 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 the sole author or major contributor of at least two of these four products. 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, which has led to at least one peer-reviewed product.

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.
Performance at Rank

The computing sciences discipline is technology dependent. Rapid advances in the field demand frequent revision of the course contents. Besides, our undergraduate program is accredited by ABET, the internationally recognized accreditor of applied science, computing, engineering, and technology programs. The Department strives for continuous program improvement through assessment of program objectives and student learning outcomes. As a result, faculty members spend significant amount of their time in continued mastery of new developments in technology and revision of course materials that demonstrate the use of contemporary hardware, software, programming languages, tools and applications. Further, as stated earlier, the quality and the quantity of contributions in teaching, scholarship, and service will vary from person to person and, for each person, will vary from year to year over a person’s career. Furthermore, The College and the department are primarily focused on teaching and, by design, do not offer doctoral programs. Therefore, it is not reasonable to expect generation of peer-revived scholarly products in every single year of a person’s career. Thus, the department believes that the determination of “at rank” performance must be “holistic”, taking into account all contributions of the individual.

Renewable Lecturer (Q.A.R.) Position

Faculty members in renewable Lecturer rank are provided term appointments, and are periodically evaluated in a rigorous manner. A renewable Lecturer is considered to be performing at rank in a year, if he/she has made some progress towards satisfying the criteria for renewal of the appointment in each of the three areas of evaluation. Under no circumstances shall additional teaching or service responsibilities be added to the workload of a faculty member on account of being found not performing at rank. Rather, the faculty member will be advised by the department chair that not performing at rank may adversely affect renewal.

Tenure-track Assistant Professor

Faculty members in renewable tenure-track Assistant Professor rank are provided term appointments, and are periodically evaluated in a rigorous manner. A tenure-track Assistant Professor is considered to be performing at rank, if he/she has made some progress towards satisfying the criteria for receiving continuing appointment (tenure) in each of the three areas of evaluation. Under no circumstances shall additional teaching or service responsibilities be added to the workload of a faculty member on account of being found not performing at rank. Rather, the faculty member will be advised by the department chair that not performing at rank may adversely affect a reappointment or continuing appointment (tenure) decision.

Tenured Associate Professor

Faculty members in tenured Associate Professor rank are provided continuing appointment. It is reasonable to expect that these faculty members would seek a promotion to the rank of Professor in 7-10 years after tenure. Hence, for the first ten years
after obtaining a continuing appointment the following criterion will be applied: A tenured Associate Professor is considered to be performing at rank, if he/she has made some progress towards satisfying the criteria for promotion to Professor rank in ten years after tenure. A faculty member shall not be considered "not at rank" simply because he/she did not seek a promotion or has been denied one. Ten years after tenure, if a faculty member continues to remain at the Associate Professor rank, the following criterion will be applied: A tenured Associate Professor is considered to be performing at rank if in the four-year window that includes the year of evaluation and the previous three years, the faculty member has

- taught a new course or an existing course after a gap of three years, or an existing course that involved significant revision to content or mode of delivery, or
- has produced at least one peer-reviewed product, or
- has made significant service contribution to the department, school, college, university or profession that includes but not limited to activities related to advisement, assessment, accreditation, and governance.

Under no circumstances shall additional teaching or service responsibilities be added to the workload of a faculty member on account of being found not performing at rank, until sufficient encouragement, resources, and opportunities to improve have been provided.

**Tenured Professor**

Faculty members in tenured Professor rank are provided continuing appointment. A tenured Professor is considered to be performing at rank if in the three-year window that includes the year of evaluation and the previous two years, the faculty member has

- taught a new course or an existing course after a gap of three years, or an existing course that involved significant revision to content or mode of delivery, or
- has produced at least one peer-reviewed product, or
- has made significant service contribution to the department, school, college, university or profession that includes but not limited to activities related to advisement, assessment, accreditation, and governance.

Under no circumstances shall additional teaching or service responsibilities be added to the workload of a faculty member on account of being found not performing at rank, until sufficient encouragement, resources, and opportunities to improve have been provided.