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I. GENERAL

This document does not stand alone. It must be read and used in conjunction with the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the University Faculty Association and the Montana University System.

II. DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

A. FACULTY COMPOSITION

The Department of Computer Science has both tenure-track and non-tenurable faculty members. The tenure-track faculty are expected to perform duties in all three areas of teaching, research and service while the non-tenurable faculty are usually only expected to teach and in a limited number of cases, perform service-type duties. The tenure-track faculty can be on one of two (2) career paths.

B. TENURE-TRACK CAREER PATHS

The Department has two career paths for tenure-track faculty, the teaching emphasis track and the research emphasis track. The requirements of each path for promotion, tenure, and salary determination are specified in section V.

New tenure-track members of the Department will be assigned a path during their employment interview. This assignment will be included in the letter offering them a position.

Any tenure-track member may request a change in his/her career path by submitting a request in writing to the Department chair during spring semester before the next fall semester teaching assignments are made. The chair, in consultation with the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the Dean, may deny the request if the grounds are not valid, or if the needs of the Department preclude the change.

C. NON-TENURABLE FACULTY

The general rights and responsibilities of non-tenurable faculty are contained in University Policy 101.2.
Non-tenurable faculty are hired on a course by course basis and a semester by semester basis. A non-tenurable Lecturer contract would normally cover the entire academic year.

1. Hiring and duty assignment

Non-tenurable faculty are recruited and hired in consultation with the Dean, College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). State and federal laws and statutes are to be adhered to including those associated with Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action policies.

Duties and Full Time Equivalent (PTE) value will be assigned in writing at the time of hiring after consultation with the Dean, CAS. While primary duties will normally be associated with teaching, research and/or service responsibilities may also be included.

2. Participation in unit governance

Non-tenurable faculty with a rank of Lecturer will normally participate fully in faculty meetings, votes on unit matters, and serve on unit committees.

Non-tenurable faculty assigned a PTE of less than 1.0 will have the option of attending faculty meetings, will not participate in unit votes and are not required to serve on unit committees.

3. Participation in the annual faculty evaluation

Non-tenurable faculty will be evaluated similarly to the tenure-track faculty, but are not eligible to be members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

Each non-tenurable faculty member will be evaluated based upon their assigned duties at the time of hiring.

III. STUDENT EVALUATION COMMITTEE (SEC)

In addition to CBA section 10.220, the following procedures apply to the Department:

A. SEC COMPOSITION

The SEC will be composed of three to seven students and one faculty observer who is among the full-time, tenure-track faculty except for the Department chair, unless he/she chooses to take this role.
B. SEC CHAIR DETERMINATION

The chair shall be determined by the student members at the first annual meeting of the SEC.

C. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Evaluation procedures will follow those specified in the current CBA. At the beginning of the first SEC meeting, the faculty observer will communicate with the student members these procedures and stress the importance of their work.

IV. FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE (FEC)

In addition to CBA section 10.230, the following procedures apply to the Department:

A. FEC COMPOSITION

The FEC will be composed of one student observer and all full-time, tenure-track faculty, except as follows:

1. The Department Chair shall not serve as a member of the FEC.

2. A faculty member will not serve as a member of the FEC for the consideration of his or her own evaluation.

3. Only tenured faculty members and the student observer will serve on the FEC when tenure matters are being discussed or decided. In the case that there are fewer than three (3) tenured faculty in the Department, the additional tenured members will be selected from other departments or schools as follows: The faculty member under consideration for tenure may specify any department(s) and/or school(s) that he/she wishes to participate in his/her tenure evaluation. The Department Chair or Dean of those specified departments and/or schools will be requested to appoint one (1) or more of his/her faculty to temporarily sit in on the Computer Science FEC until the tenure decision in question is reached.

4. An eligible faculty member scheduled for a leave for all or part of the academic year will normally be excused from FEC membership for that year, unless he/she explicitly indicates the intention to participate as a member in that year. This intention should be made in writing to the Department Chair prior to the first FEC meeting.

B. FEC CHAIR DETERMINATION

The FEC Chair shall be determined by election at the first annual meeting of the FEC. A
vice-chair will also be elected to serve whenever the FEC Chair is being evaluated.

C. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Evaluation procedures will follow those specified in the current CBA, as amplified by the following:

1. After the FEC has evaluated the records of the individual under review, in the case of a merit increase, below normal recommendation, promotion or tenure, a vote will be cast by secret ballot to decide the issue. The FEC chair will make provisions for obtaining an absentee ballot from each member not present. The total number of votes in any decision is the sum of those votes "for" or "against"; abstentions and absents are recorded as a matter of record, but are not considered in determining what constitutes a majority. A tie vote will cause a recommendation of normal to be forwarded if the issue is a merit increase or below normal increase, or a recommendation to be forwarded of disapproval if the issue is one of promotion or tenure.

2. The FEC chair will communicate the action of the committee, including an anonymous division of the house if requested, in writing to the faculty member under review.

3. The faculty member under review can request oral feedback concerning his/her FEC evaluation from the FEC chair or from another FEC member designated by the FEC chair.

4. The faculty member under review has the option to request that the FEC re-consider its decision. A request for reconsideration can be supported by written statements from the faculty member under review and/or other persons. Following reconsideration, the FEC will take a second vote on the issue, using the same procedure as for the first vote.

5. After the FEC has completed its written recommendation for each faculty member, a copy of its recommendation as well as any additional documents that have been added to the record will be made available to the faculty member. The faculty member may discuss the recommendation with the Department Chair. This must take place before the Department Chair completes his/her evaluation and recommendations.

6. A faculty member under evaluation can request oral feedback concerning his/her evaluation from the Department Chair.

D. EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR PERFORMANCE

The FEC will annually do an evaluation of the performance of the Chair of the department in his/her duties as chair providing the Chair has served at least one academic year as of August 31 and has not left the University. The evaluation might include a recommendation that someone else be appointed as Chair. The Department Chair has all the same rights and options for
reconsideration as regular faculty members. The Department Chair evaluation is to be completed by November 15, and will be forwarded to the Dean of the College along with the other recommendations of the FEC.

The Chair's evaluation should be separate from his or her regular faculty member evaluation. The Chair's performance should be based in part on the following criteria:

1. Leadership: setting and accomplishing goals, detecting and correcting problems rapidly, efficient utilization of departmental resources.

2. Routine Administrative Duties: promptness and efficiency in handling the myriad little administrative details, communicating administrative direction and feedback to the department.

3. Fairness: insures the department's work load is equitably distributed among its members.

V. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION, TENURE AWARD AND SALARY DETERMINATION

A. GENERAL

Faculty responsibilities in the areas of teaching, service and research are outlined in section 6.000 of the CBA for faculty in the bargaining unit and explicitly addressed in the letter of hire for faculty not in the bargaining unit. It is expected that all faculty within the Department show evidence of satisfactory teaching since this is the primary mission of the University. It is also expected that faculty will engage in the other activities associated with their career path or non-tenurable faculty contract, but these will vary according to the member's interest and the needs of the Department and the University.

B. EVIDENCE OF SUCCESS

The Department lists the following activities as an elaboration of the general evaluation criteria found in the current CBA. This list is to be used only as a general guide, as the Department does not wish to constrain creative endeavors which would further the objectives of the University.

1. Evidence of teaching ability

The faculty member must be a "highly effective" teacher in his/her various teaching assignments. Judgment of effectiveness is largely subjective; usually a highly effective teacher can be recognized by a continuous effort to enhance and improve the presentation of subject
matter, pedagogy used to teach the subject, and emphasis on student outcomes. Such a teacher will focus on educational as well as technical issues through the systematic re-organization of courses each semester to implement new teaching approaches and integrate advances in the field. Faculty will invest effort in student performance by helping the student to learn (in and out of the classroom), and then use these experiences to improve departmental retention rates. Teaching effectiveness can be determined through consideration of the following:

   a. Student opinion as reflected in the end-of-course critiques which are administered in each course at the end of each semester and through popularity of courses as demonstrated by strong enrollments.

   b. Peer evaluations, which may be formed after considering classroom observation by colleagues in the department or University provided experts, interviews with students, feedback from senior exit interviews, and/or evaluation of course materials.

   c. Surveys of alumni that have taken specific courses from the faculty member.

   d. Evaluation by the Student Evaluation Committee including student feedback provided to the committee.

   e. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness including feedback from students to the chair.

   f. Inclusion of new teaching and learning technologies, pedagogies, and assessment methods.

   g. Contributions to the General Education requirements and interdisciplinary efforts of the Department.

   h. Supervision of undergraduate and graduate research projects, including Master's and Ph.D. theses and dissertations.

   i. Serving on graduate committees.

   j. Supervision of independent study courses and internships.

2. Evidence of research

When evaluating faculty achievement in research, the department will assign significant weight to the rigor of the peer-review process the scholarly products have been subjected to. Specifically, we favor forms of scholarship that can be documented as appearing in publications with a high impact factor, publications having a high citation rate, or any products that result from a highly selective process. The Computer Science department prides itself on an interdisciplinary approach to science. As such, we recognize the variety of conventions within science regarding order of author's names on papers, and the importance of various intellectual products (such as conference proceedings vs. journal publication).
We recognize all of the following as legitimate products of scholarship:

a. publication of peer-reviewed articles, monographs, or books,

b. presentation at meetings, conferences, or workshops resulting in a peer-reviewed and published manuscript, abstract, or presentation,

c. award of grants or contracts from external sources,

d. submission of grants and contracts that can be demonstrated to have received favorable reviews,

e. technical reports,

f. consulting activities,

g. development, distribution, and maintenance of software, databases, or derived data sets,

h. commercialization of research products,

i. interviews with or articles for the popular press which relate to research, or

j. other evidence of research.

3. Evidence of professional/university service:

Each faculty member has the obligation and responsibility to assist in the proper administration of departmental and University affairs compatible with his/her teaching, research, and other commitments. Faculty members in the Teaching Emphasis career path will be expected to perform a higher standard of service activities than those on the Research Emphasis path. However, all faculty members, regardless of career path, should be actively involved in the following types of service activities:

a. Service to the department. Examples include:

(1) Participation in department meetings and committees.

(2) Advising and approval of graduation petitions.

(3) Assessment and accreditation activities.

(4) Fund raising and alumni relations activities.

(5) Curriculum development and revision.

(6) Recruiting and retention activities.
(7) Teaching of summer and/or continuing education courses.

(8) Continuing education activities such as extension courses, workshops, and/or seminars for business and government personnel.

b. **Service to the university. Examples include:**

   (1) Participation on system-wide, campus-wide, or college-wide faculty committees.

   (2) Participation in the organization and/or running of on-campus conferences and events.

   (3) Involvement in faculty governance.

c. **Service to the community. Examples include:**

   (1) Participation and/or judging in the state science fair.

   (2) Outreach to local schools (k-12).

d. **Service to the profession. Examples include:**

   (1) Reviewing journal and other professional publications. Participating as an editorial board member of a professional journal.

   (2) Serving on conference committees.

   (3) Serving on grant review boards.
(4) Serving as an editor of a journal.

(5) Serving as an organizer of a professional conference.

(6) Active interest and participation in professional organizations.

(7) Consulting related to the faculty member's area of professional competence.

C. TRACK REQUIREMENTS

Faculty on the teaching emphasis track will be expected to carry a heavier teaching load than faculty on the research emphasis track. Their load would normally be approximately one three-credit course per semester higher than faculty on the research emphasis track. (The teaching load is assigned as noted in the CBA section 6.210.) Faculty on this track will also be expected to carry a heavier departmental service load by assuming responsibilities such as undergraduate advising and approval of student petitions and graduation applications. Teaching emphasis faculty should pursue a reduced program of research but one which includes periodic publishing in refereed or reviewed publications.

Faculty on a research emphasis track will have a reduced teaching load in comparison to faculty on the teaching emphasis track. Faculty on this track are expected to pursue an active program of research and service to the profession. In each evaluation period, evidence of progress towards at least one of the forms of scholarly output listed in V.B.2. (a) to (d) is expected for a normal salary increment. Merit and promotion at a minimum require achievement of V.B.2. (a) to (d). Service to the department and the university is also expected.

D. SPECIFIC CRITERIA

1. Terminal Degree

A terminal degree for the Department is an earned doctorate in Computer Science or a closely related discipline. (Exceptions may be approved by the Dean and Provost.)

All faculty members hired for a tenure-track position of Assistant Professor or above will be assumed to have met the requirements of a terminal degree. This assumption also pertains to all members of the department upon approval of this document.

2. Promotion

a. To assistant professor: Requires possession of an earned doctorate in Computer Science or a closely related discipline. (Exceptions may be approved by the Dean and Provost.)
b. To associate professor: Requires 4 or more years in the rank as assistant professor. To be promoted to associate professor, the candidate must illustrate continued professional growth and recognition. The activities considered most important in recommendations for promotion are peer-reviewed publications, external grant funding, and teaching. Preferably, the candidate for promotion to associate professor will have been recognized (or at least supported by the FEC) for meritorious work (as mentioned in section D.4 of this document) during the period as assistant professor.

c. To Full Professor: Requires 5 or more years in the rank as associate professor. For promotion to full professor, evidence of high performance in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and service is required. The character of the service in rank as associate professor shall be such that there is a clear demonstration of professional growth and an increasingly valuable contribution to the University. As outlined in the CBA, no faculty member may be promoted to full professor on the basis of teaching and service alone. Scholarship must be demonstrated by peer-reviewed publication and external grant funding.

3. Tenure

To apply for tenure, the faculty member must have the appropriate terminal degree and rank of at least Associate Professor (or simultaneous application). The overall guiding criteria in recommending tenure for a faculty member will be his or her demonstrated ability to carry out the academic responsibilities in the areas of teaching, research, and service as stated in CBA section 6.200 and elaborated upon in this document. The candidate for tenure in our department should have been recognized (or at least supported by the FEC) for meritorious work during the probationary period, will have peer-reviewed publications, will have submitted competitive or successful external grant applications, and will demonstrate excellence in teaching.

For faculty members applying for tenure, it is appropriate to include outside letters of evaluation in the review file. The outside letters are particularly important in evaluating the candidate's publication record. By July 1 of the year in which a faculty member is applying for tenure, the faculty member should submit a list of at least four names of professionals from outside the University who are familiar with the faculty member's research work. These people will be tenured faculty at other universities or professionals at governmental or other organizations engaged in research. At least two of these will be people who were not faculty members or students at the institution where the applicant earned his or her doctoral degree during the time the applicant was a student there. The faculty applicant can also provide a list of reviewers that should NOT be contacted for external letters. The Department Chair or the Chair's designee will solicit letters of evaluation from individuals on the approved list provided by the candidate or from other resources.
not necessarily identified by the faculty member. Letters must be received by October 15 to be considered fully.

4. Merit

To be recommended for a merit raise, a faculty member must have above normal performance in at least two of the three areas: teaching, research, or service OR outstanding performance in at least one of these areas and normal performance in the other two areas. No one with below normal performance in any one of the three areas will be recommended for a merit raise.

5. Less than normal increment

Poor performance of assigned responsibilities within the scope of employment constitutes grounds for recommendation of a less-than-normal increment.

6. GENERAL STATEMENTS

These unit standards and procedures are intended to be in addition to and consistent with those provided in the current CBA, and in the event of any omissions or inconsistencies, the terms of the CBA shall be applicable and shall prevail. Faculty members should consult the CBA for procedures related to the evaluation process beyond the FEC and to determine the procedural requirements for appeals.