



UNIT STANDARDS REVIEW  
SIGNATURE FORM



Department of: Computer Science

Year: 2015

1) Department Chair:

[Signature]  
Signature

10/30/15  
Date

2) Dean:

[Signature]  
Signature

2-23-16  
Date

3) Chair, UM Unit Standards Committee:

[Signature]  
Signature

7-23-18  
Date

4) Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs:

[Signature]  
Signature

7/24/18  
Date

## **DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE UNIT STANDARDS**

### **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 as outlined in their hiring agreements. 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, subsection C.

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, near the third week of the semester. 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 350.

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 of the College of Humanities and Sciences (H&S). 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 (FTE) value will be assigned in writing at the time of hiring after consultation with the Dean of H&S. 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, vote on unit matters (outside of the FEC), and serve on unit committees.

Non-tenurable faculty assigned a FTE 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 about 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. When tenure matters are being discussed or decided:
  - Only tenured faculty members and the student observer will serve on the FEC.
  - Non-tenured faculty members may observe, but may not vote.
  - All available tenured CS faculty members will participate on the tenure committee.
  - Non-CS faculty members may be added (see below) to the tenure committee.
  - No more than 2 outside members should sit on the committee.
  - Unless only one CS faculty member is available to serve on the committee, CS faculty members must comprise a majority of the committee.

The faculty member under consideration for tenure may request from the CS Chair the inclusion of faculty members from other departments/schools. This request must be made prior to October 1. The requester will specify up to two departments/schools that he/she wishes to participate his/her tenure evaluation. The Chair/Dean of the specified department(s)/school(s) will appoint the requested number 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. That is, a majority is required in support of a recommendation of either a merit, promotion, tenure, or below normal increase.
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, as outlined in section 10.230 of the CBA. 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 and should refer to section 10.240 of the CBA for further details.

### **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: ensures the department's workload 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**

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.

A Normal evaluation requires that faculty teach the class load assigned to them by the department chair, and that evidence indicates competent performance of these duties. The rating of Above Normal, requires demonstrated achievements in at least a few of (a) to (k) below, which are intended to show commitment to pedagogy and teaching efficacy. A rating of Outstanding requires

demonstration of impressive teaching effectiveness, as evidenced by several of (a) to (k) below or major contributions in a number of these areas.

Teaching effectiveness can be determined through consideration of any or all 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. Each faculty member must have taught courses evaluated each semester.
- 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. Preparation of new courses.
- d. Teaching an above normal course load, or a high number of student credit hours.
- e. Engagement in relevant Professional Development opportunities such as UM's Pedagogy Project.
- 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.
- k. Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness including feedback from students to the chair.

## **2. Evidence of research / scholarship**

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 or show notable impact. 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).

For a Normal evaluation, faculty are expected to demonstrate research activity in at least one of the forms of scholarly output, (a) to (d) listed below. Scholarship products (e) to (j) may be considered as supplementary evidence of research activity. An Above Normal evaluation requires multiple contributions of scholarly output, (a) to (d). An Outstanding evaluation requires multiple contributions of scholarly output that have attracted national attention. Evaluation of research

activity will be consistent with the faculty member's workload assignments; for example a faculty member with a high teaching load (e.g. teaching track faculty) will be subject to reduced research expectations.

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 (to the University of Montana) 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. The text below suggests general guidelines for evaluation of service activity; additional qualitative aspects should be considered, particularly the time commitment and effectiveness of the service.

For a Normal evaluation, faculty are expected to serve on at least one departmental committee and have provided a contribution of service to either the university, the community, or the profession as described below. For an Above Normal evaluation, faculty are expected to serve on at least two departmental committees and to have provided substantive service to either the university, the community, or the profession. For an Outstanding evaluation in service, faculty are expected to have provided an impressive level of service that has gained recognition at the University or national level.

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 ed. 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 research emphasis track are expected to pursue an active program of research and service to the University and the profession. In each evaluation period, faculty will be evaluated based on the guidance laid out in sections V.B.1-3 above.

Faculty on the teaching emphasis track will be expected to carry a heavier teaching load than faculty on the research emphasis track, with specific load at the discretion of the chair. (The

teaching load is assigned as noted in the CBA section 6.210.) Faculty on this track will be expected to contribute a normal departmental service load, but will have essentially no expectations of research activity. Teaching emphasis faculty should engage in professional development opportunities such as UM's Pedagogy Project, and occasional attendance at pedagogy conferences if Departmental funds allow.

## **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 demonstrate 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. The external letters should not be obtained from former mentors or current collaborators. 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.