



Office of the Provost

Department of Computer Science

Evaluation and Procedures

Approved: 2024

Office of the Provost
James Madison University

MSC 7607
Alumnae Hall, Room 102
91 Alumnae Drive
Harrisonburg, VA 22807
540.568.3429

JMU Computer Science Policies and Procedures

V. 1.0, 11/7/2024 (accepted by vote of the CS Department faculty)

Preamble

The role of the JMU Faculty Handbook is to “outline the duties, rights and responsibilities of faculty members and to be a guide for the relationship between the faculty members and the university.” In some areas, the Faculty Handbook allows, or requires, the establishment of policies at the level of the academic unit. This document contains a collection of policies and procedures established within the JMU Computer Science department. Each individual policy has been approved by the computer science faculty. The policies related to evaluation criteria and procedures have also been approved by the AUH, dean, and provost as required by the Faculty Handbook (III.E.1.f.).

Table of Contents

Preamble2

AUPAC Responsibilities and Composition4

AUPAC Procedures and Processes6

Policy on Promotion and Tenure for Tenure Track Faculty9

Faculty Member Annual Evaluation Criteria.....16

Process for the Review of an Appeal of an Annual Evaluation.....21

Midpoint Review Policy16

Early Promotion and Tenure Policy23

Merit Pay Algorithm.....24

Peer Reviews.....26

Office Hours Policy.....27

Policy for Conducting Student Evaluations28

AUPAC Responsibilities and Composition

1. Purpose and Responsibilities

The role of the AUPAC is to advise the Department Head and make recommendations on personnel matters with the Computer Science Department, to hear appeals of faculty evaluations, and to offer guidance to faculty members preparing for tenure and promotion. The AUPAC will operate in accordance with Section III of the Faculty Handbook.

2. Composition & Roles

- 2.1. The AUPAC will include all active full-time instructional faculty having a primary appointment in the department, except the Department Head. The AUPAC is divided into two subcommittees, one comprised of all members with primary responsibility to the Computer Science (CS) program and one comprised of all members with primary responsibility to the Information Technology (IT) program. These will be generically referred to as the “program AUPAC subcommittees” in the remainder of this document.
 - 2.1.1. Faculty members hired into the department before the creation of the IT program or who have been subsequently hired by a search committee of the CS program have primary responsibility to the CS program. Faculty members who comprised the initial IT program faculty or who have been subsequently hired by a search committee of the IT program have primary responsibility to the IT program.
 - 2.1.2. Departmental faculty lines will be assigned to a program by the AUH before advertisement of the position. The search committee for a line will be comprised of members from that program. If there are not enough members of a program available to fill a full search committee, then any faculty member in the department may serve on the search committee provided the majority of members come from the hiring program.
- 2.2. Each program AUPAC subcommittee will elect a program Administrative and Appeals Subcommittee (AAS) each year consisting of four program members other than the Assistant Academic Unit Head, one of whom must not have tenure if possible and one of whom must hold the rank of Professor. This subcommittee will be responsible for managing all business to come before the respective program AUPAC subcommittee. Each program’s subcommittee will also hear appeals of initial and annual faculty evaluations, lead the review and revision of policies and procedures, arrange for intermediate evaluation of any faculty member upon request of that faculty member, and handle other AUPAC business as needed for faculty with primary responsibility to the program. Revising the policies and procedures that pertain to the entire department will be the responsibility of the full AUPAC.
- 2.3. Membership in each program’s AAS will be determined for the next academic year at the program’s faculty meeting before the end of the current academic year. Nominations for membership will be solicited at the meeting. Votes will be carried by a majority of (non-abstaining) votes cast.
- 2.4. Each program’s AAS will elect a chairperson who will be elected by the AAS

subcommittee. Votes will be carried by a majority of (non-abstaining) votes cast with ties decided by the entire AUPAC at the next program faculty meeting.

- 2.5. Changes to this document that apply to both programs may be proposed by either program's AAS and are accepted by a majority vote of the AUPAC faculty across both programs. Changes to this document that apply to a specific program may be proposed by the program's AAS and accepted by a majority vote of the AUPAC faculty with primary responsibility to the program.

3. Promotion and Tenure Recommendations

- 3.1. Only tenured AUPAC members will vote on tenure recommendations within their respective program's subcommittee.
- 3.2. Only AUPAC members at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor will vote on recommendations for promotion to Associate Professor within their respective program's subcommittee.
- 3.3. Only AUPAC members at the rank of Professor will vote on recommendations for promotion to Professor within their respective program's subcommittee.
- 3.4. Only tenured AUPAC members and members at the rank of Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer will vote on recommendations for promotion to Senior Lecturer within their respective program's subcommittee.
- 3.5. Only tenured AUPAC members and members at the rank of Principal lecturer will vote on promotions to Principal Lecturer within their respective program's subcommittee.
- 3.6. No individual will vote on their own case. Active faculty members who are away will have the opportunity to vote by proxy. A member of the AUPAC may abstain from any vote if unable to vote or if the member feels it is in the best interest of the department to abstain.
- 3.7. Each case will be discussed openly by those eligible to vote, followed by an open vote to recommend or not. All materials will be held confidential and shared only with members eligible to vote on the case within their respective program subcommittee. All votes will be carried by a majority of (non-abstaining) votes cast, except that a minimum of three votes must be cast. If fewer than three faculty members are eligible and willing to vote on any case, then the program's AUPAC subcommittee will conduct a special election to temporarily add the minimum number of required voters to the panel for that case only, from among AUPAC members of appropriate rank otherwise not eligible to vote.

AUPAC Procedures and Processes

Promotion and Tenure Case Processes

An applicant for promotion or tenure must send a letter of intent electronically to the Academic Unit Head by September 1st. The final application must then be submitted to the AUH, the AAS of the applicant's program, and the Dean

by October 1st. Submission to the AAS, AUH, and Dean should be made available electronically via a university-owned cloud repository accessible only to the applicant and the Chair of the AAS. If the chair of the applicant's AAS is of higher rank, the submission should be made to the chair, otherwise, the submission should be sent to a member of the AAS of appropriate rank. The AAS will provide instructions for submitting materials at the faculty member's request.

The Chair of applicant's program AAS will have electronic copies of the material shared in a private, university-owned cloud repository available only to members of the AUPAC who are eligible to vote on the applicant's case. Members reviewing the documents must keep all documents confidential and must not share them.

The Chair of the program's AAS will inform the members of the program's AUPAC subcommittee that an application has been submitted and schedule a meeting of the program's AUPAC subcommittee to consider the application. If multiple applications will be considered at a single meeting, applications for Associate Professor will be considered first, applications for Tenure will be considered second, and applications for Professor will be considered last (so that members of the AUPAC who are not eligible to review the latter cases can leave the meeting).

If the chair of the AAS is not a full professor, applications for promotion to the rank of full will be handled by the member of the AAS with full rank, who will serve as an acting chair and follow the same procedures as outlined below except with only faculty members of full rank.

Prior to the scheduled meeting, all members of the program's AUPAC subcommittee will review the electronic materials.

At the meeting members of the program's AUPAC subcommittee will discuss each applicant individually and come to a consensus about its recommendation through discussion. The program's AUPAC subcommittee will make exactly one recommendation, made for the AUPAC as a whole; the AUPAC "speaks with one voice". **The deliberations of the AUPAC will be confidential; members of the AUPAC must not discuss the deliberations with anyone, including the applicant.**

Appropriate members of the program's AAS will draft a letter of recommendation and circulate it to the appropriate members of the program's AUPAC subcommittee electronically.

Members of the program's AUPAC subcommittee will provide feedback to the program's AAS on the letter of recommendation electronically. In the event of significant/substantial feedback, the Chair of the program's AAS will schedule a meeting to discuss the letter of recommendation.

After the letter of recommendation is finalized, it will be signed by each eligible voting member of the program's AUPAC subcommittee.

The Chair of the program's AAS will submit the letter of recommendation as required by The Faculty Handbook.

Midpoint Review Policy

According to the faculty handbook "The AUPAC and AUH must independently review the accomplishments of tenure track faculty at the midpoint of the probationary period, typically during the third year of candidacy" (III.E.4.m.) These evaluations become a matter of the college's record and are filed in the office of the dean.

In the computer science department, the required evaluation will take place at the end of the fourth semester, or at the midpoint of the pre-tenure period, whichever is earlier. At the option of the faculty member, the AUPAC may also perform a second midpoint review at the end of the eighth semester. The AUPAC's evaluation report for the optional second review is the confidential property of the faculty member, and no copies shall be retained by the AUPAC or filed with the college.

The faculty member may provide the AUPAC whatever documentation they think relevant in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarly achievement. This documentation may include a current curriculum vitae, a summary of class evaluations, copies of annual evaluations, annual activity reports, a listing of relevant accomplishments, and a narrative detailing the faculty member's contributions in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

The faculty member's complete dossier must be shared with the chair of the program AAS for which the faculty member has primary responsibility. The Chair of the program's AAS will have electronic copies of the material shared in a private, university-owned cloud repository available only to members of the AUPAC who would be eligible to vote if this were a tenure case. Members reviewing the documents must keep all documents confidential and must not share them. Any personal copies made by members must be deleted or destroyed at the end of the review period.

The Chair of the program's AAS will inform the members of the program's AUPAC subcommittee that one or more such requests have been made and schedule a meeting of the AUPAC to consider them. Prior to the scheduled meeting, each member of the program's AUPAC subcommittee eligible to vote on tenure cases will review the materials electronically.

For evaluations taking place during the spring semester, the faculty member's dossier must be provided to the AUPAC by February 28th. The evaluation will be written by appropriate members of the program AAS and distributed electronically for comment among the program AUPAC for final comments. The final evaluation will be signed by the Chair of the program's AAS on behalf of the AUPAC and shared with the faculty member, the AUH and the Dean by April 15th electronically. For evaluations taking place during the fall semester, the dossier must be provided to the AUPAC by October 1st. The evaluation will

be shared by November 15th.

All midpoint evaluations (both required and optional) are made by the faculty member's program AUPAC subcommittee and held confidentially within that subcommittee.

Pre-Promotion Review Policy for Lecturers

Midpoint reviews are required by the faculty handbook for tenure-track faculty at the midpoint of the probationary period. While there is no corresponding requirement for Lecturers, a preliminary review may be beneficial for those who intend to apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers may request a pre-promotion review by their program's AUPAC subcommittee.

The program AUPAC subcommittee's evaluation report for the review is the confidential property of the faculty member, and no copies shall be retained by the AUPAC or filed with the college.

Faculty members may provide to the AUPAC whatever documentation they think relevant in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarly achievement and professional qualifications. This documentation may include a current curriculum vitae, a summary of class evaluations, copies of annual evaluations, annual activity reports, and a listing of relevant accomplishments.

For evaluations taking place during the spring semester, the faculty member's dossier must be provided to the program AUPAC subcommittee by February 28th. The evaluation will be shared with the faculty member by April 15th. For evaluations taking place during the fall semester, the dossier must be provided to the program AUPAC subcommittee by October 1st. The evaluation will be shared by November 15th. The evaluation will be written by appropriate members of the program AAS and distributed electronically for comment among the program AUPAC subcommittee for final comments. The final evaluation will be signed by the Chair of the program's AAS on behalf of the AUPAC and shared with the faculty member.

Policy on Promotion and Tenure for Tenure Track Faculty

Role of the AUPAC in Promotion and Tenure Decisions

The AUPAC makes an independent recommendation to the dean on all promotion and tenure decisions. This recommendation is determined by the program AUPAC subcommittee for the program to which the faculty member has primary responsibility.

Standards

In the evaluation of faculty members being considered for promotion in academic rank and/or tenure, the following standards apply:

Assistant Professor. At least satisfactory ratings in all three areas are required for promotion to assistant professor.

Associate Professor, Tenure. Significant effort devoted to either teaching or scholarly achievement, an excellent rating in either teaching or scholarly achievement and at least satisfactory ratings in the other areas are required for promotion to associate professor.

Professor. An excellent rating in two areas of significant effort and at least a satisfactory rating in the other area are required for promotion to professor.

Criteria

Each AUPAC subcommittee uses judgment and discretion in making recommendations on promotion and tenure. Decisions are based on a variety of evidence, including evaluations, recommendations, research, publications, curriculum artifacts, personnel records and other relevant materials. AUPAC subcommittee members will also exercise professional judgment in evaluating the dedication, conduct, and effectiveness of applicants.

Generally, it is incumbent upon the applicant to present a case for promotion and/or tenure, and to provide adequate supporting evidence. The AUPAC subcommittee may request additional evidence from the applicant or from the Department, subject to policies defined in the Faculty Handbook.

AUPAC subcommittee recommendations are not based solely on annual evaluations. In addition, it is important to note the following specific differences between the criteria used for annual evaluations and the criteria used for promotion and tenure:

- Unlike in annual evaluations, in the evaluation of faculty members being considered for promotion in academic rank, the AUH and AUPAC subcommittee will look for a continuing and cohesive pattern of productivity and contribution to the department and the field.
- The AUPAC is only involved with appeals of annual evaluations. That is, unless a faculty member appeals the AUH's evaluation, the AUPAC is not involved in the annual evaluation process. Hence, the AUPAC may disagree with the AUH's annual evaluations. In an appeal, as described in §III.E.4.h of the *Faculty Handbook*, the AUPAC will consider "[W]hether all relevant information was objectively reviewed by the AUH in accordance with evaluation criteria established by the academic unit," and "[W]hether the AUH evaluated similar achievements among similarly situated academic unit members using the same standard of judgment."

Teaching

The following are expected of a faculty member in order to be judged Satisfactory.

- Have a consistent history of annual evaluations of teaching that are at least satisfactory.
- Provide student evaluations of teaching as they relate to course content, rigor, assignments, and learning experiences.
- Prepare course curricula, syllabi and course materials (e.g., lectures, labs, assignments, and exams) that are effective, appropriate, and correct.
- Conduct classes in an effective manner, at the appropriate times and for the appropriate durations.
- Communicate effectively with students and peers, including addressing and interacting with students and peers in a professional manner.
- Provide the required number of office hours and willingly meet with students at those times.
- Be willing to teach a fair share of courses in different programs (e.g., graduate and undergraduate courses), at different levels (e.g., 100, 200, 300 and 400 level courses), and in different areas.
- Be willing to be a member of a fair share of undergraduate and graduate thesis committees.
- Make efforts to improve teaching through workshops, conferences, self-study, or other means.

The following are indicators of excellence in teaching. These are not requirements for excellence, but rather are representative indicators of excellence. This list is intended to set the standard of excellent performance in teaching, and is not intended to be exhaustive. The AUPAC subcommittee may consider some or all of these factors, as well as other related factors.

- Have a consistent pattern of excellent annual evaluations of teaching.
- Have a consistent pattern of excellent student evaluations of teaching as they relate to course content, rigor, assignments, and learning experiences.
- Prepare and teach courses in multiple programs (e.g., graduate and undergraduate courses) and at multiple levels (e.g., 100, 200, 300 and 400 level courses).

- Receive a teaching award from the University, a peer group, or professional organization.
- Develop new course materials that substantially revise and improve a course.
- Develop new courses and contribute to the development of new programs or substantial program revisions.
- Make significant efforts to support diversity, equity, and inclusion, such as developing inclusive course materials and adopting evidence-based teaching practices.
- Investigate and make appropriate use of emerging instructional technologies.
- Supervise independent studies, honors projects, and theses.
- Participate in workshops and meetings with a focus on improving teaching in general.
- Have strong recommendations and good peer evaluations from other faculty members.
- Receive significant funding that supports educational activities.
- Participate in mentoring activities (e.g., advise prestigious scholarship applicants and lead educational activities for student clubs).
- Have a consistent pattern of developing and offering special topics courses.

Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

The following are expected of a faculty member in order to be judged Satisfactory.

- Have a consistent pattern of annual evaluations in this area that are at least satisfactory.
- Demonstrate involvement in scholarship and/or student research projects in Computer Science and related fields.
- Engage in professional development activities related to pursuits in Computer Science and related fields.
- Be a member of a community of scholars (e.g., apply for funding to support scholarly activities, serve as a referee/reviewer, and participate in scholarly panels).

The following are indicators of excellence in scholarly achievement and professional qualifications. These are not requirements for excellence, but rather are representative indicators of excellence. This list is intended to set the standard of excellent performance; it is not intended to be exhaustive. The AUPAC subcommittee may consider some or all of these factors, as well as other related factors.

- Show a record of significant and original contribution as demonstrated by a cohesive record¹ of publication and/or grants. Such a record will demonstrate an ongoing contribution to the science and to the profession.
- Make consistently high-quality contributions to student research projects.
- Receive consistent and significant funding that supports scholarly activities.
- Engage in systematic professional development that involves a substantial change in focus.
- Receive nominations or awards for scholarly achievement from recognized organizations outside of the University.

¹ A cohesive contribution is indicated by a series of works and achievements that focus on a common topic and that indicate progress towards a distinct objective. Though collaboration is valued, being one of the principal/primary authors for published works indicates a higher degree of accomplishment and originality.

- Participate in scholarly/professional activities that bring recognition to the Department, College or University.

Service

The following are expected of a faculty member in order to be judged Satisfactory.

- Have a consistent pattern of annual evaluations in this area that are at least satisfactory.
- Have actively participated in a fair share of activities at the University, College, and Departmental levels.
- Attend Department, College and University meetings (as appropriate).
- Attend student-focused activities (e.g., club meetings, talks by outside speakers, recruiting events).

The following are indicators of excellence in service. These are not requirements for excellence, but rather are representative indicators of excellence. This list is intended to set the standard of excellent performance; it is not intended to be exhaustive. The AUPAC Subcommittee may consider some or all of these factors, as well as other related factors.

- Participate in activities at more than one level within the University, be involved in a wide array of different activities, and have a demonstrated record of playing a significant role in these activities.
- Provide effective service to a professional organization (e.g., serve as an officer, serve as a conference/session organizer).
- Play a significant role in recruiting activities.
- Play a significant role advising/supervising student clubs/activities.
- Advise undergraduate and/or graduate students.
- Make outstanding contributions to the development of other faculty in the Department, College, or University.
- Receive nominations or awards for service from recognized organizations outside of the University.
- Lead community service activities that bring recognition to the Department, College or University.
- Receive consistent and significant funding that supports non-scholarly activities (e.g., funding for teaching laboratories, scholarships, and recruiting).
- Accept an unusual teaching load at the request of the Department.

Policy on Promotion for Lecturers

Role of the AUPAC in Promotion and Tenure Decisions

The AUPAC makes an independent recommendation to the dean on all promotion and tenure decisions. This recommendation is determined by the program AUPAC subcommittee for the program to which the faculty member has primary responsibility.

Standards

In the evaluation of Lecturers being considered for promotion, the following standards apply:

Senior Lecturer. An excellent rating in teaching and at least satisfactory ratings in the second and third areas are required for promotion to senior lecturer.

Principal Lecturer. Excellent ratings in teaching and one other area and at least a satisfactory rating in the third area are required for promotion to principal lecturer.

Criteria

The AUPAC uses judgment and discretion in making recommendations on promotion. Decisions are based on a variety of evidence, including evaluations, recommendations, research, publications, curriculum artifacts, personnel records and other relevant materials. AUPAC members will also exercise professional judgment in evaluating the dedication, conduct, and effectiveness of applicants.

Generally, it is incumbent upon the applicant to present a case for promotion, and to provide adequate supporting evidence. This documentation may include a current curriculum vitae, a summary of class evaluations, copies of annual evaluations, annual activity reports, a listing of relevant accomplishments, and a narrative detailing the faculty member's contributions in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

The faculty member's complete dossier must be shared with the chair of the program AAS for which the faculty member has primary responsibility. The AUPAC subcommittee may request additional evidence from the applicant or from the Department, subject to policies defined in the Faculty Handbook.

AUPAC recommendations are not based solely on annual evaluations. In addition, it is important to note the following specific differences between the criteria used for annual evaluations and the criteria used for promotion decisions:

- Unlike in annual evaluations, in the evaluation of faculty members being considered for promotion in academic rank, the AUH and AUPAC subcommittee will look for a continuing and cohesive pattern of behavior.
- The AUPAC subcommittee is only involved with appeals of annual evaluations. That is, unless a faculty member appeals the AUH's evaluation, the AUPAC subcommittee is not involved in the annual evaluation process. Hence, the CSPAC may disagree with the AUH's annual evaluations. This disagreement may result from a difference of opinion about the interpretation of the criteria used for annual evaluations or from a difference of opinion about the way in which a faculty member's conduct impacted performance (either positive or negative).

Teaching

The following are expected of a Lecturer in order to be judged Satisfactory.

- Have a consistent history of annual evaluations of teaching that are at least satisfactory.

- Provide student evaluations of teaching as they relate to course content, rigor, assignments, and learning experiences.
- Prepare course curricula, syllabi and course materials (e.g., lectures, labs, assignments, and exams) that are effective, appropriate, and correct.
- Conduct classes in an effective manner, at the appropriate times and for the appropriate durations.
- Communicate effectively with students and peers, including addressing and interacting with students and peers in a professional manner.
- Provide a reasonable number of office hours and willingly meet with students at those times.
- Make efforts to improve teaching through workshops, conferences, self-study, or other means.

The following are indicators of excellence in teaching. These are not requirements for excellence, but rather are representative indicators of excellence. This list is intended to set the standard of excellent performance in teaching, and is not intended to be exhaustive. The AUPAC subcommittee may consider some or all of these factors, as well as other related factors.

- Have a consistent pattern of excellent annual evaluations of teaching.
- Have a consistent pattern of excellent student evaluations of teaching as they relate to course content, rigor, assignments, and learning experiences.
- Prepare and teach courses in multiple programs (e.g., graduate and undergraduate courses) and at multiple levels (e.g., 100, 200, 300 and 400 level courses).
- Receive a teaching award from the University, a peer group, or professional organization.
- Develop new course materials that substantially revise and improve a course.
- Develop new courses and contribute to the development of new programs or substantial program revisions.
- Make significant efforts to support diversity, equity, and inclusion, such as developing inclusive course materials and adopting evidence-based teaching practices.
- Investigate and make appropriate use of emerging instructional technologies.
- Supervise independent studies, honors projects, and theses.
- Participate in workshops and meetings with a focus on improving teaching in general.
- Have strong recommendations and good peer evaluations from other faculty members.
- Receive significant funding that supports educational activities.
- Participate in mentoring activities (e.g., advise prestigious scholarship applicants and lead educational activities for student clubs).
- Have a consistent pattern of developing and offering special topics courses.

Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

The following are expected of a Lecturer in order to be judged Satisfactory.

- Have a consistent pattern of annual evaluations in this area that are at least satisfactory.
- Engage in professional development activities related to pursuits in Computer Science and related fields.

The following are indicators of excellence in scholarly achievement and professional qualifications. These are not requirements for excellence, but rather are representative indicators of excellence. This list is intended to set the standard of excellent performance; it is not intended to be exhaustive. The CSPAC may consider some or all of these factors, as well as other related factors.

- Show a record of significant contribution as demonstrated by a cohesive record^[1] of publication, professional artifacts, and/or grants. Such a record will demonstrate an ongoing contribution to the science or to the profession.
- Make consistently high quality contributions to student research projects.
- Receive consistent and significant funding that supports scholarly or professional activities.
- Engage in systematic professional development that involves a substantial change in focus.
- Receive nominations or awards for scholarly or professional achievement from recognized organizations outside of the University.
- Participate in scholarly/professional activities that bring recognition to the Department, College or University.

Professional Service

The following are expected of a Lecturer in order to be judged Satisfactory.

- Have a consistent pattern of annual evaluations in this area that are at least satisfactory.
- Have actively participated in a fair share of activities at the Departmental level.
- Attend Department, College and University meetings (as appropriate).
- Attend student-focused activities (e.g., club meetings, talks by outside speakers, recruiting events).

The following are indicators of excellence in service. These are not requirements for excellence, but rather are representative indicators of excellence. This list is intended to set the standard of excellent performance; it is not intended to be exhaustive. The AUPAC subcommittee may consider some or all of these factors, as well as other related factors.

- Participate in activities at more than one level within the University, be involved in a wide array of different activities, and have a demonstrated record of playing a significant role in these activities.
- Provide effective service to a professional organization (e.g., serve as an officer, serve as a conference/session organizer).
- Play a significant role in recruiting activities.
- Play a significant role advising/supervising student clubs/activities.
- Advise undergraduate and/or graduate students.
- Make outstanding contributions to the development of other faculty in the Department, College, or University.
- Receive nominations or awards for service from recognized organizations outside of the University.
- Lead community service activities that bring recognition to the Department, College or University.
- Receive consistent and significant funding that supports non-scholarly activities (e.g., funding for teaching laboratories, scholarships, and recruiting).
- Accept an unusual teaching load at the request of the Department.
- Engage in significant service activities in support of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

^[1] A cohesive contribution is indicated by a series of works and achievements that focus on a common topic and that indicate progress towards a distinct objective. Though collaboration is valued, being one of the principal/primary authors for published works indicates a higher degree of accomplishment and originality.

Faculty Member Annual Evaluation Criteria

Preamble

The purposes of faculty member evaluation are to encourage performance at the highest levels, to indicate areas where improvements are needed, and to provide a factual basis for making personnel decisions (including decisions about promotion, tenure, allocation of merit pay increases, continuation of employment, and initiation of post-tenure review). This document supplements the JMU Faculty Handbook by stating explicit criteria to be used by the Computer Science department in conducting faculty member evaluations.

Criteria are stated in the categories of teaching, professional service, and scholarly achievement and professional qualifications. Different criteria may be established in any category for purposes of evaluating an individual faculty member by mutual agreement of the department head, that faculty member, and the chair of the program AAC. It would be prudent to make such an agreement in advance of the activity and record it in the faculty member's anticipated activity report.

In some categories the criteria for achieving a rating of satisfactory or excellent are expressed in terms of necessary and sufficient conditions. For example, to receive an excellent rating in service, one activity from the Quality group is necessary and two are sufficient. In this case, the determination of whether a single activity is adequate will depend on the effort and impact associated with that activity. Since these determinations are potentially subjective, faculty members are encouraged to resolve ambiguities in advance by consulting with the unit head during the preparation of the anticipated activities document.

At the end of each academic year, each faculty member must complete the department's evaluation template documents and submit them to the AUH via email. The template documents include both a guided, detailed self-evaluation of the faculty member's activities in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service that are in line with the evaluation criteria listed below as well as a quantitative document counting the number of activities in each area. Both documents are maintained in the department's cloud storage accessible to all faculty members.

I. Teaching

For a **satisfactory** rating, **all** the following activities are **necessary and sufficient**.

A. Satisfactory Group

1. Produced syllabi that clearly stated course objectives, content, texts, schedule, and student evaluation procedures
2. Produced up-to-date materials and assigned work appropriate to the course level and content
3. Prepared for class meetings thoroughly
4. Held classes and started on time
5. Used effective teaching methods
6. Posted and kept sufficient office hours
7. Answered students' inquiries promptly
8. Showed concern and respect toward students
9. Graded objectively and returned graded assignments promptly
10. Interacted with students and peers in a professional manner
11. Advised students about curricula, schedules, and professional preparation
12. Received satisfactory student teaching evaluations as they relate to course content, rigor, assignments, and learning experiences.

For an **excellent** rating, **three** of the following activities are **sufficient** provided **at least one** of them is from the Quality Group. **One** activity from the Quality Group is **necessary**.

B. Effort Group

1. Supervised one or more independent studies, honors theses, or masters theses
2. Played a major role in developing new courses or significant program revisions
3. Attended teaching workshops or participated in other teacher development activities
4. Applied for a government or foundation grant, award, or contract to fund teaching or course, curriculum, or program development
5. Supported teaching-related activities beyond regular teaching load (directed student learning, comprehensive exams, reader for theses/projects)
6. Adopted new teaching techniques or significantly improved course materials based on peer feedback or evidence in the research literature

C. Quality Group

1. Received an excellent evaluation from a peer review committee
2. Received an award or special recognition for teaching
3. Received significant funding to support educational activities
4. Received excellent student teaching evaluations as they relate to course content, rigor, assignments, and learning experiences.
5. Lead CS or IT program curriculum changes that were presented to and accepted by the program by vote of the faculty.
6. Created and delivered a teaching tutorial or workshop that was accepted by peer review

II. Scholarly Achievement and Professional Qualifications

For a **satisfactory** rating, **two** of the activities from the Effort Group (or comparable activities) are **necessary and sufficient**.

For an **excellent** rating, **one** of the activities from the Quality Group (or a comparable activity) is **necessary**. **Two** of the activities from the Quality group are **sufficient**.

A. Effort Group

1. Presented or served on a panel at a professional conference
2. Published in a non-refereed professional forum
3. Attended some scholarly gathering, such as a conference or tutorial
4. Presented research results at a faculty seminar or colloquium
5. Reviewed monographs, books, or articles for publication
6. Served on a grant review panel for a national professional organization (e.g., NSF, DoD, etc.)
7. Submitted a proposal for a government, corporate, or foundation grant, award, or contract to support research
8. Consulted outside the university in a way that increased the faculty member's expertise
9. Produced artifacts demonstrating professional or scholarly expertise such as technical reports, questions for national standardized tests (e.g., the GRE), or fielded software products
10. Produced evidence of work in progress that will likely culminate in a scholarly contribution to the discipline or its pedagogy
11. Served as Principal or Co-Principal Investigator on a continuing grant

B. Quality Group

1. Published a monograph or book in the past two years
2. Received a government, corporate, or foundation grant, award, or contract to fund research
3. Published a book review, book chapter, or encyclopedia article
4. Published an article in a refereed journal, conference, or workshop, or in some other refereed forum
5. Received a professional achievement or special recognition award
6. Presented an invited lecture or published an invited paper outside the university
7. Created and delivered a professional tutorial or workshop that required creation of material or creative synthesis of existing material

III. Professional Service

For a **satisfactory** rating, **all** the following activities are **necessary and sufficient**.

A. Satisfactory Group

1. Actively participated in departmental service
2. Attended Department, College and University meetings (as appropriate)
3. Attended a reasonable number of student-focused activities (e.g., club meetings, talks by outside speakers, recruiting events)
4. Satisfied faculty obligations as stated in the faculty handbook
5. Provided satisfactory service in a leadership position in the department (only if applicable)

For an **excellent** rating, **one** of the following activities (or a comparable activity) is **necessary**. Two are **sufficient**.

B. Quality Group

1. Played a significant role in department, college, or university committees, task forces, etc.
2. Held a leadership position in a major professional organization
3. Provided excellent service in a leadership position in the department
4. Received a government, corporate, or foundation grant, award, or contract primarily to fund instructional equipment or software for laboratories
5. Performed a leadership activity for a major professional conference or meeting
6. Served as an editorial board member of a professional journal
7. Delivered an established professional tutorial or workshop
8. Actively served as a faculty advisor to a student group (e.g., ACM, UPE, etc.)
9. Played a major role in an effort to increase departmental, college, or university resources
10. Played a major role an effort to enhance scholarship or pedagogy in the department, college, university, or profession
11. Provided support for mission critical department or university functions, such as server support, course scheduling, etc., in addition to regular duties
12. Provided state-of-the-art computing advice or support outside the department
13. Provided significant help with public relations events or student recruiting
14. Accepted service tasks that constituted an inconvenience or hardship (such as teaching an uncompensated overload course)

Faculty Member Annual Evaluation Process

- At the end of the Spring semester each year, the AUH will request that each faculty member complete the Faculty Activity Report (FAR) with supporting material be submitted electronically by the end of May. The form for this report is in the departmental cloud storage folder.
- The AUH writes the annual evaluation based on FAR with the faculty provided material and the student evaluations of teaching as they relate to course content, rigor, assignments, and learning experiences. The Faculty Member Annual Evaluation Criteria chapter of this document is the guide to the AUH in making this evaluation.
- During the months of August and September, for each faculty member:
 - The AUH emails the draft annual evaluation to the faculty member. There may be typos or slight mistakes that need correcting. In this case, the faculty members send corrections via email or on paper to the AUH and corrections as needed are made by AUH and returned to the faculty member.
 - The AUH and the faculty member schedule a meeting to discuss the evaluation. This meeting may be cancelled by mutual agreement of the AUH and the faculty member if both agree on the terms of the preliminary evaluation.
 - The AUH then writes the final evaluation document and provides it to the faculty member.
 - The faculty member signs the evaluation, electronically or on paper, and returns it to the AUH.
 - The AUH signs the faculty-signed final evaluation document.
 - An electronic copy of the AUH-signed final evaluation is sent via email to the faculty member.
 - An electronic copy of signed evaluation is saved in a department cloud storage location accessible only to the AUH and the office manager.
 - A paper copy of the signed evaluation is placed in the faculty member's folder (this is kept in a locked location only accessible by AUH and office manager).
- Appeals must be made in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook and the “Process for the Review of an Appeal of an Annual Evaluation” chapter of this document. The timeline for these procedures is outlined in the Faculty Handbook.
- Once the official evaluation is signed (or after an appeals process is completed) the evaluation is sent to the Dean to be included in the faculty member’s file at the College.

Faculty Member Initial Evaluation Process

In accordance with the Faculty Handbook, the AUH performs an initial evaluation of each new faculty member in the beginning of their second semester.

Faculty are provided with and must complete the Annual Performance Evaluation document and submit it by email to the AUH before the start of their second semester. This serves as a mechanism to expose them to the format of the end-of-year FARS report. The new faculty will meet one-on-one with the AUH (generally, during the second week of the second semester) to discuss their progress, concerns, and answer questions they may have. The meeting is required.

This meeting provides the new faculty member with expectations for the FARS document and provides feedback from the AUH. If course evaluations are not satisfactory as they relate to course content, rigor, assignments, and learning experiences, the new faculty and AUH will discuss approaches for improvement and try to identify where adjustments can be made to help facilitate more favorable outcomes in the classroom.

The AUH will then write an evaluation of the faculty member in accordance with the procedures and timeline found in the Faculty Handbook.

Process for the Review of an Appeal of an Annual Evaluation

Pursuant to §III.E.4.g of the *Faculty Handbook*, a faculty member has the right to appeal an annual evaluation before it is submitted to the Dean. The Department of Computer Science has designated each program's Administrative and Appeals Subcommittee (AAS) of the program's Academic Unit Personnel Advisory Committee (AUPAC) subcommittee as the body that will hear such appeals. In this section is described what is required of the individual making the appeal and the process that will be used by the program's AAS.

Requirements of the Individual Making the Appeal

Pursuant to §III.E.4.g of the *Faculty Handbook*, the faculty member has a maximum of seven days following receipt of the official written evaluation to make the appeal in writing. Failure to file a timely written appeal will result in the evaluation being sent forward to the dean, and no further appeal rights are available.

The faculty member making the appeal must transmit a letter to the chair of their program's AAS that describes:

1. The part or parts of the annual evaluation that are being appealed.
2. Why each part of the evaluation is thought to be incorrect.

The faculty member making the appeal should **not** transmit either the Faculty Activities Report (FAR) or the supporting materials submitted along with that report to the program's AAS.

Criteria to be Applied During the Review

As described in §III.E.4.h of the *Faculty Handbook*, the reviewing body should consider:

- “[W]hether all relevant information was objectively reviewed by the AUH in accordance with evaluation criteria established by the academic unit.”
- “[W]hether the AUH evaluated similar achievements among similarly situated academic unit members using the same standard of judgment.”

Review Process

Upon receipt of the appeal, the program's AAS will:

- Identify 2-3 similarly situated members of the academic unit.
- Ask the Academic Unit Head (AUH) to supply them with the FAR of the faculty member making the appeal and the 2-3 similarly situated members of the academic unit.
- Determine whether or not the FAR was objectively reviewed by the AUH.
- Determine whether the same standards of judgment were used by the AUH.
- Provide a written recommendation (to either uphold or modify the evaluation) to the AUH (with a copy to the faculty member making the appeal and the Dean).

The AAS must complete this process by the deadline specified in §III.E.4.h of the *Faculty Handbook*.

Early Promotion and Tenure Policy

Definitions

Early tenure refers to a tenure application/decision that is made prior to the penultimate year of the probationary period.

Early promotion refers to a promotion application/decision that is made before completing five years in academic rank.

Background

As per the Faculty Handbook, early promotion will only be awarded if the candidate presents a “compelling case” and early tenure applications will only receive favorable review if “compelling evidence of accomplishment” has been presented.

Criteria

Case materials that would lead to promotion/tenure on a normal schedule are not sufficient for early promotion/tenure. Instead, early promotion and/or tenure will only be awarded to applicants who have met the tenure/promotion criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service and exceeded the tenure/promotion criteria in at least two of teaching, scholarship or service.

Early promotion to full will only be awarded to applicants who have exceeded the promotion criteria in all three of teaching, scholarship, and service. In addition, early promotion and tenure will only be awarded if there is strong evidence that the high level of achievement in scholarship, teaching and service will continue.

Rationale for the Criteria

Under ordinary circumstances, early promotion and tenure are not in the best interest of a candidate or of the institution. Hence, the Department of Computer Science believes that early promotion and tenure applications should only be made in extraordinary cases.

Merit Pay Algorithm

Merit Rating: Each faculty member in the Department of Computer Science is evaluated annually for overall performance and in each of the three standard categories: teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service. Overall performance is evaluated as unacceptable or acceptable. Performance in the three standard categories is evaluated as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or excellent. Associated with each of the performance ratings will be a numerical value: unacceptable= -1, acceptable= 0, excellent= 2. In addition, associated with each of the three performance categories is a relative weight, determined at the beginning of the academic year as indicated in the department's policy on annual evaluation. A faculty member's merit rating (MR) for a year is computed by multiplying each of the three performance category values by their respective weights, then summing the three products. (Example: if a faculty member was evaluated as excellent, acceptable, and unacceptable in teaching, scholarly activity, and service and those categories had weights 70%, 15%, and 15% respectively, the merit rating would be $2*70\% + 0*15\% + (-1*15\%) = 1.25$.)

Total Merit Dollars (TMD): Total merit dollars (TMD) is the amount of money provided to the Department for merit raises.

Overall Department Raise Percentage: The overall department raise percentage (ODRP) is the percentage obtained by TMD by the total of the current salaries of all faculty that can be considered for merit raises (newly hired faculty are not typically included).

Base Merit Percentage (BMP): The base merit percentage (BMP) is calculated as $0.75 \times \text{ODRP}$. Example: if the department received a merit pool of 4%, the merit raise for each faculty member evaluated as satisfactory overall in their annual evaluation would include a base amount of 3.0% of their current salary.)

Base Merit Increase (BMI): All faculty evaluated as satisfactory overall in their annual evaluation receive a base merit increase (BMI) amount which is a percentage of their current salary calculated as $\text{BMP} \times \text{current salary}$.

Additional Merit Percentage (AMP): The additional merit percentage (AMP) available is $.25 \times \text{ODRP}$. In the current example, this would be $.25 \times 4\% = 1\%$.

Additional Merit Dollars (AMD): The additional merit dollars (AMD) is calculated as AMP times the sum of the current annual salaries of all faculty in the Department (not counting salaries of those newly hired).

Average Merit Rating (AMR): An average merit rating (AMR) over the last four years is computed for each faculty member by averaging the yearly merit ratings.

Overall Department Merit Rating (ODMR): An overall department merit rating (ODMR) is calculated as the sum of the AMRs for all eligible faculty.

Merit Percentage: An average department merit rating (ADMR) for each is calculated as $\text{ODMR}/(\# \text{ faculty eligible})$. A faculty member's merit percentage (**MP**) is calculated as AMR/ADMR .

Additional Merit Increase: An "additional merit increase" (AMI) is calculated as follows:

For each eligible faculty member, an additional merit increase (AMI) is calculated² as follows:

$$\text{AMI} = \text{MP} * \text{current salary} * \text{AMP}$$

Total Raise: A faculty member's total raise is

$$\text{Total Raise} = \text{BMI} + \text{AMI}$$

²AMI may possibly be adjusted slightly to make up for differences in faculty member salaries and percentages that result in either slightly less or slightly more than the total dollar pool being allocated. However, this is normally not a problem because the college can cover small differences in the total (e.g., <\$30).

Peer Reviews

Purpose

The purpose of a peer review is to make suggestions to help faculty members improve their teaching by providing a frank and confidential assessment of their teaching.

Review Initiation Process

A faculty member may at any time during a fall or spring semester ask the PAC to arrange a peer review of one or more of the faculty member's courses. The PAC will then form an ad hoc committee of three faculty members one of whom, at most, may be from another department. The PAC will then charge the review committee to perform a peer review. Oversight by the PAC ends at this point.

Peer Review Process

The peer review process will consist of the following steps:

1. The review committee and the reviewed faculty member meet to discuss the course syllabus, including course objectives, organization, policies, content, assessment tools, and pedagogy. Class sessions observed by one or more reviewers are scheduled and the specific objectives and pedagogy of the classes are discussed.
2. Each review committee member observes one or more class sessions or some period of online interaction.
3. The review committee prepares a written report and delivers it to the reviewed faculty member.
4. The reviewed faculty member may submit the report to the department head as part of their annual activities report or as part of their tenure and promotion package.
5. The review committee destroys all material collected in the course of its work.

Confidentiality

Peer review committee members are obliged to keep the results of their peer reviews confidential. Evidence and observations known to the review committee may not be confided to anyone except the reviewed faculty member, nor be used in any faculty evaluation process, except at the explicit request of the reviewed faculty member.

Office Hours Policy

Computer science faculty members must hold “office hours” each week when classes are in session (excluding exam week). Office hours must be at published regularly scheduled times and be held in a manner that allows for synchronous interaction. The office hours must meet the following requirements:

- Full-time faculty: at least five hours of office hours per week.
- Part-time faculty: at least 30 minutes of office hours per on-campus credit hour taught.

Full-time faculty must be available in person at an on-campus (e.g. office, lab) location for at least 50% of the required office hours. Faculty required to hold five office hours per week must spread those office hours over two or more days. Outside the published office hours, all faculty should exercise reasonable effort to be available by appointment. Faculty teaching computer science courses that have primary responsibility in another department shall be governed by the office hours policy of that other department.

Policy for Conducting Student Evaluations

Goals of the policy:

Given that student course evaluations are submitted to the AUPAC, it is important to ensure a reasonable degree of consistency in how evaluations are conducted. The goal of this policy is to maintain consistency within a system that is flexible enough to accommodate a range of course schedules and needs.

Requirements for conducting student course evaluations for in-person courses:

- Student evaluations must be conducted in-class during the last two weeks of the regular semester. Faculty must set aside at least ten minutes of class time for students to complete the evaluations. Faculty must leave the classroom while students complete evaluations.
- Course evaluations must remain open for at least 48 hours after in-class evaluations are completed.

Requirements for conducting student course evaluations for online courses:

- Student evaluations must be made available during the last two weeks of the regular semester.
- The instructor must clearly communicate the time period for completing evaluations.
- Course evaluations must remain open for at least 48 hours.

Requirements for all courses:

- There must be no extra credit or other rewards for completing course evaluations.
- Student course evaluations must include only the standard departmental questions.