

Computer Science and Information Systems Department

Teaching Effectiveness

Introduction

This document lists the main ways the Computer Science and Information Systems (CSIS) Department evaluates Teaching Effectiveness and is consistent with Southern Utah University's (SUU's) mission as defined in Regent's Policy, R312, "teaching is of primary importance" (SUU Policies and Procedures, Policy 6.1 – Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure, Section IV., 1.). Individuals making decisions regarding evaluation, promotion, and tenure of faculty members will use this document.

Teaching Effectiveness

In accordance with Policy 6.1 "The responses to all teaching-related questions on the student-evaluation instrument will be considered in assessing teaching ability. Thus, a portfolio approach to 'teaching effectiveness' is required for all units, including student evaluations plus one or more of the following: peer evaluations, instructional delivery/design, course management skills, letters from colleagues, or other similar factors." It is important for faculty members to document Teaching Effectiveness in as many different ways as possible. If no other means of documentation is provided, decisions regarding faculty Teaching Effectiveness will, by default, be made based primarily on student evaluations. This is not an exhaustive list. Teaching Effectiveness should be evaluated in the following ways:

- Department Chair Evaluation
The Chair will evaluate each faculty member's teaching each year. The evaluation instrument will be standardized for all evaluations and will include a review of evaluations listed in this document and any other pertinent materials.

- Peer Evaluations
Input from peers not only helps assure that material is being presented effectively in the classroom, but also ensures that the appropriate material is being taught at the appropriate level.

All faculty members should seek a written, formative, peer teaching evaluation once each academic school year and should provide evidence of reflection on the evaluation.

- Student Evaluations
Student evaluations will be conducted. The faculty member should provide evidence of reflection on the evaluations.
- Faculty Self-Evaluation
All faculty members should thoughtfully evaluate their own teaching effectiveness and should provide evidence of reflection on this evaluation.
- Other Methods of Evaluation
 - Evidence of creation of an organized and well-managed learning environment (syllabi, course outlines, learning objectives, study guides, etc.).
 - Evidence of creative, innovative, thoughtful, and thorough methods and materials (electronic media, unique field experiences, lab experiences, classroom activities, projects, etc.).
 - Evidence of adjustments made (comments or narrative about what worked and didn't work and thoughts of why).
 - Receiving teaching recognition.

- Attending pedagogical conferences/workshops and providing evidence of adapting/adopting best practices.
- Participating in pedagogical discussion groups and documenting implementation of input received.
- Students enrolled in faculty courses demonstrate positive trends in their average percentile ranking on national standardized exams.

Standard Performance

To be eligible for rank advancement and tenure, faculty members are expected to demonstrate an acceptable level of Teaching Effectiveness (using the criteria listed in SUU policy 6.1 and further defined above) by the third-year review and that a general pattern of acceptable performance be maintained thereafter. In accordance with SUU's academic freedom policy 6.28, faculty will be given the freedom to develop both the curriculum and the pedagogy for the courses they teach.

Disclaimers

The Department of Computer Science and Information Systems (CSIS) establishes, with this document, an acceptable annual level of Teaching Effectiveness for its faculty. This is done with the understanding that achieving an acceptable annual level of Teaching Effectiveness at the Departmental level may not guarantee a positive three-year review or recommendation for tenure/rank advancement at higher level(s). This document cannot possibly list all Teaching Effectiveness criteria. It is therefore extremely important that faculty members self-report their Teaching Effectiveness accurately.

Computer Science and Information Systems Department

Scholarly Activity

Introduction

This document lists the main ways the Computer Science and Information Systems (CSIS) Department evaluates Scholarly Activity and is consistent with SUU Policy 6.1, Scholarly Activity and is defined as follows: *The University has adopted the Boyer model for scholarship, as outlined in Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate (Ernest L. Boyer, 1990, Jossey Bass Publishing, ISBN: 0787940690). As approved by the department chair and reviewed for written comment by the dean of the college/school, the faculty of each department develop guidelines stipulating the required amount and kind of scholarly/creative activity expected for tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty members. In the case of a dispute over criteria for scholarly/creative activity, the question will be resolved by a committee of a representative faculty member, department chair, and Dean.* Individuals making decisions regarding evaluation, promotion, and tenure of faculty members will use this document.

Due to the applied nature of some areas within the CSIS industry, Scholarly Activity is expanded to include items that may not normally be placed under Scholarly Activity. This is not an exhaustive list. Other areas can be included as approved by the CSIS Department.

Scholarly Activity

It is important for faculty members to document Scholarly Activity in as many different ways as possible. Scholarly Activity should be evaluated in the following ways:

- Publication in a peer-reviewed journal
- Publication in a non-peer reviewed or government document
- Presentation at scholarly/professional/teaching conference
- Authorship & dissemination of protocols for peer review/non-peer reviewed
- Publication of a book/chapters/sections or lab manual
- Receive a grant award or fellowship
- Complete a terminal degree or post-doctoral studies
- Formal graduate study (credit) in one's field (not thesis or dissertation)
- Create/invent equipment or devices for application to field
- Review text or lab manual for publication
- Design and develop scholarly internet sites
- Peer reviewer of outside curricula
- Mentoring undergraduate research/presentation of that research
- Serve as a reviewer/referee of an article in a journal (can be placed in either Scholarly or Service)
- Mentor new/other faculty members
- Workshop or training to improve professional ability (participant)
- Upgrading knowledge on new software/hardware for related teaching assignments (Continuing Education Courses)
- Attendance at scholarly/professional/teaching conference
- Poster presentation at scholarly/professional venue
- Serve on a grant review panel
- Documented participation in a grant writing effort
- Receive scholarly award or other recognition/nominated but no award

- Citation of one's scholarly work

Standard Performance

Due to the Boyer model allowing a flexible definition of scholarly activity in our fields of study, it is expected that faculty members in the Department of Computer Science and Information Systems include these areas of scholarly activity, and/or other areas (as determined by the Department Chair and the Dean). This scholarly activity will be reported and discussed on each faculty member's Annual Report. Although no minimum numbers are being mandated with this document, it is strongly recommended that faculty members in the Department of Computer Science and Information Systems seek a balanced variety of scholarly opportunities in their field of expertise.

Disclaimers

The Department of Computer Science and Information Systems (CSIS) establishes, with this document, an acceptable annual level of Scholarly Activity for its faculty. This is done with the understanding that achieving an acceptable annual level of Scholarly Activity at the Departmental level may not guarantee a positive three-year review or recommendation for tenure/rank advancement at higher level(s). This document cannot possibly list all Scholarly Activity criteria. It is therefore extremely important that faculty members self-report their Scholarly Activity accurately.

Computer Science and Information Systems Department

Service to the University, Profession, Community

Introduction

This document lists the main ways the Computer Science and Information Systems (CSIS) Department evaluates Service to the University, Profession, Community and is consistent with Southern Utah University's (SUU's) mission as defined in Regent's Policy R 312, "Service: Academic departments define acceptable professional service. Generally, it means service to the University and profession. Professional service to the community may also be considered," (SUU Policies and Procedures, Policy 6.1—Faculty Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure, Section IV., 1.) Individuals making decisions regarding evaluation, promotion, and tenure of faculty members will use this document.

The importance of professional service to the community is an integral function of type II institutions in Policy 2.2—" . . . The institution contributes to the quality of life and economic development of the state and the metropolitan area or region through education, applied technology and vocational training programs associated with a metropolitan/regional university." In accordance with these guidelines the Department of Computer Science and Information Systems (CSIS) defines service as activities that contribute to the University, Profession, and Community in ways that fulfill and supports SUU's Mission/Vision/Core Values Statements.

Service to the University, Profession, Community

It is important for faculty members to document Service to the University, Profession, and Community in as many different ways as possible. This is not an exhaustive list. Service to the University, Profession, and Community should be evaluated in the following ways:

- Serving as a Department Chair
- Chairing or serving on any Departmental, College, or University committee
 - Serving on the Faculty Senate
 - Serving on a LRT Committee (at any level)
 - Serving on the Provost's Retention Committee
 - Serving on the College Recruitment and Retention Committee
 - Serving on the Departmental Recruitment and Retention Committee
 - Serving on the Departmental Curriculum Committee
 - Serving on the College Curriculum Committee
 - Serving on a Research Committee
 - Serving as a course coordinator for a Departmental course
- Serving on any hiring committee
- Serving as CSIS Club advisor (due to the planning time commitment)
- Serving in an official position for a regional, national, or international professional society, or for a state entity (such as USHE or USOE)
- Accompanying students to regional, national, or international conferences where students' original or collaborative work is presented
- Serving in the SUU community (including other SUU committees)
- Evidence of profession-related activities that were of service or usefulness to other, both on and off campus.
- Serving as an advisor of any student club or organization
- Serve as a reviewer/referee of an article in a journal, book, conference, etc. (can be placed in either Scholarly or Service)
- Membership in a professional organization (IEEE, AIS, ACM, WBEA, UACTE, etc.)

- Being nominated for a service award or other professional recognition
- CSIS-related service in the non-SUU community
- Serving as a Sterling Scholar judge
- Serving on the University Finance Committee
- Serving on the University Honors Committee

Standard Performance

Due to the subjective nature of service, it is expected that faculty members in the Department of Computer Science and Information Systems perform a sufficient amount of Service to the University, Profession, Community (as determined by the Department Chair and the Dean).

To be eligible for rank advancement and tenure, faculty members are expected to demonstrate an acceptable level of Service to the University, Profession, and Community (using the criteria listed in SUU policy 6.1 and further defined above) by the third-year review and that a general pattern of acceptable performance be maintained thereafter.

Although no minimum numbers are being mandated with this document, it is strongly recommended that faculty members in the Department of Computer Science and Information Systems seek a balanced variety of service opportunities at every (Departmental, College, University, and Community) level. (Service on the Departmental level only is not sufficient!)

Disclaimers

The Department of Computer Science and Information Systems (CSIS) establishes, with this document, an acceptable annual level of Service to the University, Profession, and Community for its faculty. This is done with the understanding that achieving an acceptable annual level of Service to the University, Profession, and Community at the Departmental level may not guarantee a positive three-year review or recommendation for tenure/rank advancement at higher level(s). This document cannot possibly list all Service to the University, Profession, Community criteria. It is therefore extremely important that faculty members self-report their Service to the University, Profession, and Community accurately.

Computer Science and Information Systems Department

Collegiality

Introduction

This document lists the main ways the Computer Science and Information Systems (CSIS) Department evaluates Collegiality and is consistent with Southern Utah University's (SUU's) Policy 6.28. Individuals making decisions regarding evaluation, promotion, and tenure of faculty members will use this document.

SUU policy 6.28 inadequately defines what constitutes collegial behavior, largely because it is often difficult to measure collegiality by any simple techniques. Regardless of the inherent difficulties, how well a faculty member works with his/her colleagues and with the institution must be a factor considered in faculty evaluation. For legal reasons, the focus of collegial evaluations should not be on what is said or on the stands that an individual takes, but on the faculty interactive process itself and the willingness of an individual to function in a positive manner as part of a department or discipline.

Collegiality

It is important for faculty members to document Collegiality in as many different ways as possible. The SUU code of professional responsibility provides that persons having a formal association with the institution shall not violate the academic freedom or constitutional rights of others, or the rules, regulations, policies or procedures of SUU or the State Board of Regents. Failure to meet professional responsibilities shall constitute serious misconduct and result in appropriate disciplinary action.

A non-exhaustive example of criteria that might be used to assess collegiality, from Policy 6.28, is included below. Collegiality should be evaluated in the following ways:

- Ensure that the content and rigor of each course is generally consistent with benchmark academic standards, as determined by the respective department and/or accrediting body.
- Faculty members will meet scheduled classes including final examinations and be well prepared to meet their teaching responsibilities.
- Faculty members will maintain regular office hours during which they are available for consultation with students and will otherwise make themselves accessible to students whenever reasonably possible.
- Evaluation of student performance will occur promptly, conscientiously, and without prejudice or favoritism. Evaluation criteria will be stated in the course syllabus. The criteria for evaluating student performance shall relate to the legitimate academic purposes of the course.
- Faculty members will avoid the misuse of class time and will not present their own views on topics unrelated to the subject matter of the course. If faculty members find it pedagogically useful to advocate a position on controversial matters, such will be reasonably articulated and professional sensitivity will be exercised.
- Faculty members will provide a respectful atmosphere and not reward agreement or penalize disagreement with their views on controversial topics.
- Faculty members will not use their positions, authority, or relationships with students to obtain uncompensated labor for their own private or pecuniary gain. They shall not ask students to perform services unrelated to legitimate requirements of a course.
- Faculty members will not plagiarize the work of any student. When faculty members and students work together, appropriate credit and attribution will be given to the students. Faculty members shall not limit nor curtail the right of students to publish or otherwise communicate the results of their independent scholarly activities.

- Faculty members will maintain confidentiality in regard to student records and other professional interactions in accordance with SUU policy as well as federal, state, and/or local laws.
- SUU faculty members will not participate in conduct or relationships with students, which place them in a conflict of interest or in a position to be accused of sexual harassment.
- Faculty members will be informed and knowledgeable about developments in their field of academic expertise
- Members of the faculty will not permit the appearance that they are authors of work done by others.
- Faculty members will not exploit their position for personal or pecuniary gain when acting as supervisor of the professional work of other persons.
- Faculty members will exhibit “professionalism” (in accordance with Policy 6.28) in meeting their commitments to their associates while engaged in doing research or other professional effort with other persons.
- Members of the faculty will exhibit “professionalism” (in accordance with Policy 6.28) in meeting their commitments to the institution which may include research, or other professional endeavors in addition to teaching.
- Faculty members will respect colleagues and their right for academic freedom.

Additional Criteria from the Department may include:

- Relationships with others
- Interacts with colleagues
- Interacts in a positive manner
- Engages in give and take of ideas and perspectives
- Treats others as professional equals by respecting their ideas, perspectives, and experiences
- Takes his/her turn in doing some of the needed institutional citizenship responsibilities
- Helps others understand the issues and possible solutions to improve the institution
- Uses his/her expertise to respond to institutional needs or problems
- Helps develop an environment of open exchange and willingness to help resolve institutional problems/issues
- Represents the institution in a professional manner—honest, factual, advocates its functions, and projects a positive image

Standard Performance

To be eligible for rank advancement and tenure, faculty members are expected to demonstrate an acceptable level of Collegiality (using the criteria listed in SUU policy 6.28 and further defined above) by the third-year review and that a general pattern of acceptable performance be maintained thereafter.

Disclaimers

The Department of Computer Science and Information Systems (CSIS) establishes, with this document, an acceptable annual level of Collegiality for its faculty. This is done with the understanding that achieving an acceptable annual level of Collegiality at the Departmental level may not guarantee a positive three-year review or recommendation for tenure/rank advancement at higher level(s). This document cannot possibly list all Collegiality criteria. It is therefore extremely important that faculty members self-report their Collegiality accurately.