

**Southern Utah University**  
**WMG COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING**  
**DEPARTMENT OF Computer Science and Information Systems**  
**Faculty Evaluation**  
***COVER SHEET***  
(to be completed by applicant)

**EVALUATION FOR:** (check as many as applicable)

- ANNUAL REVIEW
- MID-POINT REVIEW
- RANK ADVANCEMENT
  - TENURED to Full Professor
  - NON-TENURE TRACK to \_\_\_\_\_
- TENURE and PROMOTION
- POST-TENURE REVIEW

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Department:** Computer Science and Information Systems

**Track**             Tenure-track    Non-tenure track

**Highest degree earned**    Doctorate                       Masters

**Degree** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**Institution** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of hire/rank** \_\_\_\_\_

**Complete the following only if you are applying for tenure or rank advancement.**

**If you are applying for tenure or advancement in rank, check one of the following regarding credit towards tenure:**

- Not applicable - I do not have credit towards tenure granted from time of hire.
- I have credit towards tenure granted from time of hire. (copy of the agreement enclosed).

Number of years of credit towards tenure/rank being applied for: \_\_\_\_\_

Date present rank obtained at this institution (put actual date present rank was granted at this institution, do not include credit granted towards rank advancement at time of hiring): \_\_\_\_\_

Total number of years of service at SUU at current rank (plus years credited if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions for Application**

When developing your portfolio for submission, thoroughly read policy 6.1. Your portfolio should highlight and showcase your knowledge, skills, and abilities as they relate to the areas of evaluation. Cite supporting evidence that reflects your best efforts across all three domains—Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarship/Creative Activities, Service/Leadership.

# CSIS Department Mentorship Team Selection

## Mentorship process:

The mentorship process is to follow guidelines established by Southern Utah University Policies and Procedures, specifically Policy #6.1. A mentorship team will be assigned within the first week of the calendar school year.

## Mentorship Teams

- Mentorship teams have 2 people.
- There should be at least one CSIS faculty on each mentorship team.
  - Only in the case of there being no tenured CSIS faculty may there be no CSIS faculty on a mentorship team.
- Tenure-track faculty mentorship team members must have the rank of Associate Professor.
- Non-tenure track faculty may have one tenured and one tenure-track member on their mentorship team with at least one person being from the CSIS Department.
  - One member of the mentorship team may come from Non-tenure track faculty.

## Selection of Team Members

- Mentorship team members should be chosen by faculty in the spring semester.
  - Newly hired faculty will have to choose their team shortly after starting.
  - Newly hired faculty may, of course, ask for help in choosing their mentorship team.
  - Newly hired faculty may choose to have one or both members of their mentorship team appointed by the department chair.
- Faculty should pick mentorship team members based on the goals of their Contribution Plan.  
Faculty should keep in mind:
  - Who would best understand what they are trying to accomplish with their plan?
  - Faculty should feel free to ask for advice about whom to pick.
- Faculty need to receive confirmation of willingness to serve on a mentorship team so that the membership of the team can be shared with the department chair in writing.

## Changing Team Members

- The purpose of the mentorship team is to guide the faculty member through the P&T process to a successful application for tenure, and beyond. In that regard when considering a mentorship team, faculty should keep in mind that the team would be best for them if its membership was continuous.
- Faculty can change the makeup of their mentorship team at any time prior to their fall planning meeting, and any time after that for the *following year*.
- The mentorship team established for the fall planning meeting will be the mentorship team for next fall's review meeting unless team members cannot fulfill their duties for any reason.
  - In the case where a team member cannot fulfill their duties, the faculty member should find a replacement shortly after being informed by following this policy.

## Mid-Point and Tenure Review Exceptions

- A faculty member may elect to have their Mid-Point and Tenure reviews evaluated by an ad hoc committee instead of the P&T mentorship committee, policy 6.1.2, III, A and 6.1.4, IV, A, 2, respectively. These policies state that the request needs to be made at least two weeks prior to the start of fall semester, and that the ad hoc committee will be elected by both tenure and tenure-track members of the department. The ad hoc committee will include three tenured faculty members, and faculty from other departments may serve as needed.
- The department chair will call a meeting of the department minus the faculty member. The department members will nominate and vote on tenured faculty to serve on the ad hoc committee. Members of the mentorship team that is being replaced cannot serve on the ad hoc committee. The ad hoc committee will then replace the P&T mentorship team in the evaluation process.

- Before considering the mid-point and tenure exception, the faculty member should consult that policy and discuss options and ramifications with a trusted colleague

### **Evaluation Process**

Evaluations will be within guidelines established by Southern Utah University Policies and Procedures, specifically Policy #6.1, and the Walter Maxwell Gibson College of Science and Engineering. The peer evaluation process will be completed by the mentorship teams as outlined in policy 6.1 who review each portfolio and evaluate based on the scoring criteria as outlined within this policy. The portfolio must show evidence that you have met the required criteria per the scoring criteria.

# FACULTY ENGAGEMENT & CONTRIBUTION CRITERIA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Contribution Period: August 15, \_\_\_\_\_ through Aug 14, \_\_\_\_\_

## PLANNING/EARNED POINT SUMMARY

Faculty members will complete this form as part of their FEC Plan, under advisement with their mentor, and submit it to the Department Chair by the first Tuesday after Labor Day. One signed copy will be forwarded on as part of the FEC Plan. Another signed copy will be retained by the Department and attached to the FEC Report at the end of the academic year. The point ranges for each category are intended for planning purposes only, with 100 annually earned contribution points being considered a Satisfactory level of performance for Tenured (T), Tenure Track (TT) and Non-Tenure Track (NTT) rank advancements and the granting of tenure.

	T/TT	NTT
1. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS (T/TT Range: 60-80 pts; NTT: 70-90 pts)	_____ pts	_____ pts
2. SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS (T/TT Range: 10-30 pts; NTT: 5-15 pts)	_____ pts	_____ pts
3. SERVICE/LEADERSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS (T/TT Range: 10-30 pts; NTT: 5-15 pts)	_____ pts	_____ pts

---

**TOTAL POINTS PROJECTED/EARNED:** \_\_\_\_\_

## SIGNATURES

\_\_\_\_\_  
Faculty Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mentor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Department Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

# EXPLANATION OF FACULTY ENGAGEMENT & CONTRIBUTION CRITERIA

## FACULTY ENGAGEMENT & CONTRIBUTION SYSTEM EXPLANATION

All faculty members are expected to earn at least 100 FEC points per year\*. Faculty are allowed to fall under this benchmark with the knowledge that they will receive Development Required status for that years' FEC report. This action is intended to ensure these faculty members are supported appropriately by the department mentorship team. Faculty are also allowed to exceed 100 earned points, though the mentorship team should take care to develop an FEC Plan that is reasonably attainable and appropriate.

The 100-point benchmark is broken up by three main categories, Teaching Effectiveness, Scholarly/Creative Contributions, and Service/Leadership Contributions. Each category has a suggested yearly point range to be used for planning purposes. Individual FEC Plans or Reports do not need to fall within these ranges every year, allowing faculty flexibility. However, for the awarding of Tenure and/or Rank Advancement, a minimum level of points in each category are required, along with the appropriate number of years of service, and achievement of the required Key Contributions. The Mentorship Team should take great care in assisting faculty in their yearly planning as well as in formulating a plan that efficiently works towards tenure and/or rank advancement.

## FEC TENURE AND/OR RANK ADVANCEMENT POINT BENCHMARKS

### Tenure-Track Faculty (Asst. Professor to Assoc. Professor)

Tenure-track faculty must earn at least 600 total FEC points with the appropriate number of points in each category by the end of their 6<sup>th</sup> year (prior to applying for tenure). Points earned above that benchmark will be added towards their next rank advancement. Faculty hired with years granted towards tenure will be awarded points at the time of hire with the Department Chair and Dean approval. The required Key Contributions and number of points in each category are as follows:

MINIMUM POINTS;	600 total points
TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS:	400 total points
SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS:	75 total points
SERVICE/LEADERSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS:	75 total points

### Key Contributions

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: Minimum six peer/chair reviews

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS: Two peer-reviewed publication

SERVICE/LEADERSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS: Leading at least one committee/project and serving on at least one college or University level committee

**\*NOTE:** New faculty members awarded time toward rank and/or tenure at the time of hiring will be awarded 100 points per year shortening of the time in rank/probationary period.

### Tenured Faculty Rank Advancement (Assoc. Professor to Full Professor)

Tenured faculty must earn at least 1200 total FEC points (including the points earned at the time of tenure) with the appropriate number of points in each category. This can be accomplished no sooner than the 5<sup>th</sup> year after tenure was awarded. The required Key Contributions and number of points in each category are as follows:

MINIMUM POINTS;	1200 total points
TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS:	800 total points
SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS:	150 total points

SERVICE/LEADERSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS: 150 total points

**Key Contributions (*since tenured date*)**

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: Minimum six peer/chair reviews

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS: Two peer-reviewed publication

SERVICE/LEADERSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS: Leading at least one committee/project and serving on at least one college or University level committee

**Non Tenure-Track Faculty Rank Advancement (Lecturer to Assist. Professor)**

Non Tenure-track faculty must earn at least 400 total FEC points with the appropriate number of points in each category by the end of their 4<sup>th</sup> year (prior to applying for advancement to the rank of Assistant Professor). Points earned above that benchmark will be added towards their next rank advancement. The required Key Contributions and number of points in each category are as follows:

MINIMUM POINTS; 400 total points

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: 320 total points

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS: 20 total points

SERVICE CONTRIBUTIONS: 40 total points

**Key Contributions**

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: Minimum four peer/chair reviews

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS:

SERVICE/LEADERSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS: Serving on at least one college or University level committee

**Non Tenure-Track Faculty Rank Advancement (Assist. Professor to Assoc. Professor)**

Non Tenure-track faculty must earn at least 1000 total FEC points with the appropriate number of points in each category by the end of their 10<sup>th</sup> year (including the points earned when granted the rank of Assist. Professor) prior to applying for advancement to the rank of Associate Professor. The required Key Contributions and number of points in each category are as follows:

MINIMUM POINTS; 1000 total points

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: 800 total points

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS: 50 total points

SERVICE CONTRIBUTIONS: 100 total points

**Key Contributions**

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: Minimum ten peer/chair reviews

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS:

SERVICE/LEADERSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS: Serving on at least two college or University level committee

**FEC POST-TENURE POINT BENCHMARKS**

Tenured faculty must earn at least 500 total FEC points, with the appropriate number of points in each category.

MINIMUM POINTS; 500 total points

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: 334 total points

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS: 63 total points

SERVICE/LEADERSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS: 63 total points

**Key Contributions**

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: Minimum five peer/chair reviews

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS: Two peer-reviewed publication

SERVICE/LEADERSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS: Leading at least one committee/project and serving on at least one college or University level committee

# 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:

#### 0-20-Point Contributions (Outstanding - Max 1 each per year)

- Department Chair Evaluation
- Peer Evaluations – (Inside/Outside the Department)
- Receiving teaching recognition (national recognition valued higher than local recognition)
- *Other pre-approved activities deemed appropriate by the Mentorship Team or Department Chair*

#### 0-15-Point Contributions (High)

- Student Evaluations
- Faculty Self-Evaluation
- Documented consultation with educational specialist

#### 0-10-Point Contributions (Medium)

- New course development
- Evidence of keeping current with teaching strategies
- Mentoring students in capstone projects and research projects
- Participation in independent study courses

#### 0-5-Point Contributions (Low)

- 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).
- Participation in team-taught course

### 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:

#### 0-20-Point Contributions (Outstanding)

- Standard publication in a peer-reviewed journal or conference proceedings volume
- Present at scholarly/professional/teaching conference
- Authorship and dissemination of protocols in peer review/non-peer reviewed venues
- Publication of a book/chapters/sections or lab manual
- A grant award or fellowship external to SUU
- Completion of a terminal degree or formal post-doctoral studies in one's field
- Creation/invention of equipment or devices for application in the field
- Design and development of scholarly internet sites (i.e., Must have scholarly value in the field, does not include posting of syllabi, or other course information required by SUU Policy)
- Mentoring undergraduate research including presentation of that research
- Upgrading knowledge for related teaching (e.g., through certifications or other training courses)
- Service on an external grant review panel
- *Other pre-approved activities deemed appropriate by the Mentorship Team or Department Chair*

#### 0-15-Point Contributions (High)

- Publication in a non-peer reviewed or government document
- Formal graduate study (credit) in one's field (not thesis or dissertation)
- A grant award or fellowship internal to SUU
- Evidence of ongoing research
- Referee of a professionally related article in a journal or online venue
- Recipient of a scholarly award
- Poster presentation at scholarly/professional venue

#### 0-10-Point Contributions (Medium)

- Documented participation in a grant writing effort
- Serve as a reviewer/referee of an article in a journal
- Review text or lab manual for publication

- Peer reviewer of outside curricula
- Attend workshop or training to improve professional ability
- Receive scholarly recognition/nomination but no award (not self-nominated)
- Formal course work to advance professional knowledge in the discipline
- Presentation within SUU (e.g. COSE Symposium, Festival of Excellence, etc.)
- Mentor new/other faculty members

#### 0-5 Point Contributions (Low)

- Attendance at scholarly/professional/teaching conference
- Formal written professional consultation/informal documented consultation
- On-campus scholarly lecture
- Engagement in scholarly activity that results in the development or improvement of curriculum
- Citation of one's scholarly work (one occurrence per year)
- Upgrading knowledge on new software/hardware for related teaching assignments (Continuing Education Courses)
- Nominated for a scholarly award or other recognition (not self-nominated)

#### **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 and Leadership

### Introduction

This document lists the main ways the Computer Science and Information Systems (CSIS) Department evaluates Service and Leadership 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 and Leadership

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:

#### 0-20-Point Contributions (Outstanding)

- Serving as a Department Chair
- Serving as president of a professional organization with at least a national impact
- Principal or Co-organizer/host of large, national or International events
- At least ½ time special appointment at the University or College level (e.g. Faculty Senate President)
- *Other pre-approved activities deemed appropriate by the Mentorship Team or Department Chair*

#### 0-15-Point Contributions (High)

- Serving as board member or council member of a professional organization with national impact
- Principal or co-organizer of regional/state-level event
- Holding office in a professional society at the state or regional level
- Hosting a professional development event for off-campus groups (CSIS related)
- Chair of a University level committee
- 1/4 - time special appointment at the University or College level (e.g. Director)
- Receiving an award for professional service

#### 0-10-Point Contributions (Medium)

- Faculty Senator
- Administrative responsibilities at the University, College, or Department level
- Graduate committee chair
- Committee member of a University committee
- Chair of a department-level committee (e.g. Curriculum, Search)
- Advisor to CSIS or other STEM related student organization
- Recognized accomplishment in professionally related activity
- Member of a Department Mentorship Team
- Accompanying students to regional, national, or international conference where student's original or collaborative work is presented

## 0-5-Point Contributions (Low)

- Member of any College or Department-level Committee (Curriculum, Graduate)
- CSIS-related involvement in community service activity
- Overseeing a student internship (maximum of 2 contributions a year)
- Writing letters of recommendation for students (maximum of 2 contributions a year)
- Recognized accomplishment in professionally related activity
- Overseeing/organizing a student centric educational or recruitment event (field trip, bringing in a guest speaker, etc.)
- Advisor to any student organization (non-CSIS)
- Accompanying students to a regional, state, or national competition where they are competing
- Serving in a SUU, state, or national community
- Evidence of profession-related activities that were of service or usefulness to others, both on and off campus
- 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. )
- Serving as a judge in a regional or state level event (Sterling Scholar etc)
- Attending a booth at a local or state recruitment event (maximum of 2 contributions a year)
- Oversee student honors project (maximum of 2 contributions a year)

## 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.