



DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE TENURE & PROMOTION GUIDELINES

I. Required

University criteria for tenure and promotion are delineated in Lamar University MAPP 02.02.27 (Tenure and Promotion of Tenure-track and Tenured Non-library Faculty).

II. Criteria

While it is not possible to develop an exhaustive list of qualities and activities that merit promotion and tenure (due to the great variety of activities in which faculty members engage, and the many intangibles that are difficult, if not impossible, to measure) sections A-C below exhibit partial lists of activities that most evaluators would agree are worthy. Clear distinctions must be made for achievements at the international, national, regional, state, and local levels, as well as whether the contributions have been refereed.

A. Teaching Proficiency, Superior Teaching Effectiveness, and Activities for Promoting Student Learning during the review period as evidenced by (at least 70 points for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure, 80 points for promotion to Professor):

- Teaching Proficiency (30 points):
 - The candidate's proficiency in comprehending and effectively communicating course content.
 - Ability to teach both undergraduate and graduate courses.
 - Creation of instructional materials and adoption of new teaching methods/formats.
 - Peer review of teaching including classroom visits for untenured faculty members by designated department-tenured faculty members according to the Peer Review Policy and the Peer Observation Checklist of the department in attached the appendix (for untenured faculty members).

- Student course evaluation data and student accomplishments during the review period (max 25 points during the review period).
$$\frac{\text{Your Course Evaluation Avg.}}{\text{COSC Course Evaluation Avg.}} * 20$$
- Course and curriculum development. 3 points per established course/curriculum, 5 points per new course/curriculum (max 25 points during the review period)
- Direction of undergraduate research, thesis, graduate and undergraduate (e.g., Honors Thesis), graduate projects (e.g., committee chair/member), and dissertations (when applicable). (20 points)
- Recognition through honors, awards, certificates, commendations, and induction for excellence in teaching. (10 points)
- Evidence of high-quality of academic advising (5 points)
- Evidence of academic involvement with students outside the classroom setting (5 points)

*Relevant course evaluation data include questions on whether course material and learning objectives were clearly explained, whether assignments aided in achieving learning objectives, whether the instructor was available during office hours, whether the instructor was prepared, whether the instructor understood the subject matter and overall effectiveness.

B. Scholarly Production and/or Research during the review period as evidenced by: (at least 65 points for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure, 75 points for promotion to Professor)

- Attraction of research funds (title, source, amount, period).
 - Points will be awarded according to the number of submitted proposals, whether they are internal or external, the role of the Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI), and the total grant amount.
 - 0.8~3 points per submission.
- Receipt of funded external/internal research grants.
 - Points will be awarded according to the number of funded projects, whether they are internal or external, the role of the Principal Investigator (PI) or Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI), and the total grant amount.
 - 2~24 points per funded grant calculated by *Grant Type × Role × Funded Amount*, which are defined in the table below (e.g., 2 points for Co-PI of an internal grant with less than \$20K, and 24 points for PI of an external grant with more than \$200K).

Grant Type		Role		Funded Amount	
Internal	1	PI	1	<20K	3
				20 ~ 200 K	3 ~ 12 (1 point per 20 K)
External	2	Co-PI	0.5	>200K	12

- Publications of books (18 points per book) and chapters (6 points per chapter).
- Peer-reviewed articles, and papers with high impact factors.
 - Points will be awarded according to the number of publications, the order of authors (correspondent author is equivalent to first author), and publication/conference rankings.
 - 1.5~7 points per publication calculated by $1 + \text{Authorship} \times \text{Publication Ranking} \times \text{Publication Type}$, which is defined in the table below.

Authorship		Publication Ranking		Publication Type	
1 st author	1	1 st tier	4	journal	1.5
2 nd author	0.8	2 nd tier	3		
3 rd author	0.6	3 rd tier	2	conference	1
others	0.5	others	1		

- Presentations at professional meetings, workshops, seminars, short courses. (2 points; same topic presentations can only be counted as one. Others are counted as services)
- Service as a panelist (2 points per event), TPC member (1 point per event), and reviewer for professional funding agencies, journals, and conferences (0.5 points per paper).
- Direction/leadership of research seminars, workshops, etc., outside of regular classroom activities. (1 point per activity)
- Recognition through honors, awards, commendations, certificates, fellowships, and induction for excellence in research. (max 2 points per award)

C. Department, College, University, and Community Services as evidenced by: (at least 60 pts for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure, 80 pts for promotion to Professor)

- Service to department, college, and university committees and councils, emphasizing roles and contributions to those committees and councils. (1-3 points per service per academic year)
- Service to department, college, and university via special assignments and effective participation in mentoring, retention, and recruitment activities (e.g., Cardinal View, Curriculum Team Day, Industrial Advisory Board Meeting, ACM Banquet). (1-3 points per service)
- Recognized excellence in professional service (offices, committees, task forces, review panels). (20 points)
- Sponsorship of student organizations, with emphasis on academic groups. (10 points)
- Community service based upon professional expertise. (10 points)
- Effective assistance with administrative tasks (10 points)
- Evidence of high-quality academic advising and effective participation in mentoring. (10 points)
- Service in leadership roles in university and professional bodies (10 points, for promotion to Professor).
- Formal recognition from beyond the university for accomplishments as a leader (10 points, for promotion to Professor).
- Mentorship of junior faculty and recognition by peers for leadership ability (10 points, for promotion to Professor).
- Leadership and direction of special programs (10 points, for promotion to Professor).

Appendix:

Department Peer Review Policy

1. Procedure
2. Observation Checklist

Procedure

Step-1: Selection of Two Observers.

The Department Chair will select two members (one of whom will be the Department Chair) to visit and observe each planned teaching observation at the beginning of the semester after consultation with the faculty member to be observed. The person to be evaluated will submit a list for three people from whom the Chair will select the second person.

Step-2: Selection of Date/Time of Observation.

The date and time of observation will be decided jointly by the faculty member to be observed and two visiting members selected in the Step-1 above.

Step-3: Pre-Observation Meeting

The faculty member and the two colleagues who will observe his/her teaching will meet at least one week prior to be planned observation visit to co-ordinate matters involved in the observation such as particular concerns or teaching aspects to focus or feedbacks the faculty members may have to address or share.

Step-4: Post-Observation Meeting

All members involved in the class observation, including the Department Chair will have a post-observation meeting as soon as possible to

exchange comments and feedbacks in order to mutually agree on both merits and effective ways to improve the teaching effectiveness of the faculty member, if any.

Department Chair:	_____
Committee Member:	_____
Committee Member:	_____

Peer Observation Checklist

Date: _____

Instructor's Name: _____

Observer's Name: _____

It is expected that:

1. The observers complete this Checklist Form (including her/his signature) as completely as possible. In particular, when the 'Unsatisfactory' column is checked, it is required to enter some relevant comments.
2. The completed form will be forwarded to both Department Chair and the faculty member observed in preparation for the subsequent Post-Observation meeting.

Class Organization	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Not Applicable	Comments
1. Well Prepared					
2. Introduction and overview.					
3. Organization of contents relative to learning objectives of the course.					
4. Organization of contents at appropriate level.					
5. Sequenced topics logically.					
6. Related lesson to previous or future lessons or assignments.					
7. Summarization and review.					

Summary:

Presentation	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Not Applicable	Comments
8. Explained content clearly.					
9. Used examples and analogies to clarify points.					
10. Emphasized important points.					
11. Used graphics or visual enhancements to support presentation.					
12. Used appropriate voice volume and inflection.					
13. Demonstrated confidence and enthusiasm.					
14. Demonstrated command of the subject matter.					
Summary:					

Class Interaction	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Not Applicable	Comments
15. Asked question to keep students attentive, interested and involved.					
16. Asked questions to monitor student understanding.					
17. Waited sufficient time for students to answer questions.					
18. Provided opportunities for students to lead group discussions, when appropriate.					
19. Effectively stimulated creative thinking and good work habits and ethical learning behaviors.					
20. Effectively kept students attentive, interested and involved.					
21. Showed respect for student questions and answers.					

Summary:

Signed: _____