

Department of Computer Science: Post-Tenure Review Criteria

23 October 2010

Rationale/Background

The University of Missouri Collected Rules and Regulations 310.015 governs the procedures for review of faculty performance. Concerning tenured faculty members it is stated that

“Tenured faculty have proven their ability to contribute significantly in their discipline and to work independently and productively in their field. In this document we affirm and strongly defend the importance of tenure at the University of Missouri. By fostering creativity and protecting academic freedom, tenure safeguards faculty from unfair dismissal based on arbitrary or discriminatory practices, thus encouraging the constant search for truth that is the hallmark of the University. Under this policy or any other university policy, academic tenure should be revoked only with just cause [...]. However, tenure does not protect faculty from the consequences of not performing satisfactorily their duties to the University. It is in the best interest of the faculty as a whole to ensure that each faculty member contributes fully to the institution throughout that individual's career.”

Academic Tenure Regulations 310.015 Procedures for Review of Faculty Performance (<http://www.umsystem.edu/uminfo/rules/bylaws/310015.htm>)

The Collected Rules and Regulations require that each department will develop and publish minimum standards for overall satisfactory faculty performance.

Therefore, the guidelines below:

1. Define minimum standards for satisfactory performance.
2. Were developed and approved by the tenured faculty of the Computer Science department.
3. Allow for flexibility in faculty activities, consistent with the academic freedom and creativity while still maintaining a satisfactory level of overall performance and productivity.

Guidelines

Workload

Over the course of a given year, a tenured faculty is expected to provide teaching, research, and service commensurate to the level of appointment each semester, and adjusted for periods when the faculty member is on academic or personal leave.

The distribution of effort over teaching, research, and service is determined by the workload policy of the department and/or by agreement between the faculty member and the department chair. This distribution does not reflect the requirements for satisfactory standards of performance. Below minimal standards apply at any distribution of effort due

to workload policy. Differences in assignments due to workload may be reflected in awards, recognition, or pay increases, but do not affect the minimal required standards of performance.

Minimal standards

Each faculty member is expected to provide each of research, teaching, and service at a satisfactory level of performance.

The minimal performance standards for each research, teaching, and service are described below. Each faculty member has to satisfy these performance standards. In cases where an individual does not satisfy the listed minimum performance standards, the chair or evaluation committee may substitute alternative but equivalent evidence to establish that the required performance standards have been met.

Research

Each tenured faculty member is expected to carry out a consistent and independent research program nationally recognized by their peers.

Evidence for such a program is provided by grants obtained, published books and monographs; published papers in quality journals and prestigious conference proceedings; invited talks at international and national meetings; recognition from international and national experts in the research area; patents; awards and honors; citations of published papers; and other factors that provide evidence of merit for the research program of the faculty member. To be considered evidence of satisfactory performance, the faculty must be the main or sole author or the advisor or co-advisor of a student who is the sole or main author. In addition, the faculty member is expected to supervise student research projects with tangible results such as awards, reports, theses, or dissertations.

Teaching

Each tenured faculty member is expected to provide effective teaching.

Evidence of effective teaching can be in the form of teaching ratings; awards and honors; positive peer evaluations; development of new or significantly revised courses and laboratories; development of teaching tools and materials, such as instructional media or textbooks; or other activities or materials that provide evidence of effective instruction, such as curricular development and course design, effectiveness of advising activities, and adaptation to new styles and types of courses.

Service and Administration

Each tenured faculty member is expected to engage in service to the department, the university, and their academic field.

Examples of service activities include providing administrative functions; serving on department and university committees; participation in departmental student recruiting activities; providing service for professional organizations, such as conference organization or journal editing; serving as an advisor for public and private educational or research

organizations; or providing special assistance to the university or the research community based on the faculty member's expertise, in a way that will reflect positively on the department or university.

Evaluation

Faculty members should produce credible evidence of accomplishments, with respect to the norms of the department and opportunities and resources provided, in all of research, teaching, and service.

For consideration of acceptable performance, a three-year moving average is considered in order to level for events such as delay in publication review, introduction of a new courses, impact of small classes, etc.

Department of Computer Science: Bylaws – Campus Committee Elections

Elections for representatives to campus committees will consist of a two-round process conducted in a timely manner well in advance of applicable campus deadlines. In the first round, nominations, including self-nominations, are requested by a specified and reasonable deadline. In the absence of any eligible nominations of willing candidates by said deadline, the department chair will appoint an eligible faculty member, while trying to fairly balance service load. In the case of only a single eligible nomination of a willing candidate by the deadline, that candidate is automatically appointed. In the case of multiple eligible nominations of willing candidates by the deadline, a second round is held in which each faculty member has the opportunity to cast a ballot for their preferred candidate by again a specified and reasonable deadline; the candidate with the most votes by that deadline is appointed; in case of a tie, the department chair selects one of the tied candidates for the appointment.