School of Computing Policy on the Review of Tenured Faculty

(March 2003; Revised August 2014; Updated February 2015; Updated May 2015)

Goal: Dialog between individual tenured faculty and their peers in the school.

Detailed Plan

1. *Basis for the Review (As a minimum, the reviewee is to provide a current curriculum vita, a statement of professional goals, a statement highlighting significant accomplishments, and other articles or submitted documents they which to be examined as part of the review; the department will provide FAR forms for the five-year period under review and student and peer evaluations of teaching. Peer teaching evaluations will be assigned by the Director and accomplished by the reviewers).*
    - Scholarship
    - Research
    - Teaching
    - Service
2. *Criteria for Evaluation (Same for Formal RPT Action for Rank)*
    - Impact on Scholarly Community
    - Scope and Amount of Research
    - Quality and Contribution to Teaching
    - Contribution to School, College, University, State, Nation, World
3. *Summary Report: The report generated by the committee should summarize the relevant data for teaching, research, and service and provide a qualitative assessment of that data relative to standards of the department. The committee may make recommendations to the Director, if seen as needed.*
4. *Possible Outcomes*
    - Accolades: Report from Director summarizes accomplishments and lauds efforts; it may also suggest areas for increased emphasis.
    - Serious Problems: Report from Director summarizes problems and possible remedies.

Process

1. The Director appoints two committee members from tenured School of Computing faculty[1].
2. The committee reviews submitted materials, accomplished peer-teaching evaluations, and meets with reviewee.
3. The committee prepares a report detailing the information mentioned above and their assessment of the information. The committee provides the report to the Director and upon the Director's request meets with Director to discuss their findings.
4. The Director reviews the submitted materials and the summary provided by the committee, and correspondingly meets with reviewee.
5. The Director selects outcome and writes a letter expressing his/her review of the case. The letter along with the summary report are then submitted to the following:
    - Copy to reviewee
    - Copy to file
    - Copy to Dean

University Responsibility

The University and College responsibilities are to provide:

a) Adequate opportunities to carry out faculty responsibilities.
b) Financial assistance for attendance at appropriate meetings, short courses, workshops, etc.
c) Opportunities, such as sabbatical leaves, etc., for obtaining new and/or improving existing skills.
d) Adequate physical facilities for teaching and research.
e) Adequate choice of career paths within the college and/or University.

1- Director will not be reviewed.