

Computer Science Department Bylaws, Policies and Procedures

0. Revision History

- Revised and reorganized Sept. 23, 2009
- Revised May 2003

1. Organization and Operation

1.1 Preamble

The bylaws in this document have been adopted by the members of the Computer Science Department in accordance with the University of Wisconsin System and University of Wisconsin – La Crosse Faculty and Academic Staff Personnel Rules. In particular these bylaws respond to those sections of the UWS and UWL rules that direct departments to determine the specific implementation of certain policies. In addition to these bylaws, department members are governed by other duly approved and published policies, including Federal and State Administrative Code and UW-L shared governance bylaws and policies for faculty and academic staff.

1.2 Conduct of Meetings

Department meetings are conducted in accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised* and the Wisconsin Open Meeting laws. Minutes of department meetings will be recorded by a voting member or the departmental ADA and distributed in a timely manner. Copies of meeting minutes will be maintained in a secure location by the department. Minutes from closed meetings will be taken by the Department Chair and written within one week of the meeting. They will be available upon request.

1.3 Definitions of Department Membership & Voting Requirements

The voting members of the department consist of instructional academic staff with a 50% or greater appointment in the department and all ranked faculty holding appointments in the department. Voting members of the department may serve on departmental committees.

Meetings of the Department and its Committees will be governed by the following definitions. A positive vote requires a simple majority unless specifically indicated otherwise. Voting will be done by voice vote or show of hands unless a member requests a roll call vote or a roll call vote is specifically required. Proxy voting is not allowed. Members attending a meeting by teleconference are eligible to vote.

1.4 Definitions of Quorum & Majority

For meetings of the Department and its Committees, a quorum is defined as a 2/3 of the membership excluding those members on leave or sabbatical. Members on leave or sabbatical may participate in department meetings at their option. A simple majority is defined as a majority of those present at the meeting and a 2/3 majority is defined as 2/3 of those present at the meeting.

1.5 Changing Bylaws

Proposed revisions to these bylaws will be presented in writing for a first reading at a meeting of the Department. A second reading of the proposed revisions will be held at a subsequent meeting of the Department where a 2/3 majority vote will be required to adopt the revisions. The second reading may be waived by a simple majority vote for revisions that do not pertain to personnel decisions.

2. Faculty/Staff Responsibilities and Expectations

The Faculty Senate Policies (revised 2008, section IV, “Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons”) define the essential roles of academic departments, and the faculty who compose them, in university organization and function.

2.1 Faculty Responsibilities and Expectations

2.1.1 Teaching

Faculty of the Computer Science Department are expected to keep current in their subject matter area and to work to improve student learning. They are further expected to offer additional time to address student questions by holding office hours. Office hours and other course details should be part of the course syllabus shared with students at the beginning of the course. In addition, faculty are expected to grade and return student assignments, including examinations, in a timely fashion.

2.1.2 Scholarship

Faculty in the Computer Science Department are expected to develop and maintain an active program of scholarship. The Department’s definition of scholarly activities (Appendix 10.1) includes publishing papers or books in the discipline, in applications of the discipline, or in education for the discipline. Presentations in these areas at professional meetings, and in other appropriate forums, also constitute scholarship. In addition, writing successful grant proposals to support any of these activities is an important area of scholarship.

2.1.3 Service

Faculty of the Computer Science Department are expected to serve the institution, the public, and their profession. This service can take the form of participating on departmental and university committees, offering specialized advice to off campus groups, and joining and participating in the activities of professional societies in their discipline.

2.2 Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities (IAS) and Expectations

Instructional academic staff in the Computer Science Department hold position titles in the Lecturer series as described in the UWL Title Series Rank Descriptions and consequently do not have scholarship expectations. Expectations in the areas of teaching and service are the same as those for faculty (section 2.1) except that service will normally be at the departmental level. Total workload for IAS is defined as a standard minimum teaching load plus additional workload equivalency activities as adopted by the Faculty Senate (“UW-La Crosse Instructional Academic Staff Workload Policy”, approved by the Faculty Senate Mar 29, 2007). Any special expectations of a member of the instructional academic staff will be detailed in the appointment letter.

2.3 Non-Instructional Academic Staff Responsibilities and Expectations

The Computer Science department does not have non-instructional academic staff positions.

2.4 Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEIs)

The Computer Science department follows the UW-L SEI administration and reporting procedures as adopted by the Faculty Senate (“Student Evaluation of Instruction Items and Administration and Reporting Procedures”, approved by the Faculty Senate Oct. 25, 2007). Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff in the department are expected to conduct the SEI process, at the common time determined by the department, for each course they teach except for independent study courses or similar offerings. The SEI evaluation form used by the department is contained in Appendix 10.2. The department reports SEI information as a part of the faculty retention, tenure and promotion process as well as the instructional academic staff career progression process.

3. Merit Evaluation (Annual Review)

Consistent with UWS 3.05 and UWL 3.05 the performance of all faculty and continuing instructional academic staff in the Computer Science department will be reviewed annually. The review period will be from June 1st through May 31st of the prior academic year. The review will be based upon performance in areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Results of the annual review will be reported in accordance with duly approved campus requirements.

3.1. Evaluation Process & Criteria

The following process and criteria apply to both ranked faculty and instructional academic staff except where differences in expectations between faculty and instructional academic staff are identified in section 2.2.

At the end of each reporting period all faculty and instructional academic staff will submit a report on annual activities in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service in a form agreed upon by the department. This report will serve as a vehicle for self-evaluation and will, together with student and peer evaluation, form the basis for the annual review.

Early in the fall semester the Personnel Committee will use the three most recent annual evaluation reports, student evaluation information and peer evaluation information from the previous year to evaluate each department member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Sections 3.1.1, 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 describe the criteria to be used in this evaluation. A score in the range 0-5 will be assigned in each area. A department member's merit rating is the sum of these three scores plus SEI score (0-20 scale). Within one week of the review, the department chair will notify each department member of the results of the annual review, including an assessment of performance in teaching, scholarship and service and the combined merit rating.

Faculty members who are on professional leave are expected to complete an annual activities report at the end of the spring semester describing their leave and other professional activities.

The following criteria, used by the Computer Science department to evaluate annual performance, are designed to promote effective teaching, quality scholarship and service with teaching given the greater weight of importance.

3.1.1. Teaching

In the area of teaching, members of the department are expected to motivate and challenge students to learn by using appropriate pedagogical devices or techniques and by setting well-defined expectations. It is assumed that student assignments and examinations will be reviewed and graded in a timely manner, and that student achievement will be appropriately assessed. Faculty are expected to keep current in their subject matter areas, to update the curriculum, to assess the effects of their teaching techniques and to work to continually improve their knowledge of the subject matter and their teaching effectiveness. Efforts and accomplishments to these ends are to be included in the annual activities report.

3.1.2 Scholarship

As stated in section 2.1.2, faculty are expected to maintain an active program of scholarship. The Department's Definition of Scholarly Activities is contained in Appendix 10.1. Products of scholarship include papers, presentations, software and patents. Writing grant proposals to support teaching, scholarship, or service is itself an important area of scholarly activity. Faculty members are expected to include their scholarly activities and accomplishments in the annual activities report.

3.1.3 Service

The service component of a faculty member's responsibilities may take many forms: service to the program or major, the department, the university, the profession or the general public. Examples of

appropriate service activities include drafting program or policy documents, serving on committees, service as an officer in a professional society, consulting with external agencies. Faculty members are expected to include their service activities in the annual activities report.

3.2 Distribution of Merit Funds

The distribution model described in this section assumes that unclassified pay plans include a “solid performance” component and a “merit” component. This model applies to the “merit” component. The model is used to compute salary adjustments for both ranked faculty and instructional academic staff, however, these groups are treated separately with separate salary fund pools.

Instructional academic staff with appointments of less than 50% are excluded from the distribution of merit funds. First year faculty are also excluded from the distribution of merit funds since they will not have been included in the prior annual review. Instead, first year faculty, if retained for the second year will receive the average increment generated by the pay plan.

Salary Increment Distribution: The merit salary increment for a department member is the sum of two components.

The first component is the product of

- The smaller of 0.5 and the individual’s merit rating divided by 20.
- The individual’s salary divided by the total salary for the individual’s group.
- The available merit salary pool for the individual’s group.

The first component will distribute at most one half of the available merit pool for the group.

The second component is the product of

- The greater of 0 and the individual’s merit rating minus eight.
- The group merit salary pool remaining after the distribution of the first component.

3.3 Appeal Procedures

A department member may request a reconsideration of his/her annual evaluation and merit rating. This request must be made in writing to the chair within one-week of the chair’s report on the results of the annual review. Said appeal shall be heard by the Computer Science Personnel Committee who shall hear the appeal and respond in writing within one week with a merit rating.

Appeals beyond the departmental level may be presented to the Complaints, Grievances, Appeals and Academic Freedom Committee (Faculty Senate Bylaws, revised 2008, section II.E).

4. Faculty Personnel Review

This section details how the department implements the process and requirements of UWS 3.06 – 3.11 and UWL 3.06 – 3.08 with respect to review of probationary appointments, tenure recommendations and promotion recommendations. The process is consistent with campus policies on part-time faculty appointments and tenure clock stoppage. Tenure and retention decisions for a faculty member will be governed by the bylaws in effect at the time of hire unless the faculty member elects to be considered under newer bylaws.

4.1 Retention (procedure, criteria and appeal)

4.1.1 Review Process

The Personnel Committee, defined in section 7.2, conducts retention and tenure decisions for faculty on probationary appointments. If at the time of review, the Personnel Committee consists of fewer than three

faculty members, the department chair shall work with the dean to augment the committee to conduct the review using these guidelines. Early each fall semester, the Personnel Committee shall meet and elect a chair (who may be the department chair) to a one-year term by simple majority of the committee members.

Retention and tenure reviews will be conducted and reported at times determined by the campus faculty personnel review calendar. Where campus procedure permits reviews to occur on a biannual schedule the department will nonetheless conduct internal reviews on a yearly schedule. Such reviews will be conducted using the same process but will be reported only to the faculty member under review. The Personnel Committee may elect to suspend internal annual reviews at some point during the probationary period.

Each year the committee chair will select two members of the committee, who in addition to the department chair will serve as peer evaluators for the year. Each year the peer evaluators will observe at least two classes taught by each probationary faculty member. The evaluators will assess the classroom experiences they observed in a report to the probationary faculty member, the chair of the Personnel Committee and the department chair.

At least 20 days prior to the retention review, the department chair will notify each probationary faculty member in writing of the time and date of the review meeting. The chair will also remind each probationary faculty member to update and submit the following at least 7 days before the review.

- Annual Activities Report (covering teaching, scholarship and service)
- Curriculum Vitae
- Course Syllabi
- Assessment Instruments (e.g. exams, project descriptions)
- Other supplemental materials the candidate deems appropriate.

The department chair will supply the committee with the results of student evaluations, course assignments and grade information of each probationary faculty member.

The review meeting will be conducted subject to the requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meetings law. A probationary faculty member may elect to make oral or written presentations to the Personnel Committee. In addition to the information provided by the probationary faculty member and the department chair, the committee will also consider the reports of the classroom evaluators. Votes shall be cast by a show of hands on a motion to retain. A 2/3rd majority vote is necessary for a positive retention recommendation. The Committee chair will record the result of the vote.

In the case of a non-renewal recommendation, the Committee shall prepare written reasons for its decision. These reasons shall be retained by the Committee chair and provided upon request to the probationary faculty member.

Within 7 days of the review meeting, each probationary faculty member shall be informed in writing by the Committee chair of the results of the retention review. In the case of a positive retention decision, the written notice shall include concerns or suggestions for improvement identified by the Committee.

Following the review meeting the department will forward the following materials to the dean.

- Department letter of recommendation with committee vote.
- Teaching Assignment Information Form with departmental comparison SEI data.
- Merit evaluation results (if available).

4.1.2 Criteria

The Personnel Committee shall use the submitted self, peer and student evaluation information to judge each probationary faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. Of these areas of responsibility, teaching carries the greater weight. The committee looks for evidence of effective student learning. The committee also looks for evidence that course content is consistent with department expectations, taught at an appropriate level and students are appropriately evaluated.

After establishing a record of successful teaching, a program of continued scholarship is necessary for retention and, ultimately, a positive tenure recommendation (Appendix 10.1). The committee looks for evidence that the scholarly activities are substantial and ongoing.

Service is also an important faculty responsibility. For probationary faculty a service record should be established after demonstrated success in teaching and scholarship.

4.1.3 Reconsideration

If a non-renewal recommendation is made by the Personnel Committee, the probationary faculty member may request reasons for the recommendation. This request must be made in writing within 10 days of the non-renewal notice. The chair of the Personnel Committee shall supply these reasons in writing within 10 days of the request. The reasons then become part of the personnel file of the probationary faculty member.

If the probationary faculty member wishes a reconsideration of the initial non-renewal recommendation, he/she shall request such a meeting in writing within two weeks of the receipt of the written reasons for non-renewal. The procedure for the reconsideration meeting is detailed in UWL 3.07 (4), (5), and (6).

4.2 Tenure Review and Departmental Tenure Criteria

For retention reviews that would grant tenure the committee will consider a motion to retain and grant tenure. For tenure reviews the Committee will use the same procedure, criteria and appeal process as is used for regular retention reviews.

4.3 Post-tenure Review

At least once every five years, the performance of each tenured faculty member is reviewed by the chair to determine whether this performance is satisfactory in each of the areas of faculty responsibility. This review is based on the results of the annual review for the 5 preceding years. The performance of individuals receiving a meritorious rating for each of those preceding years will be deemed satisfactory. The Post-tenure Review Policy is contained in Appendix 10.6.

Each year the results of the post-tenure review, and any correction plans, will be forwarded to the dean.

4.4 Faculty Promotion (procedure, criteria and appeal)

4.4.1 Review Process

When published, the department chair will review for accuracy the lists of faculty eligible for promotion in the next year. At this time, the department chair will notify eligible faculty in writing and ask whether they wished to be considered for promotion. The department chair will also refer eligible faculty to the procedures and documents related to the campus promotion process.

In the event that there are faculty who wish to pursue promotion, the department chair will convene the appropriate Promotion Committee(s) during the first week of the semester. The Promotion Committee for candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will consist of all Associate and Full tenured professors in the department. The Promotion Committee for candidates seeking promotion to the

rank of Full Professor will consist of all Full tenured professors in the department. In the event that these committees consist of fewer than three faculty, the department chair shall work with the dean to augment the committee to conduct the promotion review using these guidelines.

At its first meeting, the Committee(s) shall elect a chair (who may be the department chair) for a one-year term by a simple majority vote, and establish the date(s) of the promotion consideration meeting(s) subject to the dates established by the campus promotion review calendar. The review date will also provide at least 20 days notice to the promotion candidate. The department chair will notify candidates of the review date and request that they provide their promotion documents at least 7 days prior to the review date for distribution to the committee.

The form of the promotion document is determined by the campus Joint Promotion Committee but will include the following.

- A candidate's report on their activities in the area of teaching, scholarship and service.
- A Teaching Assignment Information Form
- Curriculum Vita
- SEI and Merit information provided by the department chair.
- Other supplementary information.

Promotion candidates may also make an oral presentation at the promotion review meeting.

The promotion consideration meeting will be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Wisconsin Open Meeting law. After discussion of a candidate's performance with respect to the department promotion criteria the committee will vote by a show of hands on a motion to promote the candidate. At least a 2/3rd majority vote is necessary for a positive promotion recommendation. The results of the vote shall be recorded by the Committee chair. Within 7 days of the promotion review meeting, the department chair shall notify each candidate of the Committee's recommendation.

In the event of a positive recommendation the Committee will comply with requirements of the Joint Promotion Committee such as the preparation of a committee report justifying the Committee's recommendation and completion of the signature page to accompany the promotion document. The candidate will be afforded an opportunity to review the Committee report prior to its transmission to the Dean.

In the event of a negative recommendation the Committee shall prepare written reasons to be provided to the candidate upon request.

4.4.2 Criteria

To be considered for promotion to a higher rank, a faculty member must meet the minimum University criteria as stated in the Employee Handbook, as well as the following criteria.

- The member under consideration must have achieved a student evaluation of instruction rating of 3.5 or higher during the year immediately prior to the recommendation for promotion.
- The member under consideration must have achieved a student evaluation of instruction rating 3.5 or higher during two of the three years immediately prior to the recommendation for promotion.
- The member under consideration must have achieved a merit rating that is above the department average for the year immediately prior to the recommendation for promotion.

For the rank of Associate Professor a candidate must provide evidence of teaching excellence and the establishment of a program of scholarship. Evidence of teaching excellence shall include the results of self, peer and student evaluation of instruction. Scholarship shall be consistent with the department's definition of scholarly activity (Appendix 10.1). To be promoted to the rank of Professor, a faculty member must show evidence of continued excellence in teaching, significant scholarly productivity, and substantial service activity. Continued teaching excellence is measured by the results of self, peer, and student evaluations. Significant scholarly productivity is judged by the quality and quantity of presentations, publications, and grant acquisitions. Substantial service activity will include service to the department, the institution, and the profession.

4.4.3 Reconsideration

Candidates who are not recommended for promotion may request the reasons for the non-promotion recommendation. This request must be submitted in writing to the Promotion Committee Chair within seven days of the notice of the Committee's recommendation. Within seven days of the request the Promotion Committee Chair will supply the reasons for the non-promotion recommendation to the candidate. Within two weeks of receiving the written reasons, a candidate may request, by writing to the department chair, reconsideration by the Promotion Committee. The faculty member will be allowed an opportunity to respond to the written reasons using written or oral evidence and witnesses at the reconsideration meeting. Written notice of the reconsideration decision shall be forwarded to the dean within seven days of the reconsideration meeting.

5. Instructional Academic Staff Review

5.1 Annual Review

In accordance with UWS 3.05-3.11 and UWL 3.08, Instructional Academic Staff are annually reviewed at the same time, and using the same process, as ranked faculty. The review of IAS takes into consideration the differences in responsibilities and expectations described in section 2.2. To incorporate the campus Individual Development Plan (IDP) process the review of instructional academic staff will involve an additional step. Instructional Academic Staff will be given an opportunity to respond to those items contained in the IDP form in which they have an interest. The committee, as a part of its review, will similarly respond in writing and a summary, prepared by the Department Chair, of this exchange will be submitted with the IDP.

5.2 Career Progression Procedures

The department will follow the policies and procedures approved by the Faculty Senate in the document "A Guide to Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) Career Progression and Portfolio Development at UW-La Crosse" (approved by the Faculty Senate on Oct. 25, 2007). The process, and timeline, for evaluating and recommending career progression applications will parallel the process for faculty promotion applications. The Personnel Committee will serve as the committee to review career progression applications.

5.3 Appeal Procedures

The appeal process for career progression decisions made by the Personnel Committee will parallel the reconsideration process and timeline used for faculty promotion decisions.

6. Non-instructional Academic Staff Review

The Computer Science department does not have non-instructional academic staff.

7. Governance

7.1 Department Chair

Faculty Senate Policies (IV. Responsibilities of Departments, Department Members and Department Chairpersons) describe the selection, role, duties and responsibilities of department chairs. These include: preparing class schedules and teaching assignments; developing curriculum revisions; preparing and monitoring the department's operating budget; arranging department meetings; appointing faculty to departmental committees; appointing and monitoring search and screen activities for departmental vacancies; preparing the department's annual report and representing the department in various university matters.

The department chair election process is described in Faculty Senate Policies (revised 2008, section V, "The Selection of Department Chairpersons"). Any tenured faculty member of the department is eligible to serve as chair. The term of office is three years. All faculty, and continuing members of the academic staff (as defined in section 1.3) are eligible to vote in the election for a chair.

7.2 Standing Departmental Committees

<u>Personnel</u>	Membership: Tenured faculty who are members of the Computer Science Department. Duties: The committee shall have responsibility for decision and recommendations pertaining to academic personnel, including recommendations regarding granting tenure, faculty retention and academic staff reappointment.
<u>Merit Evaluation</u>	Membership: All members of the Personnel Committee. Duties: The committee shall have responsibility for merit evaluations, as prescribed in Section 3.
<u>Promotion</u>	Membership: The promotion committee for a candidate being considered for promotion will consist of all members of the Personnel Committee with a rank above that of the candidate. Duties: The committee shall be responsible for recommending promotion for department faculty.
<u>Curriculum</u>	Membership: The committee will consist of three department members appointed by the department chair for one-year terms. Duties: The committee shall annually survey the offerings of the department and make recommendations concerning the addition and deletion of courses, and shall advise the chair on class offerings in each semester.
<u>Hearing</u>	Membership: The committee will consist of the department chair plus two department members appointed by the chair for one-year terms. A first and second alternate shall be appointed by the department chair and shall serve as replacements for any regular member who is involved in a case under consideration. Duties: Shall hear and report on student questions, petitions, and complaints as they relate to the Computer Science Department.

<u>Research</u>	<p>Membership: The committee will consist of three department members appointed by the chair for one-year terms.</p> <p>Duties: The committee shall promote research activities of the department and shall approve applications for student independent study and research projects.</p>
<u>MSE</u>	<p>Membership: The committee shall consist of all CS faculty who are designated as graduate faculty according to campus policy.</p> <p>Duties: The committee shall oversee all activities related to the Master of Software Engineering program.</p>
<u>MSE Admissions</u>	<p>Membership: The committee shall consist of the MSE program director and two other members appointed by the chair for one-year terms.</p> <p>Duties: Review admissions material for new students and make a recommendation on admittance to the MSE program.</p>

7.3 Programmatic Assessment

Program goals and methods of assessment are contained in Appendix 10.3.

7.4 Salary Inequity Policy

The department's policy for handling requests for salary adjustments to address inequity issues is contained in Appendix 10.4.

7.5 Summer Appointment Policy

The department's policy on determining summer appointments is contained in Appendix 10.5.

8. Search and Screen Procedures

For tenure track and instructional academic staff positions the Search & Screen Committee will consist of all full-time members of the department. The committee will conduct the search in accordance with established university recruitment policies.

9. Student Rights and Obligations

9.1 Complaint, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures

9.1.1 Grade Appeals

Students who believe that the grade they received for a course does not reflect their performance in that course may appeal the disputed grade. This appeal must take place before the end of the semester immediately following the semester in which the grade was recorded. The student should first discuss this difference with the instructor. If a student-instructor meeting is not possible, or if such a meeting does not result in a resolution of the difference, the student should contact the department chair. After meeting with the student, the chair will discuss the student's concern with the instructor, if possible. Following these meetings, the chair will make a recommendation to the instructor regarding the grade change.

Should the above informal process not resolve the issue to the student's satisfaction, the student may file a written appeal for a grade change, with the department chair. Upon receipt of the written request, the chair will form an ad hoc committee consisting of three department members, not including the chair or

the instructor, to review the appeal. This committee may forward its recommendation to the instructor. Any decision to change a grade remains that of the instructor, unless the instructor is no longer available, in which case the decision to change a grade becomes that of the department chair in consultation with the ad hoc committee.

9.1.2 Academic Non-Grade Appeals

Students may initiate and resolve complaints regarding faculty and staff behavior. Such complaints should be lodged either orally or in writing with the department chair or dean of the college within 90 days of the last occurrence. The hearing procedures for these non-grade concerns are detailed in the student handbook, the *Eagle Eye*, in the section on “Policies”.

9.2 Expectations, Responsibilities and Academic Misconduct

Academic and nonacademic misconduct policies are referenced in UWS/UWL chapters 14 & 17. Further, students who enroll in courses offered by the Computer Science Department are expected to attend and participate in these classes. They are expected to devote sufficient non-class time to complete all class assignments in a timely manner and to undertake additional study of the material as necessary to demonstrate satisfactory mastery of the material.

9.3 Advising Policy

Each student who majors in a program offered by the Computer Science Department will be assigned a faculty advisor in the department. Students are encouraged to meet with their faculty advisor at least once each semester to discuss their academic progress, career interests, and course schedules.

10. Appendices

10.1 Definition of Scholarship

Research and scholarly activity within the Computer Science Department at the University of Wisconsin – La Crosse is defined to be any effort that contributes to the common body of knowledge in computing hardware, software, and theory. In particular, these activities shall include:

- Writing and publishing scholarly papers published in recognized journals of the computer science, or closely-related, discipline;
- Presentation of scholarly work at recognized computer science-related gatherings;
- Authoring of text, or other copyrighted or patented work, contributing to the computer science profession;
- Editing or refereeing publications or presentations for a recognized computer science-related conference, symposium, or workshop;
- Participating in the organization or operation of a computer science-related conference, symposium, or workshop;
- Proposing, receiving, and administering grants for the support of computer science at UW-L;
- Participating in computer science-related consulting;
- Developing software or software tools of significant contribution to the computing discipline;
- Supervising student research or serving on graduate student research committees;
- Collaborating to the offering of computer science-related institutes, short courses, seminars, or workshops;
- Holding membership in professional organizations of the computing discipline; and
- Refreshing and renewing personal knowledge of the discipline of computer science through self-study, or attendance at appropriate institutes, short courses, seminars, or workshops.

10.2 Student Evaluation of Instruction Form

Computer Science Department Student Evaluation of Instruction

Instructions for filling out this evaluation:

Do **NOT** put your name or social security number on the scanner sheet, but **DO** fill in the instructor's name, department, course number and section number. **USE A #2 PENCIL FOR ALL RESPONSES**

Record your answers to the below questions on the scanner sheet provided. Comments for questions 10 & 11 should be written on the back of this evaluation sheet. Since these scores are used for promotion and tenure decisions, it is important that your answers be as accurate as possible. Your cooperation in filling out this form is greatly appreciated by both the department and the university administration.

Fill in the appropriate letter to the questions below.

1. Student Classification
 - a. Freshman
 - b. Sophomore
 - c. Junior
 - d. Senior
 - e. Graduate Student
Special Student – leave blank

2. Reason for taking this course:
 - a. General Education Requirement
 - b. Core Requirement
 - c. Required in Major
 - d. Required in Minor
 - e. Elective

3. What grade do you expect in this course?
 - a. A
 - b. B
 - c. C
 - d. D
 - e. F

	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
4. I was looking forward to taking this course.	A	B	C	D	E
5. The instructor was helpful to students.	A	B	C	D	E
6. The instructor was well prepared.	A	B	C	D	E
7. The instructor communicated the subject matter clearly.	A	B	C	D	E
8. I learned a great deal from this instructor.	A	B	C	D	E
9. Overall, this instructor was excellent.	A	B	C	D	E

10. Please comment on what your instructor did to make the course worthwhile. Please be as specific as you can. (Use reverse side of this evaluation)

11. Please comment on what your instructor might do to improve the course for the benefit of future students. Please be as specific as you can. (Use reverse side of this evaluation)

10.3 Program Goals and Methods of Assessment

10.3.1 Program Goals

Major Curriculum

To provide a computer science program curriculum of the highest possible quality ...

- Maintaining curricular requirements at or above the levels established by professional organizations and recognized accreditation boards.
- Ensuring the consistent integration of the computer science curriculum with the UW-L mission.
- Offering classes which
 - Maintain the diversity of the computer science discipline,
 - Introduce up-to-date computing technology,
 - Prepare graduates for computing technology,
 - Prepare graduates for continued study in computer science,
- Disseminating department curricular plans for student planning.

Graduate Curriculum

To provide a graduate level computer science program of highest quality ...

- That is comparable and competitive with the graduate programs at other universities across the country.
- That supports local and regional industries.
- That extends its visibility across the globe.

Non-Major/Minor Curriculum

To offer computer science courses that serve the needs of non-computer science students...

- Ensuring computer science curriculum appropriate for the University Core Program.
- Meeting the needs of other UW-L programs under given resource constraints.

Instruction

To provide quality computer science instruction by ensuring...

- Student achievement
- Quality teaching

Faculty

To maintain a computer science department faculty with technical expertise and currency...

- Hiring staff with strong credentials and with concern for the breadth of discipline coverage by the department as a whole.
- Encouraging faculty participation in research and other professional development activities.

Advising

To provide accessible academic advising for computer science majors, and other students seeking information regarding computer science.

Service Outside the University

To respond to the needs of the community and beyond through computer science course offerings, lectures, consulting, and cooperative education programs.

UW-L Governance

To contribute to the decision making process at UW-L by participating in governance.

Computing Leadership

To provide campus leadership in the uses of computing.

10.3.2 Methods of Assessment

Major Curriculum

- Assess currency of the computer science major curriculum by continual review and comparison to the recommendations of the Association for Computing Machinery, the Institute for Electrical and Electronics Engineers, and the Computer Science Accreditation Board; this assessment is performed by the department chair and department Curriculum Committee.
- Assess the occupational applicability of the curriculum by informal query and written questionnaires requested of previous UW-L computer science graduates.
- Assess the occupational applicability of the curriculum by informal query of previous employers of UW-L computer science graduates.
- Assess currency of hardware and software facilities by informal discussion with colleagues outside UW-L and inspection of relevant internet bulletin boards.

Graduate Curriculum

- Assess currency of the graduate program curriculum by continual review and comparison to the recommendations of the Association of Computing Machinery, the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, and the Software Engineering Institute; this assessment is performed by the department chair and the MSE Committee.
- Assess the occupational applicability of the curriculum by informal query and written questionnaires required of previous MSE graduates.
- Assess the suitability of the curriculum by informal query and recommendations requested from local software industries.

Non-Major/Minor Curriculum

- Assess the successfulness of curricular service by informal query and occasional meetings with representatives of those academic departments being served.

- Assess the fit of computer science courses within the UW-L mission by review of all curricular changes by requiring approval of the CS Curriculum Committee, the CS Department, the Dean of the College of SAH, and the Undergraduate/Graduate Curriculum Committee.

Instruction

- Assess student achievement by graded examinations, written papers, oral presentations, and out-of-class assignments.

Faculty

- Assess all instructional staff through annual merit evaluations. (Each member is evaluated based on teaching, scholarly activity, and service as evidenced by submitted material. The submitted material must include a self-evaluation of teaching, evidence of relevant scholarly activity and service and student evaluation of instruction scores from the evaluation year.)
- Assess all non-tenured faculty through annual recommendation for retention. (Each member submits evidence of teaching, scholarly activity, and service and is evaluated by a formal vote of the CS Personnel Committee, followed by a letter of recommendation/non-recommendation from the CS Chair, followed by recommendations from the Dean of SAH and the Chancellor.)
- Assess all promotion candidates through a formal review of no less than the last three years of the candidate's record. (Each member submits evidence of teaching, scholarly activity, and service and is evaluated by a formal vote of the CS Personnel Committee, followed by a letter of recommendation/non-recommendation and data gathered by the CS Chair, followed by recommendations from the Dean of SAH, the UW-L Joint Promotion Committee, and the Chancellor.)

General Program Review

- Assess all aspects of the CS Department by way of UW-L Faculty Senate Academic Program Review Committee. This report makes specific observations and recommendations, and the report must ultimately be approved by the UW-L Faculty Senate.
- Assess all aspects of the CS Department as a part of the overall institution by way of North Central Accreditation.
- Assess all computer science programs relating to secondary and elementary education by way of periodic review from the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

10.4 Salary Inequity Policy

Definition

An equity adjustment is a salary adjustment that results from the need to address unusual disparities that cannot be remedied with departmental distribution of the annual pay plan. An equity adjustment may be recommended for the following reasons: (1) to address issues of gender or race equity; (2) to address inequities due to salary compression and inversion; (3) to address inequities due to individuals acquiring advanced degrees. Equity adjustments should not be made which negate past merit adjustments.

Process

1. A request for a salary equity adjustment may be initiated by an individual faculty member or by the

department chairperson on behalf of an individual faculty member.

2. A request for a salary equity adjustment must be submitted to the department chairperson in writing. A request for a salary equity adjustment must be accompanied by a written rationale that includes supporting documentation of inequity. The chair will inform the department of all such requests.
3. A request for a salary equity adjustment will be reviewed and judged by the department chairperson. The rationale for approval or denial of the request will be forwarded to the dean.
4. Individuals who have not been recommended by their department chairperson, but who believe they should be granted equity adjustments, may apply to their dean. If the dean denies an individual an equity adjustment, he/she may apply to the Chancellor/Vice Chancellor for equity adjustment consideration. An individual's application/appeal for an equity adjustment to the dean and/or the vice chancellor/chancellor shall include the same rationale and documentation as required at the department level.
5. Salary equity adjustments will be communicated to the department by the chairperson.

10.5 Summer Appointment Policy

1. All members of the Computer Science Department with faculty status and a minimum of 0.5 appointment are eligible for summer session appointments.
2. Members of the department are eligible for summer session appointments up to one half the amount of their annual FTE appointment. Exceptions to this policy may be made when necessary to staff summer session.
3. Summer session appointments will be tendered to members of the department in rotation. Members who refuse appointment within one week of receiving an offer of appointment maintain their position in the rotation. Those who accept, or fail to notify within one week, are moved to the bottom of the rotation list.
4. Appointment of faculty to Summer Session will be based on the chair's judgment of program needs and subject to the consent of the Personnel Committee.
5. New faculty will be added to the bottom of the rotation list.

10.6 Post-tenure Review Policy

I. Every five years the professional performance of tenured faculty will be reviewed in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, and service through the department's Merit Process. The Review Process will initially be conducted in the 1994-95 academic year. The Review will be scheduled in the spring semester before the Merit Process commences.

If however, a tenured faculty member receives an Unsatisfactory Merit rating (score of eight or less) in any yearly merit evaluation, an Interim Review Process will be initiated for that faculty member at that time. The Chair will convene all other tenured members of the department to serve as the Review Committee (also known as the CS Personnel Committee). The Review Committee will determine whether that faculty member has significant areas of concern and, if so, in which areas.

II. The Chair of the Department will initiate the Review Process. If a faculty member has received Satisfactory Merit ratings (Merit Score greater than eight) for the past five years, that member will be deemed satisfactory for the Review. If a faculty member has received an Unsatisfactory Merit rating (less than eight) in any of the five previous years and was deemed to have significant areas of concern at that time, the Chair will convene the other tenured members of the department as the Review Committee to

determine whether that faculty member still has significant areas of concern. If so, then the procedures for removal of the identified areas of concern as outlined in the “UW-L Tenured Faculty Review and Development” section of the UW-L Staff Handbook will be followed.

III. Each year (when applicable) the Chair of the Department and the Review Committee will meet to discuss how performance reviews should be conducted based on the departmental bylaws. Department members will attend University-required training programs on performance reviews.

IV. The review criteria for the three areas of performance are listed below.

A. Teaching

1. Regular meeting of classes.
2. Regular assignments and assessments of students.
3. Scheduled office hours.
4. Satisfactory SEI scores.
5. Innovative teaching methods.
6. Collaborative teaching activities.
7. Satisfactory student performance on final exams.
8. Independent study offerings or student projects.
9. Satisfactory coverage of the syllabus or course outline.
10. Clear, well organized class presentations/activities.
11. Course development,
12. Appropriate grading policies.

B. Scholarly activities in computer science or related fields.

1. Publications.
 - a. Original works.
 - b. Expository papers.
 - c. Other
2. Professional Conventions, Colloquia, Seminars, Workshops, Short Courses, etc.
 - a. Giving presentations.
 - b. Organizing.
 - c. Attending.
 - d. Other.
3. Professional Consulting.
 - a. On campus.
 - b. Off campus.
 - c. Other.
4. Writing textbooks.
5. Refereeing.
6. Software Development.
7. Grants.
 - a. Writing Proposals.
 - b. Writing Successful Proposals.

C. Service

1. Serving on Department committees.
2. Serving on University or System committees.
3. Student advising.
4. Leadership in professional organizations.
5. Cooperation with local and state school district.

6. Serving as advisor for student organizations.
7. Leadership in community organizations.
8. Other Department, University, or System activities.

V. Results of the Review.

- A. All procedures outlined in the “UW-L Tenured Faculty Review and Development” section of the UW-L Staff handbook will be followed.
- B. Written records of all reviews will be kept in the Department.
- C. Faculty members will have the option of meeting with the Chair to discuss their Reviews. If a faculty member has been judged to have significant areas of concern by the Review Committee, either during an Interim Review or during the regular five-year Review, the Review Committee will meet face-to-face with that faculty member to discuss reasons for the rating and to plan strategies to address areas of concern.
- D. Appeals will be handled as outlined in the Computer Science Department Merit Procedures.