Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

Department of Computer Science

Approved by the Faculty, December 5, 2019

This document provides criteria for assessing Computer Science Department faculty contributions to teaching, research, and service. It applies to both annual and cumulative (3-year or 6-year) reviews for all faculty. Review procedures, materials submitted, and timelines are specified in the HOP sections below and in the annual Pathways for Review document.

ADM 06-502 ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION

ADM 06-504 POST-TENURE REVIEW
https://www.utrgv.edu/hop/policies/adm-06-504.pdf

ADM 06-505 FACULTY TENURE AND PROMOTION
https://www.utrgv.edu/hop/policies/adm-06-505.pdf

General Guidelines for Narratives

Candidates should arrange their teaching, research, and service narratives to present and justify how their activities and accomplishments satisfy these criteria. In each evaluation criteria section, guidelines are provided as to the details that need to be included. The narratives should be clear not only what the candidate did, but what the significance and contribution is to our programs. Common activities and accomplishments that are described in this document do not need to be re-explained. Reviews at the department and chair levels should similarly justify their ratings based on the criteria, particularly when there is disagreement with the candidate or other reviewers.

Guidelines for Overall Ratings

The overall rating for a candidate should be Exceeds Expectations when the candidate Exceeds Expectations in at least two of the three areas (teaching, research, service), or one of the two for Lecturers (teaching, service), and Meets Expectations in the remaining category.

In the case that a Tenured or Tenure-Track candidate Exceeds Expectations in one area and Meets Expectations in the other two, it is up to the assessment of the reviewers to determine if that candidate overall Exceeds Expectations or Meets Expectations. That decision should be justified in the review based on overall performance in all areas.

The overall rating for a candidate should be at least Meets Expectations when the candidate at least Meets Expectations in all areas.

The overall rating for a candidate should be Does Not Meet Expectations when the candidate Does Not Meet Expectations in two areas or is Unsatisfactory in any area.
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In the case that a candidate Does Not Meet Expectations in any one area, but Meets or Exceeds Expectations in the other areas, it is up to the assessment of the reviewers to determine if that candidate overall Meets Expectations or Does Not Meet Expectations. That decision should be justified in the review based on overall performance in all areas.
Evaluation Criteria for Teaching

1. Student Evaluation Score

Student evaluation scores are assessed by the average over the review period, whether annual or cumulative. Responses to all required questions should be included.

In the teaching narrative, the candidate should provide context for their student evaluation score by discussing the specific courses taught during the review period. Sections should be identified where the candidate was not being solely evaluated, such as being instructor-of-record for an independent project course, or supervising a Graduate Teaching Assistant. Improvements, outliers, and other trends should be discussed along with factors that impact student evaluation scores such as survey participation, class size, class level, instructor familiarity with the course, pass rates, student interest in the topic, number of sections being taught, and modalities such as ITV.

Reviewers have the discretion to deviate from the recommended thresholds for Meets and Exceeds Expectations based on detailed examination of the courses taught. The narrative and/or review must provide the details and justification for other reviewers to accept or reject their evaluation.

2. Peer Teaching Evaluations

The policies and procedures for peer teaching evaluations are specified in Appendix A. The candidate may respond to their peer teaching evaluations in their teaching narrative.

For cumulative review, the evaluations over the review period should be assessed as a whole. For any low evaluations (below Meets Expectations), the candidate should justify that concerns have been addressed. Evidence may include other reviews to the contrary, relevant activities and accomplishments, and subsequent improvements. If the reviewer agrees that all low evaluations have been convincingly addressed (or are being addressed in the case of the final semester), then the whole should be assessed at least as Meets Expectations.

Student evaluation scores and peer teaching evaluations for the first-year faculty are formative feedback, and neither alone will result in a rating of Does Not Meet Expectations.

3. Professional Delivery of Assigned Courses

Any concerns regarding the delivery of assigned courses, student complaints, meeting curriculum requirements, and performing accreditation work are the responsibility of the department chair and curriculum committee to bring to the attention of the faculty member and seek resolution. The department committee and chair may include unresolved concerns in their reviews.

4. Teaching Activities and Major Contributions

Teaching activities improve our educational programs in four categories: (1) high-quality teaching, (2) improvements in materials, (3) improvements in methods, and (4) uncommon efforts. Major contributions are significant, strategic investments aligned with program goals and needs.
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The candidate is responsible to list their teaching activities and identify and justify the major contributions using the list and criteria below. Activities not included in the list below must be explained and justified as contributing to the educational goals and needs of the program. They can be claimed as major contributions by justifying how they are comparable to the exemplars given.

a. High-Quality Teaching
   i. Student evaluations averaging above 4.7 across more than one undergraduate lecture section (cross-listed sections are counted as one section). Survey participation must be at least 10 students for reasonable data. *(major contribution, applicable once per year)*
   ii. Teaching awards from the University, UT System, or comparable external organizations. *(major contribution)*
   iii. Teaching awards from the College, Department, or students.

b. Improvements in Materials
   i. Creating and delivering a new lecture course. Student evaluations of that course must average over 3.5. This may also apply to a complete re-creation of an older, out-of-date course. *(major contribution)*
   ii. Development of new sets of student materials – labs, activities, exercises, question banks, and so on. *(major contribution where the new materials cover at least 1/3 of the course and can be reused by other faculty, includes adapting materials for an alternate modality)*
   iii. Comprehensive review of materials, methods from multiple instructors of the same course *(major contribution with documentation of findings and recommendations, dissemination to other instructors)*
   iv. Integration of additional content and technology that enhance students’ career awareness and skill set.

c. Improvements in Methods
   i. Attending an externally hosted or funded teaching workshop or seminar at a peer or aspirant institution. *(major contribution with documentation of impact on teaching methods)*
   ii. Use of innovative teaching methods (technology or pedagogy) justified from the literature. *(major contribution with data-based evaluation)*
   iii. Use of methods and technology that contribute to diverse student success by addressing student needs at an individual level. Simple examples are individual or small-group meetings for test corrections, tutoring sessions, or mentoring. *(major contribution impacts 1/2 the students over 1/2 the course content)*
   iv. Attending University training relevant to teaching.

de. Uncommon Efforts
   i. New preparation for a lecture course the faculty member has not taught before. *(major contribution per two new preparations)*
   ii. Traveling between campuses to teach, including teaching an ITV course. *(major contribution, applicable once per semester)*
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iii. Supervising or mentoring new or temporary faculty in teaching. (major contribution with documentation of helpful bi-weekly interaction including formative feedback or summative evaluation)
iv. Teaching large sections (over 30 undergraduates, or over 10 graduates). (major contribution where over 60 undergraduates, or over 25 graduates)
v. Teaching three or more different lecture courses (not multiple sections of the same course) in one semester. (major contribution for four or more)
Evaluation Rubric for Teaching
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Guidelines for how to present and evaluate these criteria are provided in the Evaluation Criteria for Teaching.

Cumulative Evaluation (Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review)

These criteria are evaluated over the 6-year cumulative review period. Verifiable activity and achievements which will take place in the 6th year (after the submission of the dossier) should be detailed and counted as such.

1. The minimum requirements to Meet Expectations over the cumulative review period are:
   a. Professional delivery of all assigned courses, meeting curriculum and accreditation requirements
   b. Overall student evaluation score of 3.5 or higher
   c. Peer teaching evaluations Meet Expectations on the whole
   d. An average of two teaching activities per year
   e. Two major contributions, from two different categories
   f. Concerns raised by any prior annual rating of Does Not Meet Expectations or Unsatisfactory in the area of Teaching have been addressed (as justified in the service narrative)

2. The minimum requirements to Exceed Expectations over the cumulative review period are:
   a. Fulfill all the cumulative requirements to Meet Expectations AND
   b. Overall student evaluation score of 4.0 or higher
   c. Two peer teaching evaluations of Exceeds Expectations
   d. Five major contributions, from two different categories

Annual Evaluation, including Tenure-Track

These criteria are evaluated over the most recent year (the year under review) only.

1. The minimum requirements to Meet Expectations are:
   a. Professional delivery of all assigned courses, meeting curriculum and accreditation requirements
   b. Overall student evaluation score of 3.5 or higher
   c. Two teaching activities

2. The minimum requirements to Exceed Expectations are:
   a. Fulfill all the requirements to Meet Expectations AND
   b. Overall student evaluation score of 4.0 or higher
   c. One major contribution
Evaluation Rubric for Teaching

Lecturer Review

Guidelines for how to present and evaluate these criteria are provided in the Evaluation Criteria for Teaching.

Cumulative Evaluation (Promotion and Renewal)

These criteria are evaluated over the 3-year cumulative review period. Verifiable activity and achievements which will take place in the 3rd year (after the submission of the dossier) should be detailed and counted as such.

1. The minimum requirements to Meet Expectations over the cumulative review period are:
   a. Professional delivery of all assigned courses, meeting curriculum and accreditation requirements
   b. Overall student evaluation score of 3.5 or higher
   c. Peer teaching evaluations Meet Expectations on the whole
   d. An average of two teaching activities per year
   e. Concerns raised by any prior annual rating of Does Not Meet Expectations or Unsatisfactory in the area of Teaching have been addressed (as justified in the service narrative)

2. The minimum requirements to Exceed Expectations over the cumulative review period are:
   a. Fulfill all the cumulative requirements to Meet Expectations AND
   b. Overall student evaluation score of 4.0 or higher
   c. Two major contributions, from two different categories

Annual Evaluation

These criteria are evaluated over the most recent year (the year under review) only.

1. The minimum requirements to Meet Expectations are:
   a. Professional delivery of all assigned courses, meeting curriculum and accreditation requirements
   b. Overall student evaluation score of 3.5 or higher
   c. Two teaching activities

2. The minimum requirements to Exceed Expectations are:
   a. Fulfill all the requirements to Meet Expectations AND
   b. Overall student evaluation score of 4.0 or higher
   c. One major contribution

Approved by departmental faculty on December 5, 2020
Approved by Department Chair on December 5, 2020
Approved by Dean on February 20, 2020
Approved by Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs on February 24, 2020
Evaluation Criteria for Research

1. Publications

It is the responsibility of the candidate in their research narrative to list the full citations of their published work and describe the significance of the work within their research program. The classifications (Strong, Solid, Reputable) and metrics below are a recommended way to discuss the quality of the works in a way that reviewers, particularly outside the field, can appreciate and verify. In the same spirit, the rubrics use those classifications to characterize how a typical research program utilizes all three classes of venues to regularly publish, to engage and train students, and to develop and disseminate strong, impactful research.

a. Metrics

In Computer Science, conference and journal do not inherently indicate a certain level of quality or impact. They are so similar (peer reviewed, archival, cited) that there has been a decades-long scholarly debate over which type of venue is better for career advancement. A journal version of a paper is often a later, more expansive version of the work (which receives more long-term citations), while the initial impact and prestige was achieved through conference proceedings. Note that titles like symposium and colloquium and even meeting can be used interchangeably with conference. Workshops in Computer Science are also mostly peer-reviewed, published in proceedings, and cited, but typically have higher acceptance rates, welcome works-in-progress and/or serve a very narrow niche.

The proliferation of conferences and journals and the fast-changing nature of the field make evaluating all these venues difficult. In response, algorithmic rankings based on bibliometrics have become more popular. However, they are an indirect measure of quality and lack context. The notable Web of Science Group says in explaining their Journal Citation Reports product:

*The Journal Impact Factor should not be used without careful attention to the many phenomena that influence citation rates – for example the average number of references cited in the average article. The Journal Impact Factor should be used with informed peer review. In the case of academic evaluation for tenure, it is sometimes inappropriate to use the impact of the source journal to estimate the expected frequency of a recently published article. Again, the Journal Impact Factor should be used with informed peer review. Citation frequencies for individual articles are quite varied.*

[https://clarivate.com/webofsciencegroup/solutions/journal-citation-reports/](https://clarivate.com/webofsciencegroup/solutions/journal-citation-reports/)

There have also been efforts to aggregate bibliometric and traditional sources to more reliably characterize quality, such as the GII-GRIN-SCIE Conference Ratings. The investigators on this project comment:

*We realize that using bibliometric indicators may introduce distortions in the evaluation of scientific papers. We also know that the source rankings may have flaws and contain errors. It is therefore unavoidable that the unified rating that we publish in turn contains errors or omissions. Our goal was to limit these errors to the minimum, by leveraging all*
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of the indicators that were available at the sources, and by combining them in such a way to reduce distortions. We expect that in the majority of cases our algorithm classifies conferences in a way that reflects quite closely the consideration of that conference within the international scientific community. There might be cases in which this is not true, and these may be handled in Stage 2 using public feedback from the community.

http://gii-grin-scie-rating.scie.es/conferenceRating.jsf

We observe the following regarding use of these rankings:

1) They should be used to show positive evidence that a venue has the attention of the community in publication and citation.
2) They do not capture all venues or all ways to estimate quality, so lack of high position in any given ranking should not be considered negative proof. Nor does higher position in one ranking or metric prove a venue is superior to another.
3) They should not be used to compare across different subfields since frequencies of publication, citation, and other countable metrics vary.

The following rankings are established and may be useful in describing publications. This is by no means an exclusive list:

Google Scholar Top Venues (Based on h-index, shows top 20 by category)
https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=top_venues&hl=en

Scimago (Based on their SJR metric or h-index, indexes 5561 conferences and journals for Computer Science at this time)
https://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php

GII-GRIN-SCIE Conference Ratings (An aggregation of sources, indexes 2831 conferences at this time with tiered rankings)
http://gii-grin-scie-rating.scie.es/

Conference Ranks (An aggregation of sources, indexes 3655 conferences at this time with tiered rankings)
http://www.conferenceranks.com/

b. Classification of Publications

- Strong venues are the preferred destinations for dissemination of results in a sub-field. This can be demonstrated by inclusion in a selective ranking such as the Google Scholar top 20 conference and journal rankings, inclusion in the top tier (e.g. “A”) for rankings that use a tiered system such as Conference Ranks or GII-GRIN-SCIE, or inclusion in the top fourth for a sub-field in large scale rankings such as Scimago. Other potential justifications for a Strong venue include traditional journal rankings (particularly for publications in related fields outside Computer Science) or detailed analysis of the significance of prior publications at that venue.
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• *Solid* venues fall short of the *Strong* category, but are known and valued within the sub-field and competitive to publish in. Evidence of this is that they appear in established rankings, have publications from established research institutions, and/or are affiliated with an established professional organization (e.g., ACM, IEEE). Those factors combined with acceptance rates under 50% do not need further justification.

• *Reputable* venues fall short of the *Solid* category, but are still peer-reviewed, archival, and citable. Often these will be workshops, new conferences, or serve a small niche sub-field and thus be less well-known and/or have higher acceptance rates.

These classifications assume full acceptance (i.e. full oral presentation with full page count for a conference) and that the candidate or their student is a full and equal contributor to the work. Contribution should be explained where there are multiple non-student authors. If these assumptions are not the case, the classification should be adjusted accordingly.

Other less-common publication types should be explained, classified, and justified in the narrative by comparison with these guidelines.

Identification of target venues and discussion of their current categories should be part of the workload planning process, so that no one is surprised by the claims or the department evaluations.

2. **External Funding**

The candidate is responsible to list active grants and proposals submitted during the review period, including the funding agency, the status of the proposal, the amount requested/rewarded, and the role of the candidate using the terms PI, co-PI, or senior personnel. The term PI is clear across all agencies, and the term senior personnel is understood here to mean a contributor to the program rather than the one that secures funding for it. For the role of co-PI, the candidate should justify that they had a significant role in the strength of the proposal. A candidate listed as senior personnel on a proposal can make the same argument for key contribution. Subcontracts or other situations where the funds are distributed across multiple institutions should detail those arrangements in the narrative. Contracts that do not result in indirect cost recovery should be justified as research expenditure in the narrative.

In several places, we refer to grants and proposals for at least $50,000/yr where the candidate is co-PI or PI. This guideline reflects the typical minimum for substantial grants from large Engineering and Computer Science funding agencies such as NSF and DARPA. Reviewers are encouraged to use their judgment when evaluating the strategic impact of smaller grants or proposals. In particular, being awarded a notably competitive grant for a smaller amount may represent validation of research beyond the funding amount.

3. **Evidence of Research Development**

Engaging with the research community and training students are also elements of a successful research program. The following activities should be detailed in the research narrative as evidence of development and of remaining on track for publications and funding criteria over the cumulative review period:
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a. Publications not accepted or under review
b. Publishing technical reports of research
c. Presentations at conferences without formal proceedings
d. Invited talk or workshop participation
e. Senior personnel on grant proposals or active grants
f. Collaboration with other researchers, internal and external
g. Chairing a Master’s thesis
h. Membership on a Master’s thesis committee
i. Students involved in research through paid assistantships or independent research courses
Evaluation Rubric for Research

Teaching and Administrative Oriented Faculty (10% research workload)

Guidelines for how to present and evaluate these criteria are provided in the Evaluation Criteria for Research. A Strong publication may replace two Solid publications, and a Solid publication may replace two Reputable publications, but not the other way around. Any requirement to submit a grant proposal can also be met by having an active grant that year.

Cumulative Evaluation (Promotion and Post-Tenure Review)

These criteria are evaluated over the 6-year cumulative review period. Verifiable activity and achievements which will take place in the 6th year (after the submission of the dossier) should be detailed and counted as such.

1. The minimum requirements to Meet Expectations over the cumulative review period are:
   a. Three Reputable publications
   b. Two grant proposals submitted (PI or co-PI, min. $20,000/yr)
   c. Evidence of consistent strategic research development

2. The minimum requirements to Exceed Expectations over the cumulative review period are:
   a. Meet all the cumulative requirements to Meet Expectations AND
   b. One of the publications is Solid OR two additional of:
      i. Reputable publication OR
      ii. Grant proposal submitted (PI or co-PI, min. $20,000/yr)

Annual Evaluation

When the candidate is up for non-cumulative annual evaluation, the narrative should indicate the number of years that have passed towards the next cumulative review, summarize the contributions in those prior years, detail the new contributions in most recent year, and justify how the candidate is on track to Meet or Exceed Expectations in the next cumulative review. Reviewers should allow the candidate flexibility in the timing of contributions in accordance with yearly variation and deliberate, strategic planning.

Regardless of prior accomplishments in the cumulative period, the candidate is still expected to be active and productive every year. If the candidate’s most recent years fall below what would generally be required to Meet Expectations, the candidate will not be assessed to Exceed Expectations.
Evaluation Rubric for Research

Core Tenured Faculty (20% research workload)

Guidelines for how to present and evaluate these criteria are provided in the Evaluation Criteria for Research. A Strong publication may replace two Solid publications, and a Solid publication may replace two Reputable publications, but not the other way around. Any requirement to submit a grant proposal can also be met by having an active grant that year.

Cumulative Evaluation (Promotion and Post-Tenure Review)

These criteria are evaluated over the 6-year cumulative review period. Verifiable activity and achievements which will take place in the 6th year (after the submission of the dossier) should be detailed and counted as such.

1. The minimum requirements to Meet Expectations over the cumulative review period are:
   a. One Solid publication
   b. Two additional Reputable publications
   c. Two grant proposals submitted (PI or co-PI, min. $50,000/yr)
   d. Evidence of consistent strategic research development

2. The minimum requirements to Exceed Expectations over the cumulative review period are:
   a. Meet all the cumulative requirements to Meet Expectations AND
   b. One of the publications is Strong OR all three are Solid
   c. $50,000 in external funding (PI or co-PI) during the review period
   d. Student participation in research development activities

Annual Evaluation

When the candidate is up for non-cumulative annual evaluation, the narrative should indicate the number of years that have passed towards the next cumulative review, summarize the contributions in those prior years, detail the new contributions in most recent year, and justify how the candidate is on track to Meet or Exceed Expectations in the next cumulative review. Reviewers should allow the candidate flexibility in the timing of contributions in accordance with yearly variation and deliberate, strategic planning.

Regardless of prior accomplishments in the cumulative period, the candidate is still expected to be active and productive every year. If the candidate’s most recent years fall below what would generally be required to Meet Expectations, the candidate will not be assessed to Exceed Expectations.
Evaluation Rubric for Research

Research Oriented Faculty (30% research workload, all Tenure-Track faculty)

Guidelines for how to present and evaluate these criteria are provided in the Evaluation Criteria for Research. A Strong publication may replace two Solid publications, and a Solid publication may replace two Reputable publications, but not the other way around. Any requirement to submit a grant proposal can also be met by having an active grant that year.

Cumulative Evaluation (Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review)

These criteria are evaluated over the 6-year cumulative review period. Verifiable activity and achievements which will take place in the 6th year (after the submission of the dossier) should be detailed and counted as such.

1. The minimum requirements to Meet Expectations over the cumulative review period are:
   a. Two Solid publications
   b. Three additional Reputable publications
   c. Four grant proposals submitted (PI or co-PI, min. $50,000/yr)
   d. Evidence of consistent strategic research development, including student participation

2. The minimum requirements to Exceed Expectations over the cumulative review period are:
   a. Meet all the cumulative requirements to Meet Expectations AND
   b. Two of the publications are Strong OR all five are Solid
   c. $100,000 in external funding (PI or co-PI) during the review period

Annual Evaluation, including Tenure-Track Annual Evaluation

When the candidate is up for non-cumulative annual evaluation, the narrative should indicate the number of years that have passed towards the next cumulative review, summarize the contributions in those prior years, detail the new contributions in most recent year, and justify how the candidate is on track to Meet or Exceed Expectations in the next cumulative review. Reviewers should allow the candidate flexibility in the timing of contributions in accordance with yearly variation and deliberate, strategic planning.

Regardless of prior accomplishments in the cumulative period, the candidate is still expected to be active and productive every year. If the candidate’s most recent years fall below what would generally be required to Meet Expectations, the candidate will not be assessed to Exceed Expectations.

Note that first year Tenure-Track faculty are afforded an additional 10% research time but are still evaluated at the Research Oriented Faculty tier (30%).
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Evaluation Rubric for Research

High Research Faculty (40% research workload)

Guidelines for how to present and evaluate these criteria are provided in the Evaluation Criteria for Research. A Strong publication may replace two Solid publications, and a Solid publication may replace two Reputable publications, but not the other way around.

Cumulative Evaluation (Promotion and Post-Tenure Review)

These criteria are evaluated over the 6-year cumulative review period. Verifiable activity and achievements which will take place in the 6th year (after the submission of the dossier) should be detailed and counted as such.

1. The minimum requirements to Meet Expectations over the cumulative review period are:
   a. Four Solid publications
   b. An average of $50,000 in external funding (PI or co-PI) per year
   c. Evidence of consistent strategic research development, including student participation

2. The minimum requirements to Exceed Expectations over the cumulative review period are:
   a. Meet all the cumulative requirements to Meet Expectations AND
   b. An average of one Strong publication OR $100,000 in external funding (PI or co-PI) per year

Annual Evaluation

When the candidate is up for non-cumulative annual evaluation, the narrative should indicate the number of years that have passed towards the next cumulative review, summarize the contributions in those prior years, detail the new contributions in most recent year, and justify how the candidate is on track to Meet or Exceed Expectations in the next cumulative review. Reviewers should allow the candidate flexibility in the timing of contributions in accordance with yearly variation and deliberate, strategic planning.

Regardless of prior accomplishments in the cumulative period, the candidate is still expected to be active and productive every year. If the candidate’s most recent years fall below what would generally be required to Meet Expectations, the candidate will not be assessed to Exceed Expectations.
Evaluation Criteria for Service

Every faculty member is expected to contribute in the area of service. Faculty members need to serve at various times on committees at all levels of the institution (e.g., program, department, college, university and community). While we strive to allow for as much flexibility as possible in choosing areas of service, service to the department (which includes student project advising) is expected to be a significant part of all faculty’s service profile during cumulative reviews.

The candidate is responsible to list their service activities for the review period in the service narrative and indicate the significance of each activity. The list of activities below has been organized into five different categories of significance.

Activities that are not in the list must be categorized and justified by the candidate. Comparison to activities in that category is the recommended justification. For committee work, which can vary greatly, the narrative should detail both the significance of the output and the contribution of the candidate to the effort. Sufficient detail must be provided in the narrative so that reviewers can evaluate the appropriateness of the categorization.

1) Primary Service Activities
   - Assessment (ABET, SACS) coordinator
   - Core assessment coordinator
   - Senior projects coordinator
   - Scheduling coordinator
   - Exit exams/surveys coordinator
   - Coordinator for major outreach events (e.g. Programming Contest)
   - Chair of the department Tenure and Promotion committee (who also serves on the College Tenure and Promotion committee)
   - Chair or comparable role on a department, college, or university working committee with significant effort and output. Examples:
     - Faculty search
     - New program development
     - New policy documents
     - Accreditation data and reports

2) Secondary Service Activities
   - College Council member
   - Faculty Senator
   - Alumni outreach coordinator
   - Internship coordinator
   - Member of a faculty evaluation committee
   - Member of a department, college, or university working committee with significant effort and output. Examples:
     - Faculty search
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- New program development
- New policy documents
- Accreditation data and reports
- Advisor for student independent projects beyond assigned teaching workload
  - Students must be enrolled in an independent project course
  - Credit per 6 undergraduate or 2 graduate 3-hour semester-projects within a year
  - (Less than that is considered a minor service activity)

3) Minor Service Activities
- Peer teaching observer (per course observed)
- Library liaison
- Website, social media, or other public relations coordinator
- Presenter for an outreach event
- Official new faculty mentor
- Sponsor for a student organization
- Chair of a minor department or college committee (one that does not meet the criteria for primary/secondary)
- Participation in a departmental event (CS programming contest, serving as judge for CSSRD)

4) Program Advising and Student Project Support
- Participation in group registration advising sessions
- Individual student degree and career advising
- Attending student presentations – capstones, practice talks, defenses, poster sessions etc.

5) External Service Activities
- Conference organizer
- Workshop organizer
- Journal or grant reviewer
- Conference PC member or reviewer
Evaluation Rubric for Service

Tenure-Track Faculty

Participation in a particular area of service is often reliant on having the opportunity to do so. In cases where the chair requested or approved the candidate taking on a certain service instead of an otherwise required service, the narrative should indicate this, and the alternative should be considered to fulfill that requirement. The chair must confirm these cases in their review.

Guidelines for how to present and evaluate these criteria are provided in the Evaluation Criteria for Service. Primary activities may take the place of secondary, and secondary activities may take the place of two minor activities, but not the other way around.

Cumulative Evaluation (Promotion and Tenure)

These criteria are evaluated over the 6-year cumulative review period. Verifiable activity and achievements which will take place in the 6th year (after the submission of the dossier) should be detailed and counted as such.

1. The minimum requirements to Meet Expectations over the cumulative review period are:
   a. On average, fulfill the annual requirements to Meet Expectations every year
   b. Concerns raised by any prior annual rating of Does Not Meet Expectations or Unsatisfactory in the area of Service have been addressed (as justified in the service narrative)

2. The minimum requirements to Exceed Expectations over the cumulative review period are:
   a. Fulfill all the cumulative requirements to Meet Expectations AND
   b. Two additional secondary service contributions
   c. Participation in external service

Annual Evaluation (Tenure-Track)

These criteria are evaluated over the most recent year (the year under review) only.

1. The minimum requirements to Meet Expectations are:
   a. One minor service contribution OR membership on a minor department committee
   b. Membership on department committees-of-the-whole
   c. Participation in program advising and student project support as evenly distributed among the faculty (subject to need and opportunity)

2. The minimum requirements to Exceed Expectations are:
   a. Fulfill all the requirements to Meet Expectations AND
   b. One additional secondary service contribution
   c. Participation in external service
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Evaluation Rubric for Service

Tenured Faculty

Participation in a particular area of service is often reliant on having the opportunity to do so. In cases where the chair requested or approved the candidate taking on a certain service instead of an otherwise required service, the narrative should indicate this, and the alternative should be considered to fulfill that requirement. The chair must confirm these cases in their review.

Guidelines for how to present and evaluate these criteria are provided in the Evaluation Criteria for Service. Primary activities may take the place of secondary, and secondary activities may take the place of two minor activities, but not the other way around.

Cumulative Evaluation (Promotion and Post-Tenure Review)

These criteria are evaluated over the 6-year cumulative review period. Verifiable activity and achievements which will take place in the 6th year (after the submission of the dossier) should be detailed and counted as such.

1. The minimum requirements to Meet Expectations over the cumulative review period are:
   a. On average, fulfill the annual requirements to Meet Expectations every year
   b. Concerns raised by any prior annual rating of Does Not Meet Expectations or Unsatisfactory in the area of Service have been addressed (as justified in the service narrative)

2. The minimum requirements to Exceed Expectations over the cumulative review period are:
   a. Fulfill all the cumulative requirements to Meet Expectations AND
   b. Exceed Expectations in service in three of the years during the cumulative review period

Annual Evaluation

These criteria are evaluated over the most recent year (the year under review) only.

1. The minimum requirements to Meet Expectations are:
   a. Per 10% service workload:
      i. One secondary service contribution OR two minor service contributions
   b. Membership on department committees-of-the-whole
   c. Membership on minor department committees as evenly distributed among the faculty
   d. Participation in program advising and student project support as evenly distributed among the faculty (subject to need and opportunity)

2. The minimum requirements to Exceed Expectations are:
   a. Per 10% service workload:
      i. One primary service contribution OR
      ii. One secondary service contribution AND one minor service contribution
   b. Fulfill the remainder of the requirements to Meet Expectations (b-d)
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Evaluation Rubric for Service

Lecturers

Participation in a particular area of service is often reliant on having the opportunity to do so. In cases where the chair requested or approved the candidate taking on a certain service instead of an otherwise required service, the narrative should indicate this, and the alternative should be considered to fulfill that requirement. The chair must confirm these cases in their review.

Guidelines for how to present and evaluate these criteria are provided in the Evaluation Criteria for Service. Primary activities may take the place of secondary, and secondary activities may take the place of two minor activities, but not the other way around.

Cumulative Evaluation (Promotion and Renewal)

These criteria are evaluated over the 3-year cumulative review period. Verifiable activity and achievements which will take place in the 3rd year (after the submission of the dossier) should be detailed and counted as such.

1. The minimum requirements to Meet Expectations over the cumulative review period are:
   a. On average, fulfill the annual requirements to Meet Expectations every year
   b. Concerns raised by any prior annual rating of Does Not Meet Expectations or Unsatisfactory in the area of Service have been addressed (as justified in the service narrative)

2. The minimum requirements to Exceed Expectations over the cumulative review period are:
   a. Fulfill all the cumulative requirements to Meet Expectations AND
   b. Exceed Expectations in service in two of the years during the cumulative review period

Annual Evaluation

These criteria are evaluated over the most recent year (the year under review) only.

1. The minimum requirements to Meet Expectations are:
   a. Per 10% service workload:
      i. One secondary service contribution OR two minor service contributions
   b. Membership on department committees-of-the-whole
   c. Membership on minor department committees as evenly distributed among the faculty
   d. Participation in program advising and student project support as evenly distributed among the faculty (subject to need and opportunity)

2. The minimum requirements to Exceed Expectations are:
   a. Per 10% service workload:
      i. One primary service contribution OR
      ii. One secondary service contribution AND one minor service contribution
   b. Fulfill the remainder of the requirements to Meet Expectations (b-d)
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