

Bylaws of the Department of Computer Science

The University Of West Florida

Preamble

The Community of Scholars Concept dictates that policy-making within a department be vested in the faculty of the department. In keeping with this concept, the faculty of the Department of Computer Science shall recommend policy; the department chair shall carry out policy. For the purposes of this document, the department chair shall be defined as the person responsible for faculty evaluations and budgetary issues. In the firm conviction that an orderly process is essential to the government of a department, we, the faculty of the Department of Computer Science, do enact these bylaws.

1. Mission

Consistent with the Mission Statement of The University of West Florida, the mission of the Department of Computer Science is threefold. First, its primary mission is to deliver the highest possible quality of instruction in all programs of the department at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Second, the department will develop and enhance its research commitment in areas related to its programs, thereby furthering its reputation at the state, national, and international levels. Third, the department will promote the adoption and effective application of modern computer technology through outreach activities such as courses, seminars, or workshops directed to practicing computer professionals and to the user community in general.

2. Governance and Policies

2.1. The Faculty

The department shall be administered by the department chair with advice from the faculty. Subject to the Board of Trustees regulations and the bylaws of the University Faculty Senate and the College of Science and Engineering Council, the faculty shall develop the policies and procedures of the department. The faculty shall provide advice and recommendations to the department chair in matters of (1) educational policy, (2) promotion and tenure, (3) resource allocation priorities for equipment, personnel, and physical plant, and (4) student affairs.

2.2. Voting Membership

Members of the Faculty (including phased retirees during the term in which they teach) who hold the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, or lecturer are voting members of the department.

All other persons affiliated with the department (faculty associates, adjuncts, emeritus professors, and visiting faculty of any designation) are encouraged to attend and participate in faculty meetings but are not extended voting privileges.

A majority vote shall be defined as greater than half of the eligible voters within the department.

2.3. Department Meetings

Faculty meetings will be held at least twice during the Fall/Spring academic year. Special meetings may be called during the Fall/Spring academic year by the department chair or upon written request by three or more members of the faculty.

2.4 Cancellation of Classes

In the event of an illness or emergency, the instructor must contact the chair at the earliest possible time. The chairperson will attempt to arrange for a suitable substitute. If one cannot be found, the instructor should review the current schedule and make adjustments as needed to get the class back on schedule.

In the event of a planned absence, such as for a conference, the instructor must either arrange for a substitute or make other adjustments to the course to keep the class on schedule.

3. Departmental Committees

3.1. The Scholarship Committee

This committee shall be responsible for assigning scholarship and assistantship funding.

3.2. The Curriculum and Assessment Committee

This committee shall develop programs for degrees, tracks, or options, and shall review and approve new course proposals, texts, and changes of current course descriptions. The committee shall also be responsible for the department's continuous improvement process, reviewing reports from assessment activities and, as appropriate, recommending curriculum changes. Major proposed course modifications and other major recommendations shall be presented to the full faculty for approval.

3.3. The Promotion and/or Tenure Committee

This ad hoc committee may be convened when necessary to consider requests for promotion and/or tenure. The department chair may invite the participation of faculty from outside the department if the committee would otherwise be inconveniently small. In all cases, the department chair shall not be a member of the committee. The committee shall discuss candidates for tenure and/or promotion and provide the department chair with a written recommendation. The committee will also carry out any additional tasks requested by the chair related to the promotion and tenure process.

3.4. The Search Committees

These ad hoc committees are responsible for the recommendation of appropriate applicants for all open and converted faculty positions within the department. Faculty search committees shall advertise and screen potential candidates for faculty positions, subject to the procedures and regulations of the University. Recommendations of these committees shall be submitted to the department chair for appropriate action.

3.5. The Mentoring Committees

As provided for in the University's Annual Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion Policy, the department chair may establish ad hoc mentoring committees to assist new faculty members in their professional growth and adaptation to the University.

3.6. Additional Committees

The department chair may form additional ad hoc committees to carry out specific tasks when such are needed for the functioning of the department.

4. Membership of Committees

When vacancies are open on any committee, the department chair shall poll the faculty for volunteers or nominations. The chair shall then name committee members having regard for the experience of each member of the faculty and for the need for diverse representation of viewpoints. In case of conflicts, the chair shall call for a vote of the faculty.

5. Voting Procedures

Issues carried to the faculty for resolution by vote require a majority of eligible voters for passage. Eligible voters are those faculty identified in section 2.2. Absent members may vote by means of a signed proxy.

6. The Department Chair

The department chair is expected to provide leadership for the faculty in the areas of teaching, research, curriculum and program development, and general university service. The chair nominates ad hoc committees, supervises all elections, and administers the academic and budgetary policies of the department with advice and assistance from the faculty.

6.1. The Department Plan

The department chair is charged with the task of preparation and maintenance of a long-range plan consistent with the academic planning process of the University. This plan shall be presented annually to the faculty for informational purposes.

6.2. Performance Evaluation

The term of service as department chair will be four years, renewable once. Performance of the chair will be evaluated using the procedures and instruments developed by the departmental committee formed for that purpose.

7. Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review (PTR)

UWF has adopted a set of criteria and standards for the assessment of a faculty member's performance of assigned duties and responsibilities. There are three performance categories: teaching, scholarship and creative projects, and service. These assessment criteria from each of the performance categories shall form the basis for promotion and tenure decisions. The following performance levels will be used in evaluating faculty efforts in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service.

Unsatisfactory – Failure to meet expectations that reflect disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in applicable university regulations and policies.

Does Not Meet Expectation – Overall performance includes some strengths, but one or more major weaknesses exist requiring remediation.

Meets Expectation – Meets department standards for professional performance, and no areas of weakness exist.

Exceeds Expectation – Exceeds department standards for professional performance and exceeds the standards for excellence in quality, quantity, or both.

For details on the above rankings, please refer to section 7.3.

7.1. Minimum Standards

The minimum performance standards are expected with sustained effort throughout the evaluation period. Evaluation will be based on the three categories: teaching, scholarship and creative projects, and service.

7.1.1. Mid-Term Review

In accordance with UWF policies on Tenure and Promotion, the department shall conduct a tenure mid-term review approximately halfway through each faculty member's probationary period. This would normally be during the third year of a faculty member's appointment at the UWF unless a different probationary period was indicated in the appointment letter. The chair shall establish an appropriate timeline for each faculty member's review process.

7.1.1.1. Mid-Term Review Process

It is the responsibility of the faculty member's mentors to guide the faculty member in preparing the mid-point review. The faculty member shall prepare a dossier for review summarizing activities during the probationary period, as defined in UWF's T & P guidelines, containing at least the following items:

- a) Letter of Initial Appointment.
- b) Statement of Contributions (self-evaluation).
- c) Current CV.
- d) Annual Evaluations.
- e) Student/Peer Evaluations of Teaching.
- f) Examples of Teaching Materials.
- g) Evidence of Scholarship.
- h) Examples of Service.

The Tenure and Promotion Committee shall review the dossier and provide a written evaluation regarding progress toward tenure & promotion to the chair, with a copy to the faculty member. The chair reviews the dossier and the Committee's evaluation and provides a written evaluation to the dean, with a copy to the faculty member. The dean provides a written response to the chair and the faculty member, which may include recommendations for performance improvement.

Faculty members may elect to include a copy of the mid-point review evaluation letters in the tenure portfolio; however, inclusion is not required.

7.1.2. Tenure

To be granted tenure, a faculty member must meet expectations in teaching, research, and service in three of the five-year evaluation period.

Scholarship and Creative Activity Indicators:

- At least two peer-reviewed journal or conference publications and the equivalent of two tier-one items (tier-one items are elaborated in section 7.3.2) over the evaluation period.
- Faculty member's publication record reflects an identifiable research agenda in computing.

7.1.3. Promotion to Associate Professor

To be promoted to Associate Professor, a faculty member must meet expectations in teaching, research, and service in three of the five-year evaluation period.

Scholarship and Creative Activity Indicators:

- At least two peer-reviewed journal or conference publications and the equivalent of three tier-one items (tier-one items are elaborated in section 7.3.2) over the evaluation period.
- Faculty member's publication record reflects an identifiable research agenda in computing.

7.1.4. Promotion to Full Professor

To be promoted to Full Professor, a faculty member must exceed expectations in at least one category and meet expectations in each of the other two categories for three of a five-year evaluation period.

Scholarship and Creative Activity Indicators:

- At least two peer-reviewed journal or conference publications (after promotion to Associate) and the equivalent of four tier-one items (tier-one items are elaborated in section 7.3.2) over the evaluation period.
- Faculty member's publication record reflects an identifiable research agenda in computing.

7.1.5. Promotion to Senior Lecturer

To be promoted to Senior Lecturer, a candidate must meet expectations in teaching and service in three of the five-year evaluation period. An unsatisfactory evaluation in the evaluation period does not facilitate a favorable promotion decision.

7.1.6. Post-Tenure Review

The University of West Florida adheres to Florida Board of Governors' Regulation 10.003, as well as Article 11 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, in all matters relating to post-tenure review. Accordingly, all full-time faculty beyond the rank of assistant professor are evaluated for post-tenure review (PTR) every five years. Faculty are evaluated on the criteria of unsatisfactory, does not meet expectation, meets expectation, and exceeds expectation. Additionally, the Department of Computer Science endorses the University standard that post-tenure review criteria should consider the faculty member's performance holistically over the five-year post-tenure review period and not solely over the period of a single annual assignment or evaluation. With this standard in mind, the department endorses the following post-tenure review criteria:

Exceeds Expectations:

The faculty member must exceed expectations in three of the five-year evaluation period in teaching, scholarly & creative activities, or service.

Meets Expectations:

The faculty member must meet expectations in teaching, scholarly & creative activities, and service in the annual evaluation for three of the five-year evaluation period.

Does not Meet Expectations:

The faculty member does not meet expectations in teaching, scholarly & creative activities or service in the annual evaluation for three or more of the five-year evaluation period.

Unsatisfactory:

An unsatisfactory evaluation in the evaluation period does not facilitate a favorable PTR decision.

7.2. Criteria

It is expected that all faculty will conduct themselves in accordance with the policies outlined in UWF Professional Standards, and the UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement Collegiality will be used in the evaluation. Criteria evaluating teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service include, but are not limited to, the following (the order of the listing does not reflect relative importance):

7.2.1. Teaching

For tenure and promotion, a record of excellent teaching is required. Teaching effectiveness can be demonstrated with but is not limited to

- Satisfactory student evaluations
- Peer evaluations of teaching based on direct observation including, but not limited to, classroom observation
- Organization and planning of courses
- Clear and definitive explanation of assignments
- Engaging students in research projects
- Implementing new/innovative learning strategies
- Updating course material to incorporate advancements in the field
- Design, develop, and deliver new courses and/or programs
- Conference workshop or seminar participation related to specialized area
- Teaching awards
- Participation in teaching-development programs
- Teaching specialty topics in seminars, discussion groups, and other student-centric delivery forums
- Directing students in undergraduate and graduate theses
- Directing students in undergraduate and graduate projects

7.2.2. Scholarly and Creative Activity

Scholarly and creative activity consists of creative works that are externally reviewed and publicly available, including, but not limited to

- Peer-reviewed journal publications
- Developed software that is in use by industry, academic institutions, or is publicly available through a well-recognized software-dissemination organization. Examples include GNU and Open Source.
- Internally sponsored research
- Externally sponsored research
- Peer-reviewed conference publications
- Invited talks on research area
- Chapters or books on specialized subjects
- Presentations resulting in peer review of research
- Poster sessions resulting in peer review of research

- Organize conferences or workshops

7.2.3. Service

Service is broadly defined and includes a wide range of services including, but not limited to

- Service on University, College, and Department governance
- Service as department chair or program director
- Community service related to one's discipline
- Service to the University in the form of travel to and from remote campus locations
- Advising student organizations
- Advising student curricula
- Service to professional organizations
- Services related to recruitment and retention of students
- Service on editorial review boards
- Service on conference committees
- Articulation efforts at various levels
- Outreach activities that promote the department
- Participation in Computer Science professional organizations or their local chapters
- Organize or participate in the implementation of district-wide activities such as programming contests, mathematical or science contests, science fairs, and other science-education activities
- Textbook, manuscript, and grant-reviewing activity
- Curriculum development to meet the needs of the community and to keep abreast of the rapidly evolving computing sciences
- Recruitment and retention activities
- ABET accreditation activities

7.3. Departmental Criteria for Evaluation

7.3.1. Teaching

In this performance area, the rating of Unsatisfactory does not facilitate favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

7.3.1.1. Does Not Meet Expectations

Demonstrates some positive teaching outcomes but produces major areas for concern that have a moderately negative impact on students and their learning typically as reflected by a combination of several of the indicators below. In general, teaching performance is moderately below the department's standards of excellence.

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document areas of moderate concern (ratings below the department average)
- Teaching philosophy not clearly expressed in course planning and activities
- Syllabi needs to provide clearer and more appropriate expectations
- Assessment practices show some difficulty in supporting student learning and meeting department need
- Goals and course content reflect limited continuous improvement effort
- Some pedagogical practices need attention
- Some student support practices need improvement
- Advising, mentoring, and student supervision practices need improvement
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) could be executed with greater competence
- Occasional challenges related to academic integrity, including disrespect for students and their rights
- Does not typically participate in teaching development activity

Implication:

Some remediation is necessary. Change will need to be substantial to qualify for tenure and promotion.

7.3.1.2. Meets Expectation

Demonstrates consistent teaching effectiveness with positive outcomes for students as reflected by some of the indicators below.

Indicators:

- Student evaluations document consistently positive impact on learning
- Teaching philosophy provides a foundation for coherent course planning and activities
- Syllabi provides clear and appropriate performance expectations
- Assessment practices enhance student learning and contribute to department needs
- Goals and course content routinely provide evidence of continuous improvement effort
- Pedagogical practices facilitate appropriate and effective learning conditions
- Student support practices facilitate appropriate and effective student development

- High impact practice (HIP) activities incorporated into courses
- Mentoring and student supervision practices receive a consistent favorable review
- Special teaching assignments (e.g., honors, capstone, general education) executed with expert skill
- Appropriate standards of academic integrity promoted, including respect for students and their rights
- Participates voluntarily in professional development activities to improve teaching quality and flexibility

Implication:

Performance at this level justifies favorable tenure and promotion decision.

7.3.1.3. Exceeds Expectations

Demonstrates an unusually high degree of quality in teaching as shown by some of the following indicators

Indicators:

- Numerical student evaluation data document clear statistical exceptionality
- Narrative statements emphasize powerful impact on learner or transformative learning experiences
- Teaching awards honor high-caliber of performance
- Leadership evident in the promotion of high-quality teaching and curriculum development in the department

Implication:

Performance at this level easily justifies favorable tenure and promotion decision.

7.3.2. Scholarship and Creative Activities

In this performance area, the rating of Unsatisfactory does not facilitate favorable tenure decisions.

Ratings are based on two tiers of accomplishments. The indicators listed below are for the evaluation period. While all accomplishments listed in the two tiers are considered significant activities, the tier-one accomplishments demonstrate a level of maturity within the discipline.

Tier-one exemplars include computing-related accomplishments:

- Peer-reviewed journal publication of equivalent prestige as those indexed by Scopus
- Peer-reviewed conference publication of equivalent prestige as those in CORE ranked B or above
- Competitive external grant of at least \$20,000
- Authored book or textbook published by a respectable publisher such as Springer, Elsevier
- Authored chapter in a research book published by a respectable publisher such as Springer, Elsevier

Tier-two exemplars include computing-related accomplishments:

- Peer-reviewed conference publication not rising to the level of a tier-1 conference publication
- Competitive external grant of less than \$20,000
- Peer-reviewed poster session not published in the proceedings
- Authored chapter in a book or textbook
- Invited to talk on research
- Edited book or textbook
- Published technical report

Tier-one and tier-two items are the means for measuring the criteria for the different performance categories. Three tier-two items are considered equivalent to one tier-one item. Conversion of tier-two to tier-one items may not yield a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision.

7.3.2.1. Does not Meet Expectations

Demonstrates only minor tangible progress toward executing a scholarly and creative agenda, as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative projects are moderately below the department standards of excellence.

Indicators:

- Incoherent research focus
- Judgment about ethical standards for scholarly and artistic production may be problematic at times
- Limited documented attempts at scholarly and creative activities

Implication:

No support for tenure or promotion, but shows future productivity promise.

7.3.2.2. Meets Expectations

Demonstrates satisfactory execution of scholarship or creative activity agenda related to the discipline and well suited to regional comprehensive university context as shown by the indicators below. In general, scholarly and creative projects meet the department standards for excellence in both quality and quantity.

Indicators:

- Equivalent of at least three tier-one items in the current and past three years combined.

Implication:

Performance at this level facilitates favorable promotion/tenure decisions.

7.3.2.3. Exceeds Expectation

Demonstrates unusually high degree of skill in design and execution of scholarly and creative projects as shown by the indicators below. In general, this performance exceeds department standards for excellence in both quality and quantity.

Indicators:

- Equivalent of at least four tier-one items in the current and past three years combined.

Implication:

Easily qualifies for favorable promotion and tenure decisions.

7.3.3. Service

In this performance area, the rating of Unsatisfactory does not facilitate favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

7.3.3.1. Does Not Meet Expectations

Demonstrates only minor tangible progress in service contributions, as shown by the indicators below. In general, service is moderately below department standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- Minimal contributions made in service role (e.g., "sits" on committees as compared to active participation)
- Over-commitment to service spreads faculty time and energy too thinly to facilitate effectiveness
- Community service, if applicable, provides limited, tangential synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and service functions.

Implication:

No support for tenure/promotion.

7.3.3.2. Meets Expectation

Demonstrates satisfactory execution of service contributions as shown by the indicators below. In general, service contributions meet the department's standards for excellence.

Indicators:

- Scope and effort level meet department standards
- Colleagues view contributions to the department as effective
- Service agenda well suited to regional comprehensive university mission
- Service contributions represent strategic decisions that balance demands from the discipline, department, campus, and community
- Potential shown for wide recognition inside and outside of the university
- Community service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions. For example, serving as the technical consultant for a local school.

Implication:

Performance at this level qualifies for favorable promotion/tenure decisions.

7.3.3.3. Exceeds Expectations

Demonstrates high degree of skill in service contributions as shown by the indicators below that build upon indicators for Meets Expectations. In general, service contributions exceed the department's standards for excellence.

Indicators

- Leadership demonstrated in targeted arenas of service (e.g., holds elected office; collaborates skillfully and innovatively)
- Problems solved proactively through vigorous contributions
- Wide external recognition (local, national, or international audiences) or awards achieved for quality of service contributions
- Community service provided significant and measurable impact; service provides excellent synergy between the faculty member's area of expertise and the service functions

Implication

Performance easily qualifies for favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

8. Amendments

These bylaws may be amended by a majority vote of the faculty. The text of any proposed amendment must be submitted in writing to the members of the faculty as an agenda item at least one week prior to the meeting at which the amendment is to be voted upon.

9. Enactment

The provisions of these bylaws shall be enacted and shall govern the activities of the department upon an affirmative vote of the majority of the department.

10. History

February 08, 2008	Adopted by unanimous vote of the faculty
November 21, 2008	Modified by the faculty
December 06, 2008	Modified by the faculty
June 2, 2014	Modified by the faculty
November 17, 2015	Modified and accepted by unanimous vote of the faculty

February 7th, 2020
April 8th, 2024

Modified and accepted by unanimous vote of the faculty
Modified and accepted by a majority vote of the faculty

