

**Department of Computer Science**

**College of Engineering and  
Applied Science**

**University of Colorado Colorado Springs**

**Criteria, Standards and Evidence for  
Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure**

**Effective Date: February 13, 2023**

## **RPT Document for the Department of Computer Science**

### **Introduction:**

Standards and processes for reappointment, promotion, and tenure of the faculty are governed by Regent Law Article 5. These processes and requirements are further delineated in Regent Policy, University of Colorado Administrative Policy Statements, and the “Faculty Statement of Principles of Professional and Ethical Responsibilities” approved in 2008 by the University of Colorado faculty. Campus guidance is supplied in UCCS Policy # 200-001. The Department of Computer Science incorporates the above processes and requirements into its departmental criteria, which are to be used throughout the review process.

These criteria are to be considered essential for the general review of candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure in the Department of Computer Science at the University of Colorado Colorado Springs. The department is committed to quality teaching, strong research/creative work, and effective leadership and service to the university, the profession, and the community. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in our discipline. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. The evaluation process assumes: possession of an appropriate terminal degree; competent education and training in the discipline(s); conduct which reflects the professional and academic standards for generating, validating, disputing, and transmitting knowledge; and an appreciation of and respect for the rights, duties, and privileges associated with academic freedom and collegial responsibilities.

When these criteria are applied to faculty who were granted time toward tenure, the work performed during the years granted toward tenure will be considered equivalent to work performed at UCCS. While a faculty member’s career record will be considered in personnel actions described here, the main emphasis of evaluation will be on work performed at UCCS and, in particular, progress since the last review.

The Computer Science Department has decided to recognize and reward scholarly activity and creative work related to the field of computer science such as peer-reviewed video games and peer-reviewed computer-generated graphics and films, but will not credit such activity towards promotion or tenure. Therefore, such activities will be restricted only to tenured faculty. Such activity will count towards workload, annual evaluation, and post-tenure review but not towards tenure or promotion.

Candidate faculty dossiers will include a copy of the candidate’s Google-scholar page or the equivalent list of all works with citations, with only their papers and the citations counts to those papers; the candidate will place this copy in their research summary.

Traditionally, the Computer Science department has appointed a committee to make reappointment, promotion and tenure-recommendations, and this will continue. This approach is consistent with APS 1022. The department chair also writes a supporting letter in each case.

The criteria detailed below can be amended by majority vote of the department faculty subject to approval by the Dean of the College of Engineering and Applied Science and the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

**Definitions:**

A *refereed publication* is a paper that receives multiple formal written reviews provided before acceptance and publication and is not viewed by the primary unit committee as a predatory publisher. A candidate can request a faculty vote on if a publisher is predatory before submitting a publication. The reviews will be included in the dossier.

*Significant publications* are those that are more likely to have long term impact or have demonstrated significance by their level of citations. We define *Significant publications* to include journal, conference, workshop and other papers, which meet either of the following two properties:

1. Refereed paper in a venue from top 20 listed Google Scholar Engineering and Computer Science subcategory or a venue with a Google metric h-index of at least 20. The portfolio will include supporting data. As the metrics can change candidates will capture the metrics in the year when the paper is published/submitted. Ideally capture the metrics in the year when the paper is submitted.

OR

2. Any paper with at least 30 non-self-citations in Google Scholar. The candidate will need to list the citations in the dossier. Papers with higher citation numbers can be considered very significant papers, which may be counted as more than regular papers with each 30 non-self-citations counting as an added non-significant paper.

The department values multi-author publications and does not place any difference on the weight on papers based on author ordering on publications.

A *significant proposal/grant* is defined as a competitively reviewed external proposal/grant in which the candidate is the PI and is responsible for the funding of at least \$150,000. Reviews of the significant proposal will be included in the dossier. REU grants and funding for developing or deployed MOOCS or other creative works can be counted as research or teaching (i.e. not both) and must be clearly specified how they are to be counted.

For total grant funding, the “responsible” share of grant by a candidate is computed based on the workload allocation form associated with the grant, e.g., as specified via the workload and ICR agreement ([https://www.uccs.edu/eas/sites/eas/files/inline-files/Workload\\_and\\_ICR\\_distribution\\_agreement.pdf](https://www.uccs.edu/eas/sites/eas/files/inline-files/Workload_and_ICR_distribution_agreement.pdf)).

Teaching Metrics: The candidate’s teaching will be evaluated by multiple means, which may include:

- Faculty Course Questionnaires (“FCQ”) (required documentation)
- Teaching load (required documentation)

- Letters from candidate-selected students
- Faculty peer reviews of teaching
- Letters from Primary Unit Committee-selected students
- The candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor, and similar activities will be considered
- Candidate demonstration that their courses are coherently organized and thoughtfully presented
- Candidate demonstration of their commitment to teaching, evidence of which will be good interaction with students, concern with curriculum, and satisfactory development of skills in presenting material
- Teaching above required load or course to support department teaching needs
- Improvement and innovations in teaching methods and in curriculum development and contribution to the department will be taken into consideration
- Developing and updating course notes and **writing books** are important facets of teaching and will be taken into consideration
- Developing web support for teaching
- Curriculum and Scholarship Grants
- Student Mentoring (including independent student research projects)
- Curriculum Development (including **textbook authoring**).
- Curriculum, Scholarship Grants
- REU grants can be counted as research or teaching (i.e. not both)
- **Funding to create MOOCs and funding that comes to the campus from MOOCs can be counted as research or teaching (i.e. not both)**
- **Teaching awards**
- **Textbooks adopted by other institutions**
- **Evaluation data from MOOCs**
- **Letters from mentored students/faculty/instructors from other institutions/departments**
- **Refereed publications on computer science education, which can be counted as research or teaching (i.e. not both)**

*In this list above, italicized and bolded items are considered measures of impact beyond instructional setting.*

The FCQ analysis for any review will use the specified number of terms before review and compares the candidates FCQ scores compared to the per term average over the full set of comparable courses on the FCQ questions that address:

1. The course increasing knowledge
2. The instructor's role on explaining course ideas
3. The instructor's role in encouraging interest
4. The instructor's role in demonstrating interest in student learning

The analysis can be restricted to FCQs from a full set of departmental classes of comparable size, level and "required" status. The candidate will provide a spreadsheet with the analysis which will include the list of courses used in the analysis and why they

are the full set of comparable courses. The primary unit will verify the computation including the list of courses.

A positive peer review of teaching can be included in the evaluation, and the portfolio may combine it with above standard performance on other items. The choice of peers must be consistent with the department's Peer Observation and Review document.

Activities promoting equality and/or diversity and/or inclusivity can be geared toward teaching, research and service. The faculty member shall make a case in which category it should be considered, taking into account its relationship to Computer Science.

### **Initial Reappointment Review:**

The candidate's total record, including teaching, research, and leadership and service, will be evaluated. No specific rating in each area is required, but the record must show sufficient potential for future success to justify reappointment.

**Teaching:** In addition to a demonstration of quality via the Teaching Metrics defined above, the candidate will:

1. Teach the requisite number of credit hours for the approved workload.  
Note: Thirty accumulated thesis/project credit hours, not used for buying out of a course, count as a three-credit hour class when calculating the number of credit hours taught.
2. Achieve a two-term FCQ analysis of not more than one standard deviation below the department or the evaluation of comparable classes for the FCQ questions listed above. If using a comparable list, it is the candidate's responsibility to provide a spreadsheet with the computation.

For initial reappointment review, a positive peer review of teaching can be included in the evaluation. The choice of reviewer must be consistent with the department's Peer Observation and Review document.

**Research and Creative Work:** The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work which integrates existing knowledge, and applied research. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research and creative works, including MOOCs and textbooks, which can be counted as research and creative work or teaching but not both. The candidate will demonstrate a well-designed research plan and the potential for continued development as a researcher and progress toward publication. This might include drafts of work in progress, presentations at professional meetings, and/or articles submitted for publication.

**Leadership and Service:** The department recognizes leadership and service to the campus, community and to our profession. At this stage, the candidate will be involved in departmental meetings and activities supporting the department programs overall. The candidate will document each such activity.

### **Comprehensive Reappointment Review:**

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and leadership and service will each be evaluated separately as below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. The candidate must demonstrate sufficient progress toward tenure to justify reappointment. This will typically be a rating of at least meritorious in all three areas. The review may also take into account issues of material bearing such as strategic goals of the department, college, and campus.

Rating of Excellent in either research or teaching, and rating of Meritorious or better in the other two areas will be considered “on track for tenure”. Rating of Meritorious or better in two areas will be considered “not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections”. Rating of Meritorious or better in only one area will be considered “not on track for tenure”.

Per campus policy, the department will solicit letters from respected scholars in the candidate’s field(s) of research.

For a comprehensive review, proposal and grant activity can include both PI and Co-PI roles as long as the candidate has responsibility for a reasonable part of the effort. REU grants can be counted toward either teaching or research but not both.

**Teaching:** The teaching reviews based on the teaching metrics given above form the basis of the teaching evaluation at the comprehensive review.

Meritorious: Teaching is meritorious if the candidate meets all of the following criteria:

1. Teaches the requisite number of credit hours for the approved workload.
2. For the last three terms in the evaluation period, an FCQ analysis for the FCQ questions listed above that is not more than 1 standard deviation below the department average or comparable classes. If using a comparable list, it is the candidate’s responsibility to provide a spreadsheet with the computation.
3. Overall positive evaluation on at least two other teaching metrics from the list in the definitions section.

Excellent: Teaching is excellent if all the criteria of meritorious are met and if the candidate meets at least one of the following three criteria:

1. Teaches on load more than the requisite number of hours (including the accumulated thesis/project hours) and FCQ analysis is at least  $\frac{1}{4}$  standard deviation above the department or comparable classes for the FCQ questions listed above  
OR
2. Achieves FCQ ratings detailed above with at least  $\frac{3}{4}$  standard deviation above the student evaluations in comparable classes  
OR

3. Wins one significant external grant for curriculum or student scholarship.

**Research and Creative Work:** The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work which integrates existing knowledge and applied research. Such research is expected to be published in peer-reviewed venues. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research.

**Meritorious:** A rating of meritorious requires a candidate to show reasonable progress toward tenure as demonstrated by both six external proposals submitted and five refereed papers accepted for publication.

**Excellent:** Under Regent Policy 5.D.2.(B), requirements for tenure appointment, a recommendation of tenure based on excellence in scholarly/creative work will include evidence of impact beyond the institution. For comprehensive evaluation, a rating of excellent requires a candidate to show reasonable progress toward tenure as demonstrated by satisfaction of all the following three criteria:

1. Seven total refereed publications, including at least one significant paper, and
2. Either being responsible for more than \$100K in external research grant funding or submitting 10 total external proposals, and
3. Receiving overall positive external peer review letters.

Each of 1, 2 and 3 are viewed as providing evidence of impact beyond the institution, and combined they show excellence.

The above criteria provide sufficient but not necessary conditions for evaluation of meritorious or excellence in research. The committee can also consider the overall research dossier of the candidate, including the external letters, in making its recommendation, e.g., external recognition of the research impact or exceeding the stated criteria in one category can make up for minor shortfalls in another category.

**Leadership and Service:** The department recognizes leadership and service to the campus, community and to our profession. A rating of meritorious requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and some service to the college, campus, community or profession. A rating of excellent requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and multiple service contributions to the college, campus, community, or profession. In evaluating leadership and service, both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered.



## **Promotion to Associate Professor and/or Awarding of Tenure:**

Computer science is a field that, because of its very rapid pace and its focus on computer technology, has developed a set of standards for pursuing and disseminating research that is not the same as other fields. While we include all of the standard "components," we also have less traditional items, such as web-only publications and the impact of software that is shared with others. More significantly, as has been well documented, computer science places a much stronger emphasis on *selective* conferences, which are often more selective and have a greater impact than journals. This is discussed in The Computer Research Associations Best practice guide to tenure and promotion in computer science, developed by a blue ribbon committee, [http://www.cra.org/reports/tenure\\_review.html](http://www.cra.org/reports/tenure_review.html). The department guidelines proposed herein are in keeping with that seminal guide, which we anticipate will be included with each folder for promotion and/or tenure of a CS faculty.

For tenure and/or promotion review, proposal and grant activity can include both PI and Co-PI roles, with funding levels pro-rated according to the grant workload agreement. REU grants can be counted toward either teaching or research but not both. Faculty hired from other institutions may have time and funding levels counted toward tenure, with the details discussed by the primary unit tenure and promotion committee and specified in the hiring offer.

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and leadership and service will each be evaluated separately as below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. The candidate must be rated as, at least, meritorious in all three areas and must receive a rating of excellent in either teaching or research.

The department will solicit letters from respected scholars in the candidate's field(s) of research per campus policy.

**Teaching:** The department defined teaching metrics in the definitions section above.

Meritorious: Teaching is meritorious if the candidate meets all of the following criteria:

1. Teaches the requisite number of credit hours for the approved workload.
2. Achieves a three-term FCQ analysis that is not more than one standard deviation below comparable classes for the FCQ questions listed above.
3. Receives overall positive evaluation on at least two other teaching metrics from the list in the definitions section.

Excellent: Teaching is excellent if all the criteria of meritorious are met, if the candidate has demonstrated impact beyond the instructional setting, and if the candidate meets at least one of the following criteria:

1. Teaches on load more than the requisite number of hours (including the accumulated thesis/project hours) and FCQ analysis is at least ¼ standard deviation above comparable classes for the FCQ questions listed above  
OR
2. Achieves FCQ ratings detailed above with at least ¾ standard deviation above the student evaluations in comparable classes  
OR
3. Wins one *significant external* grant for curriculum or student scholarship.

Under Regent Policy 5.D.2.(B), a recommendation for tenure based on excellence in teaching will include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national and/or international level which furthers the practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one's immediate instructional setting. The department's list of metrics in the definition section identifies items which are measures of impact beyond the instructional settings, but that list is not exhaustive, and other such measures may be identified by faculty and validated by the primary unit in a particular case.

**Research and Creative Work:**

Within Research, the expectations are as follows:

- Refereed Publications:
  - Meritorious requires 10 refereed publications, of which at least two are significant. Each significant publication beyond two counts as two refereed publications toward the 10.
  - Excellent requires 15 refereed publications, of which at least three are significant publications. At least five of the refereed publications for excellent must have a first author of the candidate or one of the candidate's students. Each significant publication beyond three counts as two refereed publications towards research excellence.
- AND External Competitive Funding:
  - Meritorious requires the candidate being responsible for at least \$150K in funding or winning one significant grant.
  - Excellent requires the candidate being responsible for at least \$300K in funding and winning one significant grant.
  - Seminal papers in the candidate's field of research that are transformational in character can be used in lieu of some external funding. The case of transformational will require the candidate to provide quantitative justification, e.g., using h-index and citation levels, within their field and multiple external letters validating the transformational nature.
- AND overall positive evaluation on external review letters.

Meritorious in research is at least meritorious in both publication and funding and positive letters.

Excellence in research requires excellence in both publication and funding and positive letters.

Under the revised Regent Policy 5.D.2.(B), a recommendation of tenure based on excellence in scholarly/creative work will include evidence of impact beyond the institution. External peer reviews or publications/grants, awarded of funding, citations and letters are all viewed as providing evidence of impact beyond the institution. Excellence in research requires excellence in both publication and funding and overall positive letters.

The above criteria provide sufficient but not necessary conditions for evaluation of meritorious or excellence in research. The committee can also consider the overall research dossier of the candidate, including the external letters, in making its recommendation, e.g., external recognition of the research impact or exceeding the stated criteria in one category can make up for minor shortfalls in another category.

**Leadership and Service:** The department recognizes leadership and service to the campus, community and to our profession. A rating of meritorious requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and service to the college, campus, community or profession. A rating of excellent requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and multiple service contributions to the college, campus, community, or profession. In evaluating leadership and service both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered.

### **Promotion to Full Professor:**

Promotion to Full professor requires a national reputation with significant citations to published work. It is expected that the candidate has brought positive visibility to our department and college through their work.

Meritorious for Promotion to Full Professor in Research requires:

- a) A citation count of 1,000; AND
- b) After tenure, \$500K in external research funding (with at least \$250K as the PI in peer-reviewed federal research grants, with full F&A rate at UCCS. Note that Scholarship, Fellowship, REU, and Equipment grants do not count toward the \$250K amount, but toward the \$500K amount); AND
- c) at least 3 Ph.D. students graduated as advisor or co-advisor after tenure; co-advisees count as half.

Meritorious for Promotion to Full Professor in Teaching: Teaching is meritorious if the candidate meets all of the following criteria: All criteria for promotion to associate AND active in curriculum development and accreditation processes.

Meritorious for Promotion to Full Professor in Leadership and Service: Must serve on and chair departmental committees, as well as serve on upper level (campus, college, and system) and professional level committees.

Promotion to full professor requires a rating of excellent overall which requires meeting meritorious criteria for research, teaching, and leadership and service, and significantly exceeding the meritorious criteria in some dimensions (where a dimension means one of the three broad categories of teaching research and service; OR a subarea within the broad categories as discussed in the “Meritorious” paragraphs immediately above). It is required that the candidate has brought positive visibility to our department and college through their work in research or educational impact or both. Overall excellence requires a national or international reputation as demonstrated through the external letters.

The department will solicit letters from respected scholars in the candidate’s field(s) of research per campus policy.

The PUC letter will detail how the package demonstrates the national reputation and overall excellence.

### **Post-tenure Review:**

Recognizing the many different ways in which post-tenure faculty contribute to the University, we define “meeting expectations” for purposes of post-tenure review as consisting of three elements, each of which must be met:

1. The candidate must achieve a rating of “meeting expectations” or higher on each of the annual merit reviews included in the time period under review,
2. The candidate must show documented progress toward the faculty member’s current professional plan, and
3. The candidate must submit an acceptable professional plan for the next 5 years, which indicates an ability to achieve “meeting expectations” or higher ratings in the future.

If a faculty member is deficient in meeting these standards, the committee will consider the total record of the faculty member during the review period to determine whether strengths in some time periods or some activities compensate for the deficiency such that a rating of “meeting expectations” is still appropriate. Ratings of “exceeding expectations” or “outstanding” will be awarded for exceeding these standards.

### **Promotion from Instructor to Senior Instructor:**

Promotion to Senior Instructor requires the candidate to be a leader within the department in the area of teaching excellence by demonstrating substantial and/or significant accomplishments in teaching and potential for continued excellence in teaching. It is expected that the candidate serves as a model for other faculty to improve their own teaching, contributes to curriculum development, mentors other faculty on integrating new tools or techniques into their teaching, and/or teaches outside the UCCS community.

*Process:* During the Instructor’s annual evaluation in their first eligible year of service to the department, it is the department chair’s responsibility to acknowledge that they are eligible for promotion and to discuss the process, requirements for submission and answer any questions.

If the instructor has completed the required years of service, they are automatically eligible to initiate the process of Promotion to Senior or Principal Instructor and do not require permission or support from the chair. If the instructor is pursuing early promotion, they must get a recommendation from the chair, in writing, indicating their eligibility to pursue early promotion. If an Instructor chooses not to pursue promotion at that time, they may initiate the promotion process at any subsequent fall semester by submitting their dossier to the chair.

In the fall semester following the instructor’s eligibility, the instructor compiles a dossier of supporting evidence for their application for promotion. Once the dossier is submitted, the department chair creates an Instructor Promotion committee to evaluate the

Instructor's dossier comprised of at least 3 full-time faculty members, two of which must be instructors, preferably both at a level above the candidate applying for promotion (if the department has enough). The chair of the committee must be an Instructor, if there is one in the department; if none are available, a Tenure-Track faculty member may serve as chair.

The committee reviews the dossier, considers whether the Instructor has met the requirements for promotion, and makes a written recommendation justifying the promotion or denial of promotion to the chair who then forwards that recommendation to the dean along with the dossier. If a consensus within the committee cannot be reached, the final decision is made by the chair of the department before the recommendation is submitted to the dean.

*Dossier:* Instructors compile a dossier for promotion that demonstrates substantial and significant accomplishments in teaching and a potential for continued excellence in teaching. Materials to submit in the dossier include:

***Required elements:***

- Narrative (2-5 pages):
  - Teaching Philosophy
  - Approach to the design and implementation of new courses or modification of existing courses with specific examples demonstrating courses are thoughtfully and coherently designed, implemented, and presented
  - Approach to adapting courses to new technologies with specific examples
  - Approach to integrating current pedagogical techniques (such as active learning, problem-based learning, etc.) into courses with specific examples
  - Impact within the department outside of core teaching responsibilities
- Faculty Course Questionnaires for the entire evaluation period
- Teaching Workload Narrative (less than 1 page):
  - Number of credits taught each semester of the evaluation period with a computed semester average
  - Frequency of overloads to support departmental teaching needs
  - List of all courses taught during evaluation period (do not list duplicates)
- Teaching Materials:
  - Example syllabi from developed and new courses
  - Example assignments or projects developed for courses
  - Example exams developed for courses
- Professional Development Narrative:
  - UCCS-courses taken related to content taught, teaching and pedagogy
  - Online courses taken related to content taught, teaching and pedagogy
  - Self-education undertaken related to content taught, teaching and pedagogy
  - Conferences attended related to content taught, teaching and pedagogy
- Service Narrative:
  - Discussion of the Instructor's service activities with specific attention to:
  - Leadership positions within those activities
  - Activities with primary impact outside the UCCS community

- Achievements within those activities (honors, awards, events, impactful reports/surveys/studies, recognition, etc.)

***Instructor-Choice elements:***

Instructors are required to submit examples of the following measures of teaching excellence. The minimum number is addressed in the promotional criteria for each level of Instructor (below). Additional materials/documentation/activities that are not listed here are acceptable if these materials represent a similar level of dedication, excellence, and effort.

- Letters from Instructor-selected:
  - Students
  - Peers
  - Administrators
  - Members of the UCCS community
  - Members of the non-UCCS community
  - Mentees or collaborators outside of the department or UCCS
- Peer reviews of teaching
- Documentation of work with students outside the classroom environment such as:
  - Independent Study Project Supervisor
  - Independent Research Project Supervisor
  - Senior Design Project Advisor
  - Mentor
  - Consultant for Student Projects or Companies
  - Internship Supervisor
- Demonstration of teaching methodology in video form
- Documentation of improvement and innovation in teaching methods and curriculum development
- Examples of developed books, materials, websites, tutorials, etc., to serve as or supplement instructional materials
- Examples of developed tools used to serve as or supplement instructional materials
- Documentation of Scholarship or Curriculum Grants Received
- REU Grants
- Documentation of the development, collaboration or delivery of MOOCs including any funding related to the development or delivery of the MOOCs
- Evaluations from MOOCs
- Teaching Awards
- Documented adoption by other institutions of textbook(s) authored by the candidate
- Grant applications/awards
- Documentation of positive reception of online materials

### ***Teaching Element Point Values:***

The following point allocations per activity will be used as a general guide for evaluation of outstanding performance by the Promotion Committee. These elements must be addressed in the required teaching narrative so that it is clear to the Promotion Committee which have been completed. Additional activities not listed here may be eligible to count toward the teaching evaluation but must be addressed in the required teaching narrative and then assigned appropriate points by the Promotion Committee. Elements that are duplicated from the teaching elements under service may count for either Teaching or Service, but not for both (the candidate is advised to document where they want these to count in their portfolio). Additional points may be awarded by the Promotion Committee for extraordinary examples such as a web-based tutorial series, book adoption by multiple institutions, FCQs more than 1 standard deviation above department average, extensive professional development course, etc.

1. (1 pt) Writes one grant for curriculum or student scholarship
2. (1 pt) Develops online materials (website, tutorials, etc.) that are distributed online with demonstrated use by non-UCCS members
3. (1 pt) Completes a professional development course (may be non-credit earning) to expand their knowledge or teaching skills and applies that new knowledge to the development of their courses
4. (1 pt) Attendance at a conference relevant to the content they teach (include CS Education conferences also)
5. (1 pt) Earning a professional certification or academic certificate
6. (1 pt) Design a new course to the department or completely redesign a course
7. (1 pt) Significantly updating a MOOC
8. (1 pt per partial or full day) Teaching a workshop for K-12 or non-UCCS community
9. (1 pt per 3-credit course or equivalent) Working toward a graduate degree, academic certificate, or professional certificate that enhances the instructor's knowledge relevant to their courses
10. (1 pt per preparation above 4) Teaches an average of more than 4 preparations in a year
11. (2 pts) Achieves a three-term FCQ analysis at least  $\frac{1}{2}$  standard deviation (everything else in the document says 1, not  $\frac{1}{2}$ ) above comparable classes for the FCQ questions listed above (questions not listed above, they're below)
12. (2 pts) Wins one grant for curriculum or student scholarship
13. (3 pts) Completing a graduate degree that enhances the instructor's knowledge relevant to their courses (include advanced education degrees as well)
14. (5 pts) Teaches at least one overload or summer course (out of load) each year, on average
15. (5 pts) Develops a textbook adopted by at least one other institution
16. (5 pts) Develops and delivers one MOOC (e.g. 4-5 week Coursera course) (If an instructors develops 4 MOOCs do they get 20 points, or is this just for the first MOOC?)
17. (5 pts) Developing and teaching a course new to the instructor



18. (5 pts) Developing a new degree program for the department (only if we launch the program)

***Service Element Point Values:***

The following point allocations per activity will be used as a general guide for evaluation of outstanding performance by the Promotion Committee. These elements must be addressed in the required service narrative so that it is clear to the Promotion Committee which have been completed. Additional activities not listed here may be eligible to count toward the service evaluation but must be addressed in the required service narrative and then assigned appropriate points by the Promotion Committee. Elements that are duplicated from the teaching elements under service may count for either Teaching or Service, but not for both (the candidate is advised to document where they want these to count in their portfolio). Additional points may be awarded by the Promotion Committee for extraordinary examples such as receiving a particularly large grant, chairing an important or broadly reaching committee like Faculty Senate, or administering an ongoing service requiring extraordinary commitment like an outreach activity for middle-school students that meets weekly for a workshop, etc. Points are calculated per event, class, activity, etc.

1. (1 pt) Serving on a standing or ad hoc department, UCCS, or system committee (with exceptions for larger time commitments listed individually below)
2. (1 pt) Representing UCCS at a non-UCCS community event (promotional booth, career day, etc.)
3. (1 pt) Completes a professional development course (may be non-credit earning) to expand their knowledge or teaching skills and applies that new knowledge to the development of their courses
4. (1 pt) Serving as an investigator or consultant on a grant
5. (1 pt) Submitting a grant as an investigator or consultant on the grant
6. (1 pts per year) Administering a grant as an investigator or consultant on the grant
7. (1 pt) Mentoring a faculty member for at least 2 or more hours
8. (1 pt) Student Club Faculty Advisor
9. (1 pt) Serving as the designated course coordinator for classes with multiple sections
10. (1 pt) Serving as the designated primary instructor for core courses where consistency of content and presentation are required
11. (1 pt for each course) Participating in ABET-related course assessment
12. (1 pt per partial or full day) Teaching a workshop for K-12 or non-UCCS community
13. (1 pt per 3-credit course) Working toward a graduate degree that enhances the instructor's knowledge relevant to their courses
14. (1 pts for every 10 students enrolled) Serving as a Program Director for a PhD or Master's program
15. (1 pts for every 50 students) Serving as a Program Director for a Bachelor's or Minor program
16. (2 pts) Serving on an Instructor Search Committee within the department
17. (3 pts) Serving on a Compass Curriculum Committee or Faculty Senate

18. (3 pts) Developing a new Bachelor's or Master's program (only if we launch the program)
19. (3 pts) Serving as the chairperson of an ad hoc or standing department, UCCS, or system committee
20. (3 pts) Completing a graduate degree that enhances the instructor's knowledge relevant to their courses (include advanced education degrees as well)
21. (3 pts) Submitting a grant proposal for funding as Principal or Co-principal Investigator
22. (3 pts) Receiving a grant as a Principal or Co-principal Investigator
23. (3 pts per year) Administering a grant as a Principal or Co-principal Investigator
24. (5 pts) Serving on a Tenure-Track Search Committee within the department
25. (5 pts) Serving as the ABET committee chairperson in an evaluation year
26. (5 pts) Teaches at least one overload or summer course (out of load) each year
27. (5 pts) Chairing an Instructor Search Committee within the department

***FCQ Questions for Evaluation of Instructor:***

For FCQs prior to the 2019 revision, a "best fits" matching will be used to include their data in a reasonable manner.

The following questions will be used to evaluate the three-term FCQ analysis.

1. Course materials (including any textbooks, readings, lectures, online content, etc.) were organized effectively.
2. Materials (including any textbooks, readings, lectures, online content, etc.) were useful for this course.
3. Exams and graded assignments were clearly related to the course content (including lectures, assigned readings, etc.).
4. The course made it possible for me to increase my knowledge, skills, and understanding of the subject.
7. The instructor explained course ideas in a clear and understandable manner.
8. The instructor encouraged interest in this subject.
9. The instructor demonstrated interest in student learning.
10. The instructor demonstrated respect for and professional treatment of all students.
11. The instructor communicated effectively with students about the course.

The following questions will be used to scale the acceptable deviation for the Teaching evaluation so that courses with extraordinarily high workloads (7) or low interest (1) will be evaluated at 1.5 standard deviation below comparable classes. A linear relationship between these questions and the standard deviation threshold will be used.

5. The workload for this course was:
6. My personal interest in this material before I enrolled was:

The following questions will be used to document course improvement and refinement based on student feedback.

12. List up to three things about the course that contributed to your learning.
13. List up to three things that could be changed to improve student learning in this course.

14. Additional comments (i.e., Is there anything else you think would be helpful for the instructor of this course to know)?

### **Promotion to Senior Instructor**

**Eligibility:** An instructor is eligible to apply for promotion to Senior Instructor after 4 FTE years of service to the Computer Science Department. An instructor whose record is extraordinary may be considered for early promotion to Senior Instructor. The evidence required for early promotion must be greater than that required for normal progress toward promotion.

Instructors who served as lecturers prior to being hired as an Instructor may optionally apply their time as lecturer to meet their minimum eligibility for promotion. Credits taught as an adjunct will count at the same rate as the Instructor's average teaching load. For example, if an Instructor teaches 6 credits per semester, on average over their 4 years, they can reduce that time using courses taught as a lecturer at a rate of 6 credits per semester.

**Dossier:** The contents of the candidate's dossier for Senior Instructor will be derived from the same materials listed above. The Instructor-Choice elements must include at least 3 of the listed elements and must emphasize the Instructor's contributions to the non-UCCS community.

### **Criteria:**

The candidate's record in teaching and service will each be evaluated separately as below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. The candidate must meet the following criteria for promotion to Senior Instructor.

### **Teaching:**

**Required Elements:** Candidates must meet 5 of the following 6 criteria:

1. Teaches the requisite number of credit hours for the approved workload
2. Achieves a three-term FCQ analysis that is not more than 1 standard deviation below comparable classes for the FCQ questions listed above. The threshold of 1 standard deviation will be reduced proportionally to the FCQ questions indicated above to a maximum of 1.5 standard deviations
3. Receives overall positive evaluation from the Promotion Committee of an average of 3/5 on all required elements
4. Receives overall positive evaluation from the Promotion Committee of an average of 3/5 on at least two of the Instructor-choice elements
5. Demonstrates the ability to engage students through innovative teaching
6. Demonstrates the ability to refine courses based on student performance and feedback as addressed in the open-ended FCQ questions and/or results from ABET reports and/or results from internal surveys given by instructor

**Choice Elements:** Candidates must earn a total of 10 pts over the entire evaluation period by meeting one or more from the Teaching Elements Point Values listed above.

Service: Candidates must earn 10 pts over the entire evaluation period by meeting one or more from the Service Elements Point Values listed above.

**Promotion to Principal Instructor:**

Eligibility: An instructor is eligible to apply for promotion to Principal Instructor after three (3) FTE years of service to the Computer Science Department beyond the promotion to Senior Instructor or after hire if hired as a Senior Instructor (which will be considered the promotion date to Senior Instructor for these individuals for the remainder of this document). An instructor whose record is extraordinary may be considered for early promotion to Principal Instructor. The evidence required for early promotion must be greater than that required for normal progress toward promotion.

Time spent as a lecturer can be applied to the minimum required years of service as described in the Senior Instructor promotion eligibility.

Dossier: The contents of the candidate's dossier for Principal Instructor will be derived from the materials listed above. The instructor-choice elements must include at least 8 of the listed elements and must emphasize the instructor's contributions to the non-UCCS community.

Criteria: The candidate's record in teaching and service will each be evaluated separately as below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. The candidate must be rated as, at least, meritorious in service and meritorious in teaching to be promoted to Principal Instructor.

**Teaching:**

Required Elements: Candidates must meet 5 of the following 6 criteria:

1. Teaches the requisite number of credit hours for the approved workload
2. Achieves a three-term FCQ analysis that is not more than 1 standard deviation below comparable classes for the FCQ questions listed above
  - i. The threshold of 1 standard deviation should be reduced proportionally to the FCQ questions indicated above
3. Receives overall positive evaluation from the Promotion Committee of an average of 3/5 on all required elements
4. Receives overall positive evaluation from the Promotion Committee of an average of 3/5 on at least two of the instructor-choice elements
5. Demonstrates the ability to engage students through innovative teaching
6. Demonstrates the ability to refine courses based on student performance and feedback as addressed in the open-ended FCQ questions and/or results from ABET reports and/or results from internal surveys given by instructor

Choice Elements: Candidates must earn a total of 12 pts over the entire evaluation period by meeting one or more from the Teaching Elements Point Values listed above.

Service: Candidates must earn 12 pts over the entire evaluation period by meeting one or more from the Service Elements Point Values listed above.

**College of Engineering and Applied Science**  
**Department of Computer Science**  
**RPT Criteria**  
**Version History**

***Version 2: Minor changes to the Principal Instructor section***

Approved by the CS tenured/tenure track faculty, 11/2/2022

Approved by Dean Don Rabern, 11/2/2022

Approved by Provost Nancy Marchand-Martella, 02/13/2023

Effective date, 02/13/23

***Version 1: Initial Version***

Approved by the CS tenured/tenure track faculty, 05/05/2020

Approved by Dean Don Rabern, 05/18/2020

Approved by Provost Tom Christensen, 7/1/2020

Effective date, 07/01/2020

***Promotion to Principal Instructor*** section was approved by CS faculty on 05/05/2020, but not included in Version 1, because the position was still not approved by the campus.

***Revision:*** Minor corrections made by Jugal Kalita, Chair, Computer Science, based on comments by Acting Provost Kelli Klebe; and Principal Instructor section added. 11/2/2022

---