Dean's Office
DEC 0 6 2006
Arts & Science

December 1, 2006

MEMORANDUM

TO: Larry Dunning
           Computer Science

FROM: John W. Folkins
           Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

RE: Updates to Promotion and Tenure Document

Your recent revision to your unit's promotion and tenure document has been reviewed and approved
at all levels. This represents a significant step forward for the University, as it creates an
unambiguous standard for the recognition of engaged activities. Although all agree that engagement
with community partners is not necessary for successful fulfillment of faculty duties in teaching,
research, and service, the revision of the promotion and tenure documents opens the door to allow,
recognize, and encourage faculty to engage with community partners in all their scholarly
undertakings.

C: D. Nieman
       D. Madigan

Preamble: The purposes of this document are:

a) to guide and assist faculty and their academic units in the development of merit, contract renewal, promotion and tenure policies;

b) to promote, protect, and ensure that the policies and processes so delineated reflect the autonomy and unique characteristics of the academic units;

c) to assure that faculty personnel processes are reflective of the current BGSU vision statement;

d) to assure that internal faculty peer review and judgment which lie at the core of our values are maintained in reappointment, promotion, tenure, and merit decisions;

e) to ensure that all faculty experience fair, equitable and consistent processes in the evaluations that take place at their career mileposts, and

f) to ensure that the relevant sections of the Academic Charter are followed.

DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW, MERIT, CONTRACT RENEWAL, PROMOTION, AND TENURE OF TENURED AND PROBATIONARY FACULTY

Approved by Computer Science Faculty
November 6, 2006
Not in force – Additional approvals pending

Department of Computer Science
College of Arts and Sciences
Bowling Green State University

I. Department Policy

The Department of Computer Science explains by means of this policy statement the procedures, criteria, and standards that it will use in the annual evaluation of tenured and probationary faculty for salary changes (merit), promotion, tenure, and contract renewal. This statement complies with the policies of the Board of Trustees of Bowling Green State University, the Academic Charter, and the College of Arts and Sciences. This statement is provided to all faculty in the department upon joining the department and thereafter upon request. A copy is maintained in the department office. It has been approved by the faculty of the department in accord with department policies.

A. Vision Statement

The department recognizes that in matters relating to annual review, contract renewal, promotion, and tenure of faculty, Bowling Green State University supports performance consistent with the University's aspiration to be the premier learning community in Ohio and one of the best in the nation. As defined by the Academic Charter (Article II.A, Section A), "The persons who create and maintain the University constitute the University Community. There are five groups within this Community: students, faculty, administrators, administrative staff and classified staff." To achieve its objectives, the University expects faculty participation in the interdependent areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service that is of the highest quality, grounded in intellectual discovery, and guided by rational discourse and civility. The essence of this department's evaluation process is to improve faculty members' performance through appropriate evaluation and timely feedback. Careful and consistent application of the criteria and standards in evaluating faculty

performance in teaching, research/scholarship and service are of fundamental importance in achieving the department's mission and in protecting the rights of the individual faculty member. Department review processes are to be conducted clearly, openly, responsibly, and fairly.

In the spirit of open and responsible review, it should be recognized that some faculty make essential contributions to the University community through their participation in the University's interdisciplinary programs. Joint and dual appointments as defined in the Academic Charter (section B.I.A.2 and B.I.A.3) have been developed to provide structures for those faculty appointments wherein a faculty member may distribute his/her teaching, research/creative, and service activities across colleges, departments, and/or programs. Thus the evaluation for tenure, promotion and merit, of faculty members with joint and dual appointments (Academic Charter section B.I.D.3) should include representation from all of the colleges, departments, and/or programs in which the faculty member serves. The chairs and directors of the departments and interdisciplinary programs in which a probationary faculty member participates should co-author a retention plan that clearly expresses the expectations of each unit and sets clear standards for tenure, promotion and merit.

B. The Academic Charter
The University Policy on Faculty Appointment and Tenure (section B-I.C) and the statement on Evaluation of Faculty Personnel (section B-I.D), as contained in the Academic Charter, identify the three relevant evaluation criteria as teaching, research/scholarship, and service and define the basic requirements for merit, contract renewal, tenure, and promotion. As stated in the Academic Charter (section B-I.D.2a), for promotion policies "Academic units may develop more specific or more rigorous criteria in teaching, service, or scholarly activity, provided that such criteria are equitable and appropriate and provided that they do not conflict with the criteria below and, in a department/school, with the criteria of the majority of the faculty members of the academic unit." As stated in the Academic Charter for tenure policies, section B-I.D.2 b, "An academic unit may develop a promotion policy with more specific or more rigorous criteria in teaching, service, or scholarly activity, provided that such criteria are equitable and appropriate and provided that they do not conflict with the criteria below. More specific or more rigorous criteria shall be ratified by the majority of the faculty members of the academic unit." As stated in the Academic Charter for tenure policies, section B-I.D.2 b, "An academic unit may develop . . . more precise statements of what is expected under teaching effectiveness, scholarly or creative activity, or service, but may not add other criteria. All such statements shall be approved by the tenured faculty of the appropriate academic unit. . ." These criteria and standards allow for differentiation among faculty members with regard to their roles and contributions within the department in fulfillment of the, department, college and University mission.

1. Faculty Appointments
The Academic Charter (B-I.C.2) defines two types of faculty appointments (tenure track and non-tenure track) and distinguishes between two types of tenure track appointment (probationary and tenured). Non-tenure track appointments are discussed in Section B-I.C.2.a of the Academic Charter. Probationary appointments and the policies associated with them are described in Section B-I.C.2.b of the Academic Charter. Tenured appointments and the policies associated with such appointments are described in Section B-I.C.3 of the

Academic Charter, which includes statements on the meaning, obligations, and termination of tenure.

2. Annual Review for Reappointment

The Academic Charter mandates a comprehensive annual review of all non-tenure track continuing faculty members in Section B-I.D.4 (Instructor) or Section B-I.D.5 (Lecturer), and of probationary tenure track faculty members in B-I.D.2.b. For probationary faculty members, the overriding question to be considered by the department and the dean during the annual review is whether or not the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure. Probationary faculty members who are awarded two or three-year contracts shall be reviewed during the last year of the contract to determine whether the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and whether the contract shall be rebewed.

3. Review for Tenure

The department has the primary responsibility for evaluating probationary faculty for tenure. In addition to annual reviews, the Academic Charter at B-I D.2.b.(2) mandates that a probationary faculty member be evaluated no later than the next-to-last year of the probationary appointment. Probationary faculty members may seek tenure at any time during the probationary period. Because department and college review committees apply tenure standards without discounted expectations based on a shorter probationary period, faculty members are discouraged from seeking early tenure decisions unless there are compelling reasons for doing so.

4. Review for Promotion

The department also has the primary responsibility for the comprehensive review of all faculty members nominated for promotion. The qualifications for assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are described in B-I.D.2.a.(1).(b), (c), and (d) of the Academic Charter. The department may stipulate criteria and standards for promotion that differentiate among the ranks with regard to their expected contributions to the department's performance as long as those criteria and standards do not conflict with the provisions of the Academic Charter and of the College.

5. Review for Merit

Finally, the department has the primary responsibility for making all recommendations of salary changes (merit) for faculty (Section B-I.D.1 of the Academic Charter). Although the Academic Charter does not require that this be done annually, University practice has been to encourage such reviews on an annual basis to provide feedback on performance to the faculty member regardless of whether or not a merit salary allocation is made in a particular year.

C. Distinctive characteristics of the Computer Science discipline.

Professionals are often drawn to the computer science discipline because of the interest and excitement caused by the continual development and progress of the field. However, being part of such a rapidly developing field also presents challenges. Here are some of the challenges presented and what these imply about the responsibilities of a computer science professional.

- CHALLENGE: Our curriculum evolves rapidly to keep pace with technology. This applies both to our local curriculum and to model curricula developed by our professional organizations.

  IMPLICATION: Members of our department are substantially and continuously involved in curriculum development, implementation, and evaluation.

- CHALLENGE: The computing hardware that we use for teaching and research/scholarship becomes more complex every year as technology advances, and we are expected to know experimental as well as commercial hardware.

  IMPLICATION: Members of our department are substantially and continuously involved in mastering new computing hardware.

- CHALLENGE: The technical software that we use for teaching and research/scholarship becomes more complex every year as technology advances, and we are expected to know experimental as well as commercial software.

  IMPLICATION: Members of our department are substantially and continuously involved in mastering new software—far more than in most other departments.

- CHALLENGE: We use programming languages for teaching and research/scholarship that are frequently replaced by newer, more complex languages, and we are expected to know experimental as well as commercial languages. Further, we are often required to master not only the language but also the development environment that surrounds it.

  IMPLICATION: Members of our department are substantially and continuously involved in mastering new computer languages and environments.

- CHALLENGE: New and changing curricula, software, hardware and programming languages require new and changing facilities.

  IMPLICATION: Members of our department are substantially and continuously involved in the planning, designing, implementation and support of the facilities we require to conduct our work.

Together, these constraints require us to put a large and ever-increasing effort into all facets of development: faculty development, curriculum development, self-development, and facilities development.

II. Allocation of Effort

Each faculty member needs to expend effort on a wide range of teaching, research/scholarship, and service obligations that promote the mission and goals of the University, college, and department. All faculty members have a right to know what allocations of effort are expected of them and to understand how departmental expectations, evaluative criteria, performance indicators, and weightings will be used in assessing their performance.

A. Departmental Norms

The normal expectations for allocation of faculty effort are as specified for the Standard Track in the table below.

	Standard Track	Alternate Track
Teaching	50%	50%
Research/Scholarship	30%	20%
Service	20%	30%

A majority of the Ph.D. faculty of the department, including all probationary faculty, will be assigned to the Standard Track. Tenured faculty will request either the standard or the alternate track and will normally remain in the same track for a period of at least three calendar years. These weights will apply to most faculty who are carrying full teaching loads as defined by department policy. Exceptions are made only as specified in the following section. Changes in track are normally made at the beginning of an academic year.

The Personnel Committee will approve the track selection of the faculty member whenever possible. The committee needs to ensure that a majority of the faculty remain on the Standard Track and that a sufficient number are on the Alternate Track to enable the service responsibilities of the department to be carried out. If the Personnel Committee assigns a faculty member to a track not requested by the faculty member, that person can request reassignment to the desired track effective at the beginning of the next academic year.

A faculty member's service percentage will be considered by the committee in determining departmental and other service assignments. Faculty will be evaluated relative to their assigned percentages in each of the three areas during the evaluation period.

B. Individual Variations

The faculty member's assigned track will determine the percentage allocation of effort unless specific, formal agreements are made to the contrary. All individual variations must be made in writing, approved by the Personnel Committee, signed by both the faculty member and the department chair, and endorsed in writing by the dean of the college. Faculty on leave shall have the right to determine with the department chair the appropriate allocation of effort in accordance with the purpose of the leave.

Although all percentage allocations are approximations and not exact time measurements, reasonable attempts must be made to insure that a faculty member's allocation of effort is consistent with his/her actual distribution of workload for instruction, research/scholarship, and service responsibilities. Unless otherwise specified in writing, a faculty member's allocation of effort will be considered to apply as an average over the period of any given academic year or contract period.

III. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching effectiveness by faculty is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Achievement in this area is of critical importance to the department's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for merit, reappointment, promotion, or

tenure. Domains used in the evaluation of teaching may include: undergraduate teaching; graduate teaching; instructional development; and other contributions to student learning. Beginning in the first year of a teaching appointment, faculty must create and maintain an up-to-date teaching portfolio that contains written records pertaining to the teaching performance of each faculty member. Items A through C below suggest items for the portfolio.

At least three performance indicators must be included in teaching portfolios used in the reappointment, tenure and promotion process. One of these must be a summary of student teaching evaluations prepared by the Personnel Committee. The portfolio will be used by reviewers as the primary source of information for the evaluation of teaching. The department may obtain additional information from other sources to the extent that the information contained in a teaching portfolio is incomplete with respect to any of the domains or performance indicators applied.

Ph.D. faculty should be willing to teach a wide variety of undergraduate courses and are expected to have significant involvement in both undergraduate teaching and graduate teaching. Instructors and lecturers will, for the most part, be involved exclusively at the undergraduate level.

A. Undergraduate Teaching
The department considers high quality undergraduate instruction to be a major component of a faculty member's record of teaching. Performance indicators used in the evaluation of undergraduate teaching may include: statements of teaching philosophy and pedagogy; self-evaluations of teaching effectiveness; results of student evaluations of courses taught; peer teaching observations and evaluations; documentation of student learning outcomes (such as results of standardized assessment measures, licensure or professional examinations, and graduate follow-up studies); supervision of undergraduate projects; student enrollment and retention data; teaching awards and distinctions; and written statements from colleagues, students, and others concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching.

B. Graduate Teaching
The department expects that all Ph.D. faculty contribute to the learning of graduate students. Based upon one's area of research/creative expertise and its relationship to the focus of the graduate program, faculty should provide formal graduate instruction through regular courses and seminars and make appropriate contributions to the recruitment, retention, advising, and placement of graduate students. Ph.D. faculty are expected to participate in supervision of graduate projects, the direction of theses and/or to serve on committees of students being directed by other faculty. Ph.D. faculty are expected to maintain qualifications for Graduate Faculty status. The performance indicators identified in section A above also apply to graduate teaching.

C. Instructional Development
Departmental faculty are expected to devote professional development efforts to continuously improve the curriculum as well as their own teaching methods and effectiveness. Performance indicators used in the evaluation of instructional development may include: course outlines, syllabi, and other items that demonstrate the nature of instruction and range of courses taught; independent studies offered to students; the development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses, including technology updates to existing

courses; learning and demonstrating a facility with new hardware and software systems used in instruction; and innovations in the effective use and development of instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning.

1.) Contributions to Student Learning
Faculty members make other contributions to student learning and development that fall outside the traditional domains of curriculum and instruction. Performance indicators used to evaluate such contributions may include: being readily available to students (e.g. helping students outside of the classroom, regularly scheduled office hours, availability by email and voicemail, etc.), academic advising services provided to students; guidance of students in internships or co-operative work experiences; involvement in clubs, organizations, and activities promoting faculty-student interaction; participation in University initiatives to create a campus wide learning community; involvement in activities to promote departmental programs and services to prospective students; participation in University, college, or departmental projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning; activities which have a "service learning" or related institutional outreach components; and other pedagogical activities that contribute to effective teaching.

2.) Role of Student Teaching Evaluations
A standard departmental student evaluation form is provided by the department. This form must be used in each class taught by a faculty member each semester. Faculty are free to supplement the standard teaching evaluation form with a form of their choosing. Evaluation forms should be completed by the students in a class close to the end of the term and returned to the departmental office using current department procedures. The forms will be reviewed by the Personnel Committee.

In considering the student responses contained on an evaluation form, the Personnel Committee will only consider responses in areas where student evaluation is reasonable and relevant (e.g. regularly keeps office hours, is available for consultation, is open to questions, etc.). No consideration is given to responses which are irrelevant (e.g. the instructor's style of dress) or outside the student's ability to judge (e.g. the instructor's scholarship). If there are factors which reduce the reliability of the teaching evaluations collected for a particular class, the faculty member should bring that information to the attention of the Personnel Committee.

A summary of student teaching evaluations will be provided by the Personnel Committee as part of any portfolio being reviewed for reappointment, promotion and tenure.

Other types of evaluations that may be used include peer evaluation, standardized tests, interviews with students, analysis of grading practices, portfolios, etc. Consideration will be given to any evidence of teaching performance which is submitted by a faculty member. In cases where evaluations point out problems, these problems will be brought to the attention of the faculty member in a timely fashion.

A candidate may submit and request that the department consider other evidence of achievement in teaching that is appropriate to his/her specific case. The question to be considered by the department in its evaluation of teaching is

this: Is the faculty member's demonstrated performance in teaching consistent with the general standards for merit, reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described in the University's governance documents and supportive of the instructional mission of the department, college, and University?

IV. Evaluation of Research/Scholarship
Making significant contributions to the knowledge base or the creative practice of one's discipline is a central responsibility of all faculty members. Such contributions are important both in their own right, and because they are an essential qualification for instructing others at a university. Thus, achievement in this area is vital to the department's evaluation of faculty members who are under review for merit, reappointment, promotion, or tenure. Domains used in the evaluation of research/scholarship may include: publications; presentations; software or hardware systems developed; sponsored program extramural support; institutional outreach; reputation within the discipline. The department also recognizes that directing the work of masters students, especially when documented through a thesis, often reflects and can, in some measure, document research efforts of a faculty member. (If a thesis is used in this way, it cannot also be listed as an accomplishment in teaching.) As a means of facilitating the evaluation, faculty members should maintain a record of their research/scholarship which addresses the performance indicators used for evaluation.

A. Publications/Presentations/System Development
Publications, presentations and the development of state-of-the-art software or hardware systems are the primary products of any research/scholarship in computer science and thus central to its evaluation. Publications in peer-reviewed symposium volumes or journals (including electronic journals) are especially significant. Refereed presentations at certain professional conferences are considered equivalent to journal publications. State-of-the-art software or hardware systems are the equivalent of performances in other disciplines and may be developed by the faculty member or by graduate students under his or her direction. Such systems and their importance may be documented through refereed publications, technical reports, letters of reference, or evidence of use by others. Also valued as evidence of scholarship is the publication of books, monographs, applied research and consulting. Research/scholarship should show evidence of originality, impact, and importance. This is demonstrated by the prestige of the setting and the impact on the work of others in the discipline or, in the case, of applied or engaged scholarship, on the community. Candidates for tenure or promotion must have at least some refereed computer science related publications. Publications regarding pedagogy are valued, and a candidate's publications can be solely in this area when this is appropriate for their area of expertise, for example computer mediated instruction or distance learning.

B. Sponsored Program Extramural Support for Research/Scholarship
In addition to supporting research, securing extramural support and establishing external research alliances are important additional validations of the quality of research and creative activity. Performance indicators include: agency reviewers' evaluations of the proposal; significance and scope of the project; research funds awarded; and performance of duties as principal investigator for funded projects. No specific quantity of extramural research support is required for merit, reappointment, promotion, or tenure. Department expectations will be based upon norms appropriate to the research areas of the individual faculty. It is

recognized that funding in computer science may be less available to faculty in masters level programs.

C. Institutional Outreach

Given the University's commitment to public service and community engagement, faculty members may direct their scholarship/creative work to applied and engaged scholarship as well as basic research or creative activity. As in the case of basic research or creative activity, applied or engaged scholarship should be evaluated according to its quality, significance, and impact on the discipline and the community. In assessing the impact of applied or engaged scholarship, evaluations by community partners as well as academic and professional experts shall be considered probative. Performance indicators used to evaluate such contributions may include: letters from stakeholders reviewing the engagement activity; published citations of the activity; detailed descriptions of the activity (possibly including stakeholder, scope, funding, etc); lists of copyrighted or licensed materials produced such as training materials, manuals, etc.; statements of impact on our computer science programs (including new/modified courses, assistantships, employment of graduates); details of other activities pursuant to dissemination of results including expositions attended, etc.

D. Professional development

Computer science faculty are expected to keep pace with rapidly evolving computer technology that is relevant to the computer science core undergraduate curriculum and as appropriate for their computing specialty. When a faculty member develops new expertise in a computer science research area, the time needed to develop such expertise may be considered for evaluation purposes in addition to the credit normally given to the artifacts associated with the research itself. Faculty members are encouraged to apply novel, state-of-the-art computer science techniques in other research areas in conjunction with faculty from outside computer science or in conjunction with consulting activities. Performance indicators may include conferences and workshops attended, courses taken, or other professional development activities to develop or enhance computing expertise; teaching a course or offering a workshop in a new or broadening computing specialty; MS projects or theses in a new computing specialty; software or publications arising from professional development activities or from consulting activities in a new computer science area.

E. Reputation within the discipline

One of the most important indicators of the quality of a faculty member's research/scholarship is his/her reputation within the discipline and among community partners in the case of a faculty member who has pursued the scholarship of engagement. The reputation within the discipline can be reflected through professional activities of the faculty member such as serving as an editor, referee/reviewer or through various roles in professional organizations.

In the case of tenure and promotion, this quality in the area of research/scholarship must be demonstrated by the evidence of reputation gathered by the department from authoritative reviewers external to the University.[1] The reviewers will include individuals from a list provided by the

---

[1]External peer reviews are not required for annual review, for merit and for contract renewal.

candidate for evaluation as well as individuals who are selected independently by the departmental review committee. At least one reviewer must be selected from each list, with no fewer than three letters included in the file.

F. Other evidence of research/scholarship
In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider other evidence of achievement in research and scholarship in computer science that is appropriate to his/her specific case, including statements by community partners in the case of faculty members who pursue the scholarship of engagement. The question to be considered by the department in its evaluation of research/scholarship is this: Is the faculty member's performance in research/scholarship consistent with the general standards for merit, reappointment, promotion, or tenure as described in University governance documents and specified by the department?

V. Evaluation of Service Effectiveness
Service contributions by faculty at the department, college, and University professional levels are critical to the overall mission of the University. Faculty seeking merit, tenure, contract renewal, or promotion shall provide evidence of appropriate service to the University community or to the profession. For faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, a record which documents continuous and active involvement in service is required. For faculty seeking promotion to professor, a record which documents significant service to the University or profession is required.

The department defines service as performance of departmental, collegiate, University, and professional activities which fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance; professional expertise shared with the internal and external community; and contributions to a faculty member's profession. In presenting their records of service, faculty members should include documentation which provides evidence of their activities and contributions and which address the performance indicators used for evaluation.

A. Internal University Service
These activities include participation in departmental, college, or university committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like. University service also includes performance of any assigned administrative service responsibilities at the departmental, college, or university level. This would include those duties handled by faculty serving as center directors, program directors, department chairs, associate deans, and the like. Performance indicators used to evaluate internal service may include: records of membership and attendance at committee and organizational meetings; significance and scope of activities; degree of active involvement; documentation of significant contributions; leadership positions held; recruiting of students at the undergraduate or graduate level; offering workshops on computer-related topics to interested groups; consultations with university faculty and staff on computing topics; computing-related services to other campus units; recruiting students at the undergraduate and/or graduate level; collegiality in working with others and sharing responsibilities; testimonials from colleagues, committee chairs, and others. Performance indicators used to evaluate administrative service may include: significance and scope of assignment; amount of time devoted to assignment; professionalism and dependability in performing assignment; evidence of collegiality in working with others; documentation of

specific contributions and accomplishments; evaluations by constituents, publics served, and others.

B. External Community Service

Faculty members are encouraged to lend their professional expertise to collaborations with external entities that contribute to the well-being of the larger community. To be considered as community service appropriate for merit, contract renewal, tenure, or promotion considerations, such external activities must draw upon a faculty member's professional expertise and must be recognized by the department, college, or University as qualifying. All faculty members are encouraged to participate fully in civic and community life as citizens, but they need to recognize that not all such activities will be viewed as directly related to their professional expertise. Performance indicators used to evaluate community service may include: records of relevant activities and professional contributions; degree of active involvement; significance and scope of involvement in each activity; evidence of contributions and achievements; leadership positions held; professionalism and dependability demonstrated in performing activities; community awards and other recognition; written statements or testimonials.

C. Professional Service

These activities include a faculty member's membership and active involvement with professional organizations connected to his/her discipline at the local, state, national, or international levels. Performance indicators used to evaluate professional service may include: records of affiliations with appropriate professional associations; records of service to private or extramural funding agencies; leadership positions held in professional associations; time spent on fulfilling professional service obligations; professionalism and dependability demonstrated in performing activities; professional recognition; organization of professional conferences, symposia, and the like; sessions moderated that contribute to the profession.

D. Other evidence of service effectiveness

In addition to the foregoing, a candidate may submit and request that the department consider any other evidence of achievement in service that is appropriate to his/her specific case. The question to be considered by the department in evaluating service is this: Is the faculty member's performance in service consistent with the general standards for merit, contract renewal, promotion, or tenure as described in University governance documents and as specified by the department?

VI. Application

For faculty appointments commencing on or after August 20, 1997, these policies shall apply. For faculty appointments commencing before that date, these policies shall not apply to the tenure decision or to the next promotion decision, unless the faculty member consents to their application, but will apply to any subsequent promotion decision regardless of the consent of the faculty member.

VII. Amendments

Amendments to this document may be proposed by any probationary or tenured faculty member of the department. Amendments must be approved by two-thirds of the probationary and tenured faculty members and must also have the concurrence of the Dean and the Provost.

Approved by the Department of Computer Science

Chair _____ Date _Nov 6, 2006_

Reviewed by the Dean_____ Date _11-9-06_

 _✓_ concur _____do not concur for the following reason(s):_____

_____

Reviewed by the Provost/VPAA _____ Date _12-1-6_

 _✗_ concur _____do not concur for the following reason(s): _____

_____

This document was approved and updated by the Department of Computer Science during 1997, 1998 and 2006.