

I. Overview

The purpose of this charter is to provide guidelines for the organization, operation, and governance of the Department of Computer Science.

How the Department operates - The operation and governance of the Department is based on mutual respect among faculty, students, staff, and the Department's administrators.

How decisions are made - The Department strives to make decisions by consensus and by considering the opinions of all members of the Department.

Role of student advice - The Department accepts the advice of students in making decisions.

Relationship of faculty and staff to Chair - The Chair has decision making authority that is based on the recognition of the faculty's academic freedom. The Chair's authority rests on the importance of consensus building, consultation, and the opinions and needs of individual faculty members.

Relationship to the University - If statements, policies, or procedures in this charter are in conflict with the University's policies and procedures, the University policies and procedures shall take precedence. The Chair's authority is subject to University and College governance policies.

II. Approach to Governance

The responsibility of the tenured and tenure-track faculty to come to consensus on issues that affect the Department is based on the conviction that faculty should come to decisions, though not necessarily unanimous ones, in the spirit of unity.

The outline for arriving at consensus is as follows:

A. Matters requiring a decision are placed before the Department in time for careful and deliberate consideration. Most matters require at least one week's consideration before a meeting. Very important matters may require longer consideration.

B. All faculty members who wish to express an opinion should be heard.

C. When the Chair feels that Department is generally united in its thinking, the Chair attempts to state clearly the "sense of the Department."

D. If the faculty gives approval to this statement, consensus is reached. The wording of this statement should be agreed upon and read for Department approval at this time.

III. Meetings

A time each quarter will be found for Departmental meetings. This meeting time shall be available for all faculty members.

Emergency meetings can be called when consensus is needed before a regularly-scheduled meeting. Faculty should be informed of the nature of the emergency as soon as possible.

Faculty should be informed of meeting agenda and other information as soon as possible and in a timely manner. For most agenda items, one week before a regularly scheduled meeting is sufficient.

Minutes of Departmental meetings will be taken, distributed to faculty, and maintained in a Departmental file. Minutes will be approved at Departmental meetings.

IV. Committees

The Department has standing committees and ad hoc committees.

Generally, committee assignments are decided by consensus. Exceptions to this rule include assignments to the Promotions, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee. Ad hoc committees may be formed at any time as necessary.

Standing Committees:

Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment(PT&R) - The PT&R Committee consists of the tenured faculty of the Department not including the Department Chair nor the tenured faculty member on the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. Members of the Department's PT&R Committee determine the chair of this Committee by consensus.

The Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee functions in accordance with "Tenure and Promotions Guidelines" (Fall 1991, Amended Fall 1993), Appendix A, and makes recommendations to the Department Chair on

- (i) retention of all untenured faculty (Appendix B),
- (ii) tenure of tenure-track faculty,
- (iii) promotions, and
- (iv) initial appointments involving tenure, reduced time-period tenure and promotion considerations, and an initial rank higher than Assistant Professor.

Recommendations for promotion, tenure, and reappointment require the approval of the Provost, President, and the Board of Control.

Each academic year, the Department Chair in consultation with the Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee determines a date by which faculty should indicate to the Department Chair their desire to be considered for promotion and/or tenure. The Department Chair will give the faculty three weeks notification of this date.

Graduate - The Graduate Committee consists of at least three faculty. The Chair of this committee is the Director of Graduate Studies. The Graduate Committee makes recommendations to the faculty on matters involving graduate recruiting, admission, advising, courses, instruction, and degree programs. The Committee recommends applicants to be admitted to the M.S degree program; recommends applicants to be offered financial assistance, and in consultation with the Chair, determines the academic standing of students whose performance is unsatisfactory. This committee also recommends to the faculty the recipients of all honors and awards bestowed upon graduate students by the Department, College, or University.

Undergraduate - The Undergraduate Committee consists of at least three faculty. The Chair of this committee is the Director of Undergraduate Studies. The Undergraduate Committee makes recommendations to the faculty on matters involving undergraduate recruiting, admission, advising, courses, instruction, and degree programs. This committee also recommends to the faculty the recipients of all honors and awards bestowed upon undergraduate students by the Department, College, or University.

V. Departmental Grievances

"A grievance shall be defined as a complaint alleging a misinterpretation, incorrect application, or violation of a policy, procedure, or practice of the University, not pursued by the faculty member in some other forum." (Proposal 13-95 of the Senate of Michigan Technological University)

Means of filing with the Chair a grievance - A grievance must be filed in writing with the Chair. The grievance notification must state the nature of the grievance, the name of the faculty member filing the grievance (the grievant), the date or dates the grievance occurred, and the relief requested by the grievant.

Committee of peers to review the grievance - A Departmental grievance committee will be created when a grievance is filed. A grievance committee will consist of three tenured or tenure-track faculty who are not involved in the grievance. Together, the Department Chair and the grievant will select, at random, three tenure or tenure-track faculty to be on the grievance committee. The committee will also include an ex officio, non-voting member from Human Resources.

None of those selected for the grievance committee can be involved in the issues of the grievance. If someone is selected who is involved in the grievance, that person must be excused from serving on the grievance committee and another random selection made. If the Department Chair and the grievant do not agree on the appropriateness of a randomly selected faculty member, then an additional random selection is made.

It is possible that a grievance may be filed by more than one person or that no random selection is appropriate. This might make it difficult to find three faculty members in the Department who are not involved in the grievance. In this case, the University Ombudsperson will select, at random, tenure or tenure-track faculty from another department. The Department Chair and the grievant must also agree to this selection.

Report of a Department grievance committee - A Departmental grievance committee will prepare a written final report of its deliberations within 30 work days of the filing of the grievance. This report will state the nature of the grievance, name the faculty member who filed the grievance, list the members of the grievance committee, indicate the date or dates of the incident(s) leading to the grievance, identify the relief requested by the grievant, and include the committee's decision. This final report will be given to the grievant, the Chair, and, in case the committee disagrees with the Chair, the University Faculty Review Committee.

VI. Selection of Chair

The Dean, in consultation with the Provost and the Department, will decide if the search for a Chair will be restricted to internal candidates, or if there will be an open search for internal and external candidates.

A Search Committee will consist of tenured and tenure-track faculty from the Department.

A detailed description of the search process is attached in Appendix C.

VII. Evaluation of Chair

A detailed description of the evaluation process is included in Appendix D.

The evaluation process will be administered by a committee of all full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty with the exception of the Chair.

VIII. Amendments

Amendments to this Charter may be proposed by any faculty member at any time. Amendments that are approved by the faculty by consensus will be forwarded in accordance to University policy and are subject to approval by the Provost and the President.

IX. Charter Adoption

This Charter will be adopted by a simple majority of the votes cast by tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Note: This Charter was approved by the President on Aug 15, 1996.

APPENDIX A:

Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
(Fall 1991, Ammended Nov. 2, 1993)

Rational for This Document

Advancement guidelines are established to guide the professional development of the individuals to which they apply. Such guidelines serve the needs of the individual and the needs of the department, college and university of which the individual is a member. While the need for professional development is readily apparent to each individual, the purposes that development serves for the department, college and university are not always as clear. This document is intended to clarify those purposes at the departmental level. Thus, besides presenting criteria for professional advancement, this document describes the context in which such advancement efforts are best placed. It gives a brief statement of the department's goals for the next few years, with the intention that advancement efforts should be directed toward furthering those goals as well as meeting the general criteria listed under each rank that follows.

It is recognized that promotion and tenure evaluation procedures must allow for the fact that these departmental goals will change over time. The nature of this allowance cannot be formalized; it relies on the good judgment of the promotion and tenure committee of the department. Nonetheless, such judgment is commonly a part of the evaluation procedure and it is the intention of this document to describe as well as possible all relevant aspects of the criteria considered during that procedure.

Goals of the Department through 1995:

- Maintain excellent undergraduate instructional programs
- Maintain a high quality M.S. program.
- Establish a Ph.D. program in computer science.
- Obtain external funding for instruction, research and departmental infrastructure.
- Contribute to the advancement of the discipline of computer science through widely recognized instructional innovations and research programs.

In the context of these departmental goals, the criteria for promotion and tenure are described below. It is the usual practice of the university for assistant professors to apply for promotion and tenure at the same time.

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:

In general, a candidate merits tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor if the candidate has demonstrated an active concern for the academic welfare of students in both the undergraduate and the graduate programs of the department, has contributed to the development of the discipline of computer science through research or scholarly activity, and has contributed expertise and guidance to the service of the department, college or university or to the activities of professional societies. The level of the contribution that is required in each of these three areas is determined by the department promotion and tenure committee and by other applicable college and university procedures. The candidate will be apprised of their performance on a timely basis through departmental review procedures and through any other applicable procedures established by the college or university.

Activities that are regarded as noteworthy contributions in the areas of teaching, research, and service are listed below. While the candidate must contribute through some combination of activities in each of these three areas, in the area of teaching there are two specific requirements that the candidate must satisfy. The candidate must be a good teacher, as evidenced by student teaching evaluations and peer review procedures, and the candidate must either teach graduate courses or direct thesis students.

1. Instruction:

The candidate must contribute by means of some combination of the types of activities listed below. The candidate must be successful in the first two of these activities.

- provide high quality instruction
- teach graduate courses or direct thesis students
- introduce or revise courses, curricula, or instructional methods
- pursue external funding for instructional activities

2. Research and Scholarly Activity:

The candidate must contribute by means of some combination of the types of activities listed below.

- the publication of books
- the publication of monographs
- the publication of papers in refereed professional journals
- the publication of papers in refereed conference proceedings
- the presentation of papers at appropriate professional meetings
- the presentation of invited addresses at professional meetings
- the presentation of invited addresses at other institutions
- the securing of research grants
- the securing of research contracts
- the securing of research patents

3. Professional Service:

The candidate must serve by means of some combination of the types of activities listed below.

- serve on departmental committees
- serve on college or university committees
- direct or organize computing laboratories
- direct or administer departmental programs
- direct or administer college or university programs
- referee research papers
- referee professional conference papers
- review monographs
- review grant proposals
- serve on professional conference organizational committees
- consult for business or industry
- consult for government
- consult for professional organizations

Criteria for Promotion to Professor:

The criteria for promotion to professor primarily differ in degree rather than in kind from the criteria for promotion to associate professor. All the criteria for promotion to associate professor apply to promotion to professor. The primary difference is the level of achievement and the breadth of recognition associated with that achievement. In general, promotion to the rank of professor will be made when there is substantial evidence of national or international recognition for instructional excellence or research programs, or the candidate has held positions of national prominence in service to a professional organization and has demonstrated substantial policy-making capabilities in those positions.

Included with the following criteria are examples of the types of activities that meet the intent of the description above. However, this list is not intended to be exhaustive. For example, the successful introduction of new pedagogical methods are often accompanied by the result of a well developed line of research; high office in a professional organization is often a result of recognition gained through activities in instruction or research.

In most cases, excellence in one of the areas of teaching, research or service is required for promotion to professor; the quality of the candidate's contribution in the two remaining areas must be maintained at the levels required for the rank of associate professor. However, the evaluation of levels of achievement that do not fit neatly into the categories listed below must rest on the good judgment of the tenure and promotion committee of the department.

1. Instruction:

To be recognized for excellence in this category, the candidate must significantly impact educational methods in some area of computer science.

Examples of such instructional excellence include authorship of a widely recognized textbook, other widely recognized instructional materials, and new pedagogical methods which have achieved wide recognition.

2. Research and Scholarly Activity:

To be recognized for excellence in this category, the candidate must demonstrate a substantial publication record and a funding record that has lent significant support to the candidate's research effort. In addition, this effort should have created a program of research that researchers at other institutions follow and contribute to. There should be clear evidence that this research program has had an impact on some area of computer science.

Examples of such an impact include widespread applications of the results of the research, incorporation of those results into the curriculum of computer science or related disciplines, and a new collection of problems to which other investigators direct their efforts. Such evidence of impact should be apparent regardless of whether the effort is primarily directed toward applications-oriented research, basic research, interdisciplinary research, or educational research.

3. Service:

To be recognized for excellence in this category, the candidate must demonstrate a widely felt influence in some area of computer science.

Examples of such an impact include holding high office in a national professional organization, membership on the editorial board of high quality professional journals, founding a conference series or other type of regular professional activity, and attaining a position of prominence on governmental or industrial policy-making bodies.

The Dean indicated in a February 28, 1992, memo that the Provost and the President have approved these guidelines. The following amendment has not yet been approved by the administration in writing. On September 28, 1994 A. Melton indicated the Dean said that this amendment was approved.

Amendments of November 2, 1993:

The members of the Department's Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee are the tenured faculty of the Department not including the Department Chair and not including the tenured faculty member on the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. Members of the Department's Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee determine the chair of this Committee by consensus.

(Note, "Head" was editorially changed to "Chair" in the above paragraph.)

APPENDIX B: Reappointment Guidelines

To assist the Department Chair, the Promotions, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee conducts reappointment reviews. For tenure-track faculty there are two types of reviews: major and interim (or minor) reviews.

For a major review the Committee does the following:

- A. The Committee performs or assists in peer reviews using the Department's Peer Review Policy.
- B. The Committee also examines the faculty member's Departmental Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment File.

C. Using the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (Appendix A), the Committee analyzes the faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion and writes a memo to the Chair that summarizes this analysis. The memo will also indicate whether or not the committee recommends another two-year reappointment.

2. For an interim review the Committee does the following:

The Committee reviews the faculty member's Departmental Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment File (which includes a current vita and evidence of recent professional activity.) Then, using the Department's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, the Committee writes a short memo to the Chair recommending or not recommending that the next year not be a terminal year.

APPENDIX C: Selection of the Chair

The Dean, in consultation with the Provost and Department, will decide if the search will be restricted to internal candidates or if there will be an open search for internal and external candidates.

1. The Search Committee consists of all tenured and tenure-track faculty. The search committee's chairperson is chosen by the committee at their first meeting.
2. The Dean initiates the activity of the Search Committee. As part of the search process and to establish the context for a search, the Department reviews and, if necessary, modifies the Department's goals. The committee's activities and the selection process will follow procedures established by the University.
3. The Search Committee, with input from the present Department Chair, the Dean and the Affirmative Action Officer, review and revise, if necessary, the Chair's position description (e.g., qualifications, expectations of Department growth).
4. During the search process and the interview process, the Search Committee may solicit comments from all faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduates. Each candidate's vita is available to all faculty and staff of the Department. The reference letters are accessible (e.g., kept with the secretary) to any member who would like to examine them. No copies of these letters can be made.

The Search Committee makes arrangements for each candidate to make two presentations:

- (1) A technical presentation in his/her field of specialization that includes trends, directions and opportunities for research in the field.
- (2) A presentation that may include, but is not limited to the following issues:
 - candidate's administrative philosophy and plans for meeting the short- and long-term goals.
 - the direction of education in the Department (e.g., What will and should be the attributes of a graduate 10 years from now?)
 - resources needed to attain the goals.
5. The Search Committee will recommend to the Dean acceptable candidate(s) for the Chair.

APPENDIX D:

Evaluation of the Chair

This describes an evaluation process for a Department Chairperson that will be conducted by a faculty evaluation committee.

The faculty evaluation committee will consist of all full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty with the exception of the Chair.

1. Frequency of Evaluation: Evaluation must occur in the final year of the Chair's term.

In addition, the Chair may request one additional evaluation each year except for the final year of the Chair's term.

A faculty member may request that the Chair be evaluated. Based on a faculty request, if there is consensus at a Department meeting that the Chair should be evaluated, an evaluation will occur.

The Dean of Sciences and Arts may request an evaluation.

Regardless of who requests an evaluation, there should be at most one evaluation each year.

2. The faculty evaluation committee will determine by consensus a committee chair whose duties are to manage and coordinate the evaluation process.

3. The evaluation process:

A. The Chair prepares a written report that is distributed to all faculty and staff of the Department. This report should include but need not be limited to:

- Achievement of the Department goals for the period of evaluation.
- Budget and its management.
- Growth and quality of academic programs.
- Future needs and directions of the department.
- The charge given to the Chair or any goal of the Department which the Chair thinks is controversial in the Department and the effort the Chair has made to address the controversy.
- A discussion of how the Chair addresses, facilitates, and resolves problems of a professional nature arising between faculty or staff, non-professional situations affecting a faculty or staff member's well-being, and instances caused by personality conflicts.
- Handling of the Departmental reward structure.

B. The distribution of this report is followed by a meeting of all members of the Department. The purpose of this meeting will be to answer questions and provide clarification about the report.

C. The faculty evaluation committee will forward the report to the Dean. If necessary, the faculty evaluation committee will prepare a short commentary on the report. The commentary will be sent to the Dean with copies to the Chair, faculty, and staff. Individual members of the Department may meet with the Dean or comment in writing on the evaluation committee's commentary.

D. The faculty evaluation committee will prepare an evaluation form which will be sent to all faculty and staff of the Department. The evaluation form permits individual faculty and staff to evaluate the Chair. The evaluations will be sent to the evaluation committee chair.

Individual members (faculty or staff) of the Department may meet with the Dean or forward a separate evaluation directly to the Dean.

A subcommittee of the evaluation committee will prepare a summary of the completed evaluation forms.

The completed evaluation forms will not be made public and will not be seen by the Chair. All individual evaluation forms will be destroyed at the end of the evaluation process.

E. The faculty evaluation committee will meet to approve the summary of the completed evaluation forms. The approved summary of the evaluation forms is given to the Chair and copies are sent to all faculty and staff.

Within a week, the Chair may request a Departmental meeting to discuss the summary or prepare written comments on the summary or both. Any written response is sent to all faculty and staff.

F. The summary report, and the optional response from the Chair are forwarded to the Dean by the faculty evaluation committee.

G. The Dean may wish to meet with the Department to discuss the summary report and the optional response from the Chair.

H. The Dean prepares a written report on the strengths and weaknesses of the Chair. This written report is sent to all department faculty and staff, the Chair, and the Provost.

The Dean's report should include the following items:

- Guidance and management of the quality and growth of the academic programs within the Department.
- Guidance and support of research activities within the Department.
- Practice of sound financial management within the Department.
- Management and guidance of personnel within the Department.
- Definition of goals within the Department and progress of the department toward these established goals.

The distribution of the Dean's report is followed by a meeting for all members of the Department to answer questions and to provide clarifications. Individual members of the Department may meet with the Dean or comment in writing on the Dean's report.

I. The faculty will vote by secret ballot on reappointment or dismissal of the Chair. If a simple majority of the full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty support either reappointment or dismissal and the vote is greater than or equal to 50% of the Department's Senate voting constituency, then result of the vote is forwarded to the Dean.

When the administration decides contrary to a simple majority vote of the faculty, the Dean should explain the reasons for that decision in writing to the members of the Department.

The distribution of the Dean's reasons for a decision contrary to the Department's vote is followed by a meeting for all members of the Department to answer questions and to provide clarifications. Individual members of the Department may meet with the Dean or comment in writing to the Dean.