

Faculty Bylaws

Computer Science and Engineering¹

University of South Florida

Mission Statement:

In keeping with the mission of the College of Engineering, Computer Science and Engineering strives for excellence in teaching, research, and service. Specifically, we aspire to:

1. Lead the advancement of computer science, computer engineering, information technology, and cybersecurity through internationally recognized research and education, as well as technology transfer;
2. Prepare students for full and ethical participation in a diverse society and encourage lifelong learning;
3. Foster an inclusive climate and broaden participation in computing;
4. Educate students in the best practices of the field as well as integrate the latest research into the curriculum;
5. Foster the development of problem solving and communication skills as an integral component of the profession;
6. Provide quality learning experiences through effective classroom practices, active learning styles of teaching, and opportunities for meaningful interactions between students and faculty.

Preamble:

The Department of Computer Science and Engineering (CSE), as an administrative unit of the College of Engineering of the University of South Florida, shall be governed by the following Articles of Governance, which do not supersede the Policy statements of the University of South Florida or the bylaws of the College of Engineering and the UFF-Board of Trustees Agreement.

ARTICLE I. Structure

A. Membership

The Department Faculty shall consist of all (Assistant, Associate, Full, Distinguished) Professors, Research (Assistant, Associate, Full, Distinguished) Professors, Visiting

¹ CSE is not currently a multi-campus unit. If future faculty are hired at branch campuses we will modify our T&P documents to ensure that those faculty are included in matters of T&P and to ensure they have a voice in promotion issues. We recognize the principles of equity of assignment, resources and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university.

(Assistant, Associate, Full) Professors, (Assistant, Associate, Full, Visiting) Professors of Instruction, Affiliate Faculty, Courtesy Faculty, and Professors of Practice who are employed full-time during the academic year by the College of Engineering and have at least 51 percent of their duties assigned by the Department.

B. Voting Faculty

For points of business discussed in full faculty meetings that require a vote, the voting faculty shall consist of all tenured and tenure earning CSE faculty members; joint faculty who are tenured or tenure earning with at least 51 percent of their salaries administered by CSE; and full-time CSE (Assistant, Associate, Full) Professors of Instruction.

Similarly, these voting rights extend to points of business in committee meetings for faculty in committees to which they are appointed.

Voting faculty on sabbatical or leave from the department shall retain voting privileges if present at a meeting.

“Faculty in residence” are those voting faculty that are not on leave, sabbatical, or assigned elsewhere, and will be used to establish the number of faculty required for a quorum.

C. Faculty Recruitment

Faculty recruitment will be conducted by a committee, appointed by the Chair. The committee will conduct searches consistent with College and University guidelines.

D. Chair

The Chair serves at the pleasure of the College Dean and is appointed for a renewable term. The Chair is the chief executive officer of the department and has the powers and responsibilities as delegated by the President, Provost, and College Dean. In this capacity, the Chair will provide leadership and direct the administration of the Department’s academic, fiscal, and operational activities. The Chair acts as a liaison between the Faculty and the College and the University. The Chair advocates for the Department’s needs and will promote policies that would advance the Department, College, and University. The Chair is evaluated according to the College’s procedure.

E. Hiring a Chair

When the Chair’s position becomes vacant, the College Dean will lead the search and selection process in consultation with the Faculty and in accordance with the College and University procedures.

F. Other Administrative Positions

The Chair can appoint other faculty members in leadership roles to help with different aspects of running the department, such as undergraduate affairs, graduate affairs, broadening participation in computing, etc. The CSE department will hold elections whenever the Faculty Senate seat for the department is vacant; the result will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Office. Similarly, the CSE department representative

to the College Faculty Governance Committee will be elected by the department faculty whenever the position becomes vacant.

ARTICLE II. Departmental Faculty Meetings

1. A quorum is defined as majority of the voting faculty in residence for the semester during which the meeting is called.
2. The Chair will convene the Faculty, generally, twice a semester. Additional meetings may be called by the Chair as needed. Remote attendance to faculty meetings is allowed. The Department will make reasonable efforts to arrange remote access for faculty to attend these meetings.
3. Ordinarily the Chair will chair the faculty meeting. The Chair may make proposals and suggestions, participate actively, and lead discussions, but shall not make formal motions. The Chair is a voting member of the department and his/her right to vote is not confined to the case of breaking a tie.
4. Informality is desired in the conduct of the faculty meetings; however, in case of unresolved disagreements as to procedure, Robert's Rules of Order shall apply except as otherwise specified in this document.
5. All votes require a simple majority of those present to pass. A secret ballot will be taken if the Chair believes the issue demands one, or if any faculty member requests a secret ballot either before or during the meeting. Voting by faculty attending faculty meetings remotely is allowed. In cases when secret ballots are to be taken, the department will provide a suitable mechanism for remote voting.
6. Minutes of all meetings will be made available to the faculty and kept as a permanent electronic record. The specific actions taken regarding students, faculty, faculty recruiting, or other personal matters will be confidential and will not be included in the general minutes.

ARTICLE III. Committees

A. *Standing Committees*

1. Faculty Evaluation Committee

The duties include yearly evaluation of all department faculty in teaching, research and service. The committee is made up of tenured department faculty nominated and then elected by the department faculty at the end of every fall semester. The election is done by anonymous vote.

2. Tenure and Promotion Committee

The duties include review and evaluation of faculty candidates for tenure and promotion as well as mid-term reviews of tenure-track faculty. The committee is made up of all Associate Professor, full Professor, Associate Professor of Instruction, and full Professor of Instruction faculty in the department. Only Associate Professors and full Professors in the committee participate in the review

and evaluation of those department faculty applying for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor; only full Professors in the committee participate in the review and evaluation of those department faculty applying for promotion to the rank of full Professor; the entire committee participates in the review and evaluation of those department faculty applying for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor of Instruction; and only full Professors and full Professors of Instruction in the committee participate in the review and evaluation of those department faculty applying for promotion to the rank of full Professor of Instruction.

3. **Undergraduate/ABET/SACS Committee**

The duties include assisting in the undergraduate studies aspects of the department operations, including admissions, progression of students, revising curricula, and ABET/SACS accreditation activities.

4. **Graduate Committee**

The duties include assisting in the graduate studies aspects of the department operations, including admissions, progression of graduate students, curricula, and program reviews.

5. **Broadening Participation in Computing (BPC) Committee**

The duties include proposing and leading initiatives and activities to increase the representation of women and other underrepresented populations in computing students in the undergraduate and graduate programs and to assist with faculty hiring towards identifying and hiring women and candidates from underrepresented populations in computing.

Other standing committees may be appointed and/or dissolved as circumstances warrant. Standing committee chairpersons shall present an oral report of their activities at the faculty meetings, as required.

B. Ad Hoc Committees

Ad hoc committees may be appointed and/or dissolved by the Department Chair as circumstances warrant. Ad hoc committees include Faculty Search Committees, Interview Panels, committees to organize one-time events, or other committees deemed appropriate by the Chair.

ARTICLE IV. Annual Evaluation of Faculty

Faculty will be evaluated annually in whatever areas they are assigned effort according to the amount of effort they are assigned in each category. Professors of Instruction are typically assigned effort in Teaching and Service. Research Professors are typically assigned effort only in Research and Service. Tenure-earning and Tenured faculty are typically assigned effort in the areas of Research, Teaching, and Service. Candidates for tenure or promotion are directed to a separate document developed and approved by the Department faculty that includes the Department's cumulative criteria and procedures for promotion. If the expectations described herein are in any way unclear,

faculty are encouraged to consider their previous annual evaluations and to seek additional feedback from the evaluation committee and/or Department Chair.

Evaluative Criteria

All evaluative criteria are rough guidelines; activities that have greater impact will be given greater weight. Expectations will be in correlation to the faculty rank. Ratings will be based on all of the information provided and will consider the amount of effort assigned to each faculty. The guidelines given assume typical assignments. Higher and lower assignment percentages will result in increased or decreased expectations for each category.

Faculty are evaluated on a scale of 1-5 (0.5-point increments may be assigned) as described below. In the below descriptions, the terms “significantly exceeding expectations”, “exceeding expectations”, “meeting expectations”, and “not meeting expectations” respectively mean achieving well-above-average, above-average, average, and below-average performance compared to faculty members at the same rank at other leading departments in peer institutions who are active in the same specific discipline as the candidate.

- An Outstanding (5) contribution is typified by significantly exceeding expectations in the area.
- A Strong (4) contribution is typified by exceeding expectations in the area.
- A Satisfactory (3) contribution is typified by meeting expectations in the area.
- A Weak (2) contribution is characterized by making some substantial (i.e., nontrivial) contribution, but not meeting expectations, in the area.
- An Unacceptable (1) contribution is reflected by not making a substantial contribution in the area.

Product Categories and Activities by Effort Area

Research

Evaluation of contributions to research will be based only on information provided in the faculty self-evaluation and any other information known to the Faculty Evaluation Committee and to the Chair. Faculty members are expected to conduct high-quality research and produce scholarly works from that research with excellence and impact recognized at national and international levels.

Typical research product categories may include (but are not limited to):

- a. Funding of and competitive applications for grants
- b. Publications in high-quality peer-reviewed journals and conference proceedings
- c. Publication of books, book chapters, monographs, or other forms such as non-refereed conference proceedings and published abstracts
- d. Presentations at national and international conferences

- e. Invited seminars and talks
- f. Support of Ph.D. students and postdoctoral scholars
- g. Research related awards
- h. Patents or other technology transfer for research-related inventions
- i. Scientific instruments, software, codes, and/or databases

Teaching

Evaluation of contributions to teaching will be based only on information provided in the faculty self-evaluation, student evaluations, and any other information known to the Faculty Evaluation Committee and to the Chair.

The goal of teaching in the department is to promote students' learning, intellectual development, and career preparation. Towards this goal, faculty are expected to achieve excellence in teaching, as evidenced by a successful track record of classroom teaching, mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students, and active participation in curricular development and/or innovation in Computer Science and Engineering education. The self-evaluation should identify evidence of this proficiency, for example by including context and impact of their teaching activities. Typical teaching product categories may include (but are not limited to):

- a. Teaching one or more courses and obtaining positive student evaluations
- b. Creating a new course, redesigning an existing course, or other course improvements
- c. Evidence of meeting student learning outcomes
- d. ABET related analysis and documentation
- e. Peer evaluations
- f. Teaching awards and other recognitions of teaching accomplishments
- g. Documentation of innovative teaching methods, and attendance at teaching workshops
- h. Documentation of incorporating educational research findings in courses taught
- i. Student mentoring and training (e.g., graduate student supervision)
- j. Publishing a textbook(s)

Service

Evaluation of contributions in the area of service will be based only on information provided in the faculty self-evaluation and any other information known to the Faculty Evaluation Committee and to the Chair. Faculty are expected to have substantive service at the national and/or international level, with the appropriate amount and stature of such service external to the university increasing with the rank of the candidate.

Typical service product categories may include (but are not limited to):

- a. Active participation in faculty meetings and governance
- b. Service on university, college, or department committees
- c. Service as it relates to mentoring and leadership

- d. Service to the profession in the form of engagement and leadership in organizations related to the discipline
- e. Engagement in activities related to Broadening Participation in Computing (BPC)
- f. Peer review activities and editorial roles in the publication of scientific works
- g. Peer review in the funding process
- h. Organization and participation in scientific meetings, seminars and workshops
- i. Outreach or service to the community and other institutions
- j. Awards for service-related activities

Potential Information to Include in the Self-Evaluation

Research

- Narrative self-assessment that discusses the focus of the research program; expresses contribution to university, college, and Department goals; evaluates progress against the goals from the previous year and relative to career status; and sets goals for the coming year.
- Research grants or training grants funded/submitted
 - Nature and extent of the faculty member's contribution to the research or training program (e.g. role of faculty member as reflected in principle investigator or co-investigator status; extent of research activities involved; mentoring of grant personnel such as post-docs or students).
 - Quality of the funding source (e.g. federal, state, foundation, corporate, university internal; quantity of funds involved)
 - Support for graduate students and postdoctoral scholars
- Peer reviewed articles (journals, conference or workshop proceedings, or book chapter) or books submitted and/or accepted
 - Nature and extent of the faculty member's contribution to the research (e.g. role of faculty member as reflected in authorship status; extent of research activities involved such as a multiple or single experiments, case study or studies, systematic literature review, narrative review, edited volume, monograph, etc.).
 - Quality of the journals, proceedings, or books according to indicators such as impact factors, acceptance rates, quality of publisher, and/or influence of publication on a particular research community
- Scholarly presentations
 - Proper reference format with full author list.
 - Nature of the presentation (invited/contributed, peer-reviewed/non-peer reviewed), role of faculty member, special status (e.g., won award, keynote, panelist, etc.)
 - Title and scope (e.g., international, national, regional, local)
- Intellectual property
 - Patent applications and granted patents
 - Technology transfer activities

Teaching

- Narrative self-assessment that discusses teaching philosophy relative to University, College, Department, and individual teaching goals, including setting forth teaching goals for the coming year.
- Documentation of efforts to improve content delivery, to develop curriculum, or to otherwise contribute to student success outside of the typical requirements of one's course load.
- Quality of student evaluations of teaching (in relation to the level and content of the courses taught, the number of students enrolled, and the percent completing the evaluation)
 - Ratings in relation to the size, level, and nature of content of the course taught
 - Percent of students responding to evaluation
 - Summary of and responses to individual student comments
 - Explanations for why particular courses may have received low evaluations with plans for correction
- Peer review or observation of teaching. This could be completed by another faculty member in the Department, or by someone outside the Department (e.g., Center for Innovative Teaching & Learning)
- Student mentoring
 - Descriptions of all activities should include the depth of involvement (chair, supervisor, committee member, etc.), status of the project, and outcomes including any presentations or publications/submissions.
 - Ph.D. dissertations
 - Master's theses
 - Undergraduate Honors theses
 - Directed research activities
 - Independent studies
 - Industry internships
- Training grant or research grant administration that involves mentoring
 - Nature and type of administration, including depth of involvement in post-doc or student mentoring
 - Number of post-docs or students involved, and number directly supervised
 - Outcomes including any presentations or publications/submissions
- For Professors of Instruction only, any publications and presentations relating to the science of teaching and learning should be included in this area. (Tenure-track and tenured faculty should include such publications and presentations as Research outputs.)

Service

- Narrative self-assessment that discusses the nature of the service activities; expresses contribution to university, college, and Department goals; evaluates

progress against the goals from the previous year and relative to career status; and sets goals for the coming year.

- Service on university, college, or Department committees
 - Describe responsibilities, type and degree of involvement
 - Whether elected or appointed
- Service as it relates to mentorship
 - Formal and informal mentoring of faculty relating to teaching and/or research
 - Leadership or advising of student organizations and activities
- Service to the profession
 - Formal activity in societies, organizations, or agencies in the discipline or related to the discipline beyond paid membership
 - Scope and status of society (e.g. international, national, state, local; disciplinary or interdisciplinary membership)
 - Describe responsibilities, type and degree of involvement (e.g. chair, co-chair, fellow, board/senior member, member)
 - Whether elected or appointed
 - Peer-review activities
 - Grant review activity (include funding agency, participation in panels, depth and extent of involvement)
 - Peer reviews for books, articles, or conferences (specify type and number of items reviewed and for which publisher, journal, society, committee, or Department)
 - Editorial activity
 - Journal or series editor or associate editor (describe scope and nature of activities, time commitment, quality of outlet)
 - Formal appointment to editorial, review, or advisory boards (describe scope and nature of involvement)
 - Seminars and workshops primarily oriented to continuing professional education in the discipline or related to the discipline
 - Extent and nature of participation (e.g. organizer, participant, discussant)
 - Status of venue (e.g. international, national, state, or local organization)
 - Whether participation was invited or submitted
 - Inter-Institutional Invitations
 - Invitations to participate in promotion and tenure process or related academic evaluations, program evaluations, etc.
 - Describe nature and extent of invitation, standing of institution
- Service to the community
 - Describe the nature and extent of the activity including:
 - The community involved (e.g. global, national, regional/state, local)
 - Extent of curricular engagement between university and community (e.g. address community-identified needs, deepen students' civic

- and academic learning, enhance community well-being, and enrichment to the scholarship of the institution).
- Outreach activity (i.e. provision of institutional resources for community use with benefits to both campus and community)
 - Partnership activity (e.g. collaborative interactions with community and related scholarship for the mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, information, and resources such as research, capacity building, economic development, etc.).
- Engagement in activities related to Broadening Participation in Computing (BPC)
 - Describe the extent and nature of the engagement (e.g., leading or participating in activities designed to recruit or retain students or faculty from underrepresented groups, mentoring students from underrepresented groups, etc.)

Conflicts of Interest

Conflicts of interest, as defined by the University, must be managed per University regulations during the faculty-evaluation process.

Appeals Procedure

If a colleague wishes to appeal the Faculty Evaluation Committee's (FEC) and/or the department Chair's evaluation, the colleague should ask to meet with the FEC and/or the Chair, as appropriate, as the first step in an appeals procedure. The FEC and/or the Chair may be asked to explain the basis of the evaluation and/or the colleague may wish to present new material or to shed light on old material.

If a colleague wishes further review of the FEC's and/or the Chair's evaluation, the colleague should inform the FEC chair and the Department Chair in writing. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will appoint three of its members, who are not currently serving on the FEC nor as Department Chair, to an Ad Hoc FEC, serving as an Ad Hoc Appeals Committee. This Ad Hoc Appeals Committee, after examining relevant documents and arguments, will consult with the colleague who wants the review and with the FEC chair and the Department Chair. Whatever the committee's judgment of the appeal, its recommendation is to be sent on to the dean with the comments of the FEC and/or the Chair (whichever is appropriate). The colleague who initiates the review may attach comments to any of the material in the file under consideration.

ARTICLE V. Tenure and Promotion

Please refer to a separate document developed and approved by the Department faculty that includes the Department's tenure and promotion guidelines and procedures.

ARTICLE VI. Professor of Instruction Promotion

Please refer to a separate document developed and approved by the Department faculty that includes the Department's promotion guidelines and procedures for Professors of Instruction.

ARTICLE V. Amendments

Any CSE voting faculty member may propose amendments to this governance document. A proposed amendment must be submitted in writing/email to the Chair who will place it on the agenda within the next three scheduled departmental faculty meetings. The Chair may refer the amendment for review by a departmental committee. Upon completion of the review of the amendment within a reasonable time, the proposed change will be placed on the agenda of the next faculty meeting, where after a discussion a vote will be taken. Upon request by any faculty, the vote must be by secret ballot. A simple majority vote of all voting faculty members in residence is necessary to pass such amendments.

ARTICLE VI: Effect

Earlier versions:

Voted and adopted by CSE faculty on January 22, 2021.

Approved by the Provost's office on January 29, 2021

Current version:

Voted and adopted by CSE faculty on 2/25/2022.

Approved by the Provost's office on 11/1/2022.

Effective one year from Provost approval.