

Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure

Criteria and Procedures for the Department of Computer Science and Engineering (CSE)

Revised version approved by CSE faculty on 29 April 2013

***Based on <http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html> (viewed 18 March 2013) and
<http://trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php> (viewed 18 March 2013).***

Table of Contents

1. PREAMBLE	4
2. DEPARTMENT MISSION	4
3. APPOINTMENTS	5
3.1. Criteria	5
3.1.1. Tenure-Track Faculty	5
3.1.2. Tenure-Track Faculty at Regional Campuses	5
3.1.3. Regular Clinical-Track Faculty	5
3.1.4. Regular Research-Track Faculty	6
3.1.5. Auxiliary Faculty	7
3.1.6. Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty	7
3.2. Procedures	8
3.2.1. Tenure-Track Faculty	8
3.2.2. Tenure-Track Faculty at Regional Campuses	8
3.2.3. Regular Clinical-Track Faculty	8
3.2.4. Regular Research-Track Faculty	9
3.2.5. Auxiliary Faculty	10
3.2.6. Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty	10
4. ANNUAL REVIEWS	10
4.1. Procedures	10
4.1.1. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty	10
4.1.2. Tenured Faculty	12
4.1.3. Tenured-Track Faculty at Regional Campuses	12
4.1.4. Regular Clinical-Track Faculty	12
4.1.5. Regular Research-Track Faculty	13
5. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS	13
5.1. Criteria	13
5.2. Procedures	14
5.3. Documentation	14
6. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS	14
6.1. Criteria	14
6.1.1. Promotion to Associate Professor With Tenure	14
6.1.2. Promotion to Professor	15
6.1.3. Regional Campus Faculty	15
6.1.4. Promotion of Regular Clinical-Track Faculty	16
6.1.5. Promotion of Regular Research-Track Faculty	17

6.2.	Procedures	18
6.2.1.	Nonmandatory Reviews for Promotion and Tenure or for Promotion	19
6.2.2.	Promotion and Tenure Committee Voting Procedures	19
6.2.3.	Summary of Normal Promotion and Tenure Schedules	20
6.3.	Documentation.....	20
6.3.1.	Teaching	20
6.3.2.	Scholarship	22
6.3.3.	Service	24
6.4.	Regional Campus Faculty.....	25
7.	APPEALS	25
8.	SEVENTH YEAR REVIEW	25
9.	APPENDIX: PUBLICATION STRATEGIES FOR CSE FACULTY.....	26

1. Preamble

This document is a supplement to the general descriptions of appointment, promotion, and tenure (AP&T) criteria, procedures, and documentation that are outlined in the [Rules of the University Faculty](#) and the [Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). It specifically elaborates details of the AP&T criteria, procedures, and documentation outlined Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty ([Rules of the University Faculty Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure](#)); Chapter 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty ([Rules of the University Faculty Concerning Regular Clinical Track Faculty and Regular Research Track Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Nonreappointment, and Promotion](#)); the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews (see the current [Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#) and [Promotion and Tenure Review](#)); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the department shall follow the new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on appointment or reappointment of the department chair.

This document must be approved by the dean of the college and the Office of Academic Affairs before it may be implemented. It sets forth the department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the college and university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments, and its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the dean and Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to its mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-01](#).

2. Department Mission

The Department of Computer Science and Engineering (hereinafter the **Department**) will impact the information age as a national leader in computing research and education. We will prepare computing graduates who are highly sought after, productive, and well-respected for their work, and who contribute to new developments in computing. We will give students in other disciplines an appropriate foundation in computing for their education, research, and experiences after graduation, consistent with computing's increasingly fundamental role in society. In our areas of research focus, we will contribute key ideas to the development of the computing basis of the information age, advancing the state of the art for the benefit of society, the State of Ohio, and The Ohio State University. We will work with key academic partners within and outside of OSU, and with key industrial partners, in pursuit of our research and educational endeavors.

3. Appointments

3.1. Criteria

3.1.1. Tenure-Track Faculty

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#) and [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03](#).

An appointee to the rank of assistant professor will have strong potential to help the Department achieve its mission and to enhance its quality and reputation. Specifically, an appointee will have:

- demonstrated excellence in verbal and written communication;
- a record of notable research in the computing field;
- a potential for excellence in teaching, both in the classroom and in student advising;
- a potential for excellence in scholarship, associated primarily with research that enhances the state-of-the-art in computing;
- a potential for leadership in service, both to the profession and to the university;
- an attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a professional, ethical, and constructive fashion; and
- strong potential to achieve tenure and advance through the tenure-track faculty ranks.

Appointments at the rank of associate professor or professor will be made consistent with the criteria for promotion to those ranks, as discussed in Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2, respectively. Generally, an initial appointment at one of these levels will require that the candidate has achieved higher and/or more sustained levels of accomplishment in most of the above areas, as opposed to being based primarily on potential or on number of years of experience.

3.1.2. Tenure-Track Faculty at Regional Campuses

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#).

In recognition of the differing mission of the regional campuses, for regional campus faculty appointments relatively less weight will be placed on the quantity of an applicant's research compared to main campus appointments and more emphasis will be placed on teaching potential or excellence. The quality of research of regional campus appointments is expected to be comparable to that of Columbus appointments. The length of probationary period for regional campus faculty is the same as that for Columbus faculty.

3.1.3. Regular Clinical-Track Faculty

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-7-05](#).

Clinical-track faculty members in the Department will develop, enhance, and teach courses generally emphasizing professional practice issues and incorporating practical design experiences. They also may develop and teach courses designed for industry professionals seeking to advance their understanding of computing and especially its practice. In addition, regular clinical-track faculty may engage in the development and delivery of technology transfer and consultative services for industry and for other academic units at OSU, primarily in the

context of mentoring students in such activities. They will participate in faculty governance to the extent outlined in Section 6.2 and in the Department's Pattern of Administration document. Regular clinical-track faculty members will be referred to as "Assistant Professor of Practice", "Associate Professor of Practice", or "Professor of Practice" in Computer Science and Engineering.

An appointee to the rank of assistant professor of practice will have strong potential to help the Department achieve its mission and to enhance its quality and reputation, by contributing in the manner described in the previous paragraph. Specifically, an appointee will have:

- demonstrated excellence in verbal and written communication;
- a record of successful professional experience and productive activities in previous employment involving professional practice, indicating advanced knowledge and capability in the appointee's area of specialization within computing;
- a history of involvement in professional activities appropriate to the appointee's area of specialization, and documented professional accomplishment in these activities;
- a potential for excellence in teaching courses involving professional practice in computing, both in the classroom and in student advising;
- a potential for excellence in scholarship, associated typically with leadership in academic program development involving professional practice in computing and related state-of-the-practice activities that directly engage students;
- a potential for leadership in service, both to the profession and to the university;
- an attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a professional, ethical, and constructive fashion; and
- strong potential to advance through the clinical-track faculty ranks.

Appointments at the rank of associate professor of practice or professor of practice will be made generally consistent with the criteria for promotion to those ranks, as discussed in Section 6.1.4, but with the recognition that some of the criteria may not have been possible to meet in the case of new hires. Generally, an initial appointment at one of these levels will require that the candidate has achieved higher and/or more sustained levels of accomplishment in most of the above areas, as opposed to being based primarily on potential or on number of years of experience.

3.1.4. Regular Research-Track Faculty

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-7-32](#).

Research-track faculty members in the Department are expected to focus their efforts on research. They will be expected to advise graduate students, and may participate in limited educational activities such as developing and teaching courses related to their research, but are not expected and will not be required to do the latter. They will participate in faculty governance to the extent outlined in Section 6.2 and in the Department's Pattern of Administration document. Regular research-track faculty members will be referred to as "Research Assistant Professor", "Research Associate Professor", or "Research Professor" in Computer Science and Engineering.

An appointee to the rank of research assistant professor will have strong potential to help the Department achieve its mission and to enhance its quality and reputation, by contributing in the manner described in the previous paragraph. Specifically, an appointee will have:

- demonstrated excellence in verbal and written communication;
- a record of notable research in the computing field;
- a potential for excellence in advising of graduate students;
- a potential for excellence in scholarship, associated primarily with research that enhances the state-of-the-art in computing;
- a potential for leadership in service, both to the profession and to the university;
- an attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a professional, ethical, and constructive fashion; and
- strong potential to advance through the research-track faculty ranks.

Appointments at the rank of research associate professor or research professor will be made generally consistent with the criteria for promotion to those ranks, as discussed in Section 6.1.4, but with the recognition that some of the criteria may not have been possible to meet in the case of new hires. Generally, an initial appointment at one of these levels will require that the candidate has achieved higher and/or more sustained levels of accomplishment in most of the above areas, as opposed to being based primarily on potential or on number of years of experience.

3.1.5. Auxiliary Faculty

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-5-19](#).

An appointee to a lecturer or senior lecturer position will have strong potential to help the Department achieve its mission and to enhance its quality and reputation, by contributing to teaching. In addition, an appointee to a lecturer position normally will have an advanced degree in computing or a related field, or equivalent experience; an appointee to a senior lecturer position normally will have an earned doctorate in the computing field, or in a closely-allied discipline appropriate to the appointee's area of specialization. Specifically, an appointee to either position will have:

- demonstrated excellence in verbal and written communication;
- a potential for excellence in teaching; and
- an attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a professional, ethical, and constructive fashion.

3.1.6. Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty

Courtesy appointments are no-salary joint appointments for regular Ohio State faculty from other tenure-initiating units. Candidates for such appointments will have significant experience in computing, and will be ready and able to engage effectively with the Department's regular faculty in activities that help the Department achieve its mission and enhance its quality and reputation.

3.2. Procedures

3.2.1. Tenure-Track Faculty

A national search will be conducted for each tenure-track faculty position unless the Office of Academic Affairs approves an exception to this policy. The Department will make vigorous efforts to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for each position. A candidate for a tenure-track faculty appointment will submit an application that includes a current curriculum vitae and the names of at least three references, who will be asked to write on his/her behalf. After receiving an invitation to visit the Department, the candidate will participate in an interview that includes meetings with several tenure-track faculty, and will make a public presentation of his/her research. The Faculty Search Committee will then consider the reference letters and feedback on the interview from faculty, staff, and students, to make a recommendation to the Department chair regarding an offer.

A tenure-track faculty appointment will be made by the Department chair, following approval by the dean of the College of Engineering. An offer at the associate professor or professor rank, with or without tenure, or an offer of prior service credit, will require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. An offer to a foreign national will require prior consultation with the Office of International Education.

If a proposed appointment includes credit toward tenure or is an appointment to associate professor, the Department chair's decision to appoint will be approved in advance by the faculty who would be eligible to vote on promotion and tenure, according to the voting rules in force for an internal promotion-and-tenure decision; or if it is an appointment to professor, according to the voting rules in force for an internal promotion-to-professor decision.

3.2.2. Tenure-Track Faculty at Regional Campuses

The hiring of regional campus faculty is initiated by the dean of the regional campus, since funding for such positions comes from these campuses. The regional campus faculty have the primary responsibility for determining the position description for a regional campus faculty search, but it should consult with and reach agreement on the description with the Department chair. The search committee for a regional campus position will include at least one member of the CSE Faculty Search Committee. Part of the interview process will be conducted on main campus. The CSE Faculty Search Committee will consider recommendations of the regional campus faculty search committee and make a recommendation to the Department chair.

A regional campus appointment will be made jointly by the Department chair and the dean of the regional campus, following approval by the dean of the College of Engineering. An offer at the associate professor or professor rank, with or without tenure, or an offer of prior service credit, will require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. An offer to a foreign national will require prior consultation with the Office of International Education.

No tenure-track appointment to a regional campus faculty position in CSE will be made if it would result in the total number of FTE tenure-track faculty in CSE on all regional campuses exceeding 20% of the number of FTE tenure-track faculty in the Department on main campus.

3.2.3. Regular Clinical-Track Faculty

A candidate for an initial regular clinical-track faculty appointment will submit an application that includes a current curriculum vitae and the names of at least three references, who will be

asked to write on his/her behalf. After receiving an invitation to visit the Department, the candidate will participate in an interview that includes meetings with several tenure-track, regular clinical-track, and regular research-track faculty, and will make a public presentation to highlight his/her background, qualifications, and vision for supporting the department's mission. The Faculty Search Committee will then consider the reference letters and feedback on the interview from faculty, staff, and students, to make a recommendation to the Department chair regarding an offer.

An initial regular clinical-track faculty appointment will be made by the Department chair, following approval by the dean of the College of Engineering. An offer with the associate professor of practice or professor of practice title will require the prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. An offer to a foreign national will require prior consultation with the Office of International Education. Appointment will be for a period of three years, and may be at any FTE level.

Reappointment to a regular clinical-track position will be made by the Department chair, following consultation with the tenure-track faculty and the current regular clinical-track faculty (see Section 4.1.4), and following approval by the dean of the College of Engineering. A reappointment at the associate professor or professor rank will require the prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Reappointment of a foreign national will require prior consultation with the Office of International Education. Reappointment will be for a period of three years, and may be at any FTE level.

No appointment or reappointment to a regular clinical-track faculty position in CSE will be made if it would result in the number of FTE regular clinical-track faculty plus the number of regular research-track faculty in the Department exceeding 20% of the number of FTE tenure-track faculty in the Department on main campus.

3.2.4. Regular Research-Track Faculty

A candidate for an initial regular research-track faculty appointment will submit an application that includes a current curriculum vitae and the names of at least three references, who will be asked to write on his/her behalf. After receiving an invitation to visit the Department, the candidate will participate in an interview that includes meetings with several tenure-track, regular clinical-track, and regular research-track faculty, and will make a public presentation to highlight his/her background, qualifications, and vision for supporting the department's mission. The Faculty Search Committee will then consider the reference letters and feedback on the interview from faculty, staff, and students, to make a recommendation to the Department chair regarding an offer.

An initial regular research-track faculty appointment will be made by the Department chair, following approval by the dean of the College of Engineering. An offer with the research associate professor or research professor title will require the prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. An offer to a foreign national will require prior consultation with the Office of International Education. Appointment will be for a period of three years, and may be at any FTE level.

Reappointment to a regular research-track position will be made by the Department chair, following consultation with the tenure-track faculty and the current regular research-track faculty (see Section 4.1.4), and following approval by the dean of the College of Engineering. A

reappointment at the associate professor or professor rank will require the prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Reappointment of a foreign national will require prior consultation with the Office of International Education. Reappointment will be for a period of three years, and may be at any FTE level.

No appointment or reappointment to a regular research-track faculty position in CSE will be made if it would result in the number of FTE regular clinical-track faculty plus the number of regular research-track faculty in the Department exceeding 20% of the number of FTE tenure-track faculty in the Department on main campus.

3.2.5. Auxiliary Faculty

An appointment or reappointment to an auxiliary faculty position will be made by the Department chair, following consultation with appropriate faculty who are familiar with the candidate and the duties of the position and (in the case of reappointment) have interacted with the candidate in performance of the candidate's assigned duties. For an auxiliary appointment that involves a regular or modified faculty title, input also will be sought from the Faculty Advisory Committee (see the Department's Pattern of Administration document). Appointment or reappointment will be for a period not to exceed three years.

3.2.6. Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty

A candidate for a courtesy appointment will be nominated initially by a tenure-track faculty member in the Department. The Department chair, after consultation with the tenure-track faculty, will invite the candidate to make a public presentation of his/her research that highlights past and potential interactions with the Department's faculty.

A courtesy appointment or a courtesy reappointment will be made by the Department chair, following consultation with the tenure-track faculty. Appointment or reappointment will be for a period not to exceed three years.

4. Annual Reviews

Each faculty member will be expected to prepare an **Annual Activity Report** detailing his/her professional activity over the past year. This report, accompanied by a current curriculum vitae, normally will be due in March. The Department chair will annually provide at least two weeks advance notice to all faculty of the exact due date of this material. The report will contain information on scholarship, teaching, and service as specified on the forms provided for this purpose. The Annual Activity Report form will follow the promotion and tenure dossier outline prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs. Information from the Annual Activity Report will be used in annual evaluations as noted below, and in determining salary increases (see Section 5). Supplementary information may be offered by the faculty member, or may be requested by the Department chair. The Annual Activity Report and any other materials submitted by the faculty member as part of the annual review will be included in that faculty member's personnel file.

4.1. Procedures

4.1.1. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03](#).

The Department chair will prepare a written annual review for each probationary tenure-track faculty member. This review will be conducted as follows:

- in the second year of the candidate's appointment, with the advice of the entire Promotion and Tenure Committee;
- in other years in which a more elaborate formal review is not required, with the advice of a subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee consisting of at least two members selected annually at a meeting of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Should any annual review suggest that the faculty member's likelihood of meeting expectations for promotion and tenure is poor, the case will be presented to and reviewed by the entire Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will decide whether or not to recommend renewal of the faculty member's appointment.

The review will be based on relevant materials including the Annual Activity Report submitted by the faculty member, and normally will be given to the faculty member before the end of Spring semester. The review will summarize strengths and weaknesses, contain a clear statement of the area(s) of performance needing improvement, and whenever possible suggest ways and means to bring about improved performance.

The Department chair then will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review, and the faculty member will be offered an opportunity to comment on the review. If necessary, a response to the faculty member's comments will be prepared by the same person(s) who prepared the review, and a copy of this new statement will be sent to the faculty member. A copy of all summary statements and responses, if any, will be included in the faculty member's personnel file.

Fourth Year Review

The fourth year review normally will be conducted during the Spring semester of the candidate's fourth year of service, and will be conducted similarly to a promotion and tenure review (see Section 6, with promotion and tenure criteria applied with respect to achievement to date and potential for achievement till the promotion and tenure review). The entire Promotion and Tenure Committee vote will determine whether or not to recommend renewal of the faculty member's appointment. Other than the later review in the semester, the only major difference in procedure is that external evaluation letters will not be solicited by the Department for the fourth year review.

Exclusions and Extensions

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) provides for a total of up to two years' time, in one-year increments, to be excluded from the probationary period for birth or adoption of a child, personal illness, care of sick or injured person or other factors beyond a faculty member's control that significantly interferes with productivity; and for a total of up to three years' time, in one-year increments, as an extension of the probationary period for less than full-time service (based on the principle that the usual probationary period represents full-time service). While an eligible individual may request an exclusion or extension at any time within the limits of the rule, the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee will consider during the annual review process whether to *recommend* that a faculty member apply for an exclusion or extension if eligible. However, the Department will not *require* a faculty member to apply for an exclusion or extension until and unless the college or university requires it.

4.1.2. Tenured Faculty

The Department chair will prepare a written annual review for each tenured faculty member. The review will be based on relevant materials including the Annual Activity Report submitted by the faculty member, and normally will be given to the faculty member before the end of Spring semester. The review will summarize strengths and weaknesses, contain a clear statement of the area(s) of performance needing improvement, and whenever possible suggest ways and means to bring about improved performance.

The Department chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review, and the faculty member will be offered an opportunity to comment on the review in writing. If necessary, the Department chair will prepare a response to the faculty member's comments, and a copy of this new statement will be sent to the faculty member. A copy of all summary statements and responses, if any, will be included in the faculty member's personnel file.

4.1.3. Tenure-Track Faculty at Regional Campuses

For untenured regional campus faculty, annual reviews (except for the fourth year review and reviews for promotion and tenure) will be conducted by the regional campus, in consultation with the Department chair who will provide feedback on research performance. The fourth year review will be conducted following the procedure described above for faculty on the main campus, except that the dean of the regional campus will provide an evaluation on the candidate's teaching and service activities. Reviews for promotion and tenure will be conducted according to criteria and procedures described later in this document.

For tenured regional campus faculty, annual reviews (except for promotion reviews) will be conducted by the regional campus, in consultation with the Department chair who provides feedback on research performance. Reviews for promotion will follow criteria and procedures described later in this document.

4.1.4. Regular Clinical-Track Faculty

The Department chair will prepare a written annual review for each regular clinical-track faculty member of each rank. The review will be based on relevant materials including the Annual Activity Report submitted by the faculty member, and normally will be given to the faculty member before the end of Spring semester. The review will summarize strengths and weaknesses, contain a clear statement of the area(s) of performance needing improvement, and whenever possible suggest ways and means to bring about improved performance.

The procedure will include an additional stage for the final annual review during the faculty member's current appointment contract. The Department chair will appoint an *ad hoc* committee consisting of both regular clinical-track faculty and tenure-track faculty. The former will be selected by the Department chair. The latter will be a subset of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, selected by the Department chair in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair. This committee will review the cumulative performance of the faculty member whose appointment contract term is ending and will make recommendations to the Department chair regarding whether the contract should be renewed, and if so whether the faculty member should be considered for promotion to the next regular clinical-track faculty rank (in which case see Section 6).

The Department chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review if either party requests a meeting (such a meeting is required for probationary faculty members), and in any

event the faculty member will be offered an opportunity to comment on the review. If necessary, the Department chair will prepare a response to the faculty member's comments, and a copy of this new statement will be sent to the faculty member. A copy of all summary statements and responses, if any, will be included in the faculty member's personnel file.

4.1.5. Regular Research-Track Faculty

The Department chair will prepare a written annual review for each regular research-track faculty member of each rank. The review will be based on relevant materials including the Annual Activity Report submitted by the faculty member, and normally will be given to the faculty member before the end of Spring semester. The review will summarize strengths and weaknesses, contain a clear statement of the area(s) of performance needing improvement, and whenever possible suggest ways and means to bring about improved performance.

The procedure will include an additional stage for the final annual review during the faculty member's current appointment contract. The Department chair will appoint an *ad hoc* committee consisting of both regular research-track faculty and tenure-track faculty. The former will be selected by the Department chair. The latter will be a subset of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, selected by the Department chair in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair. This committee will review the cumulative performance of the faculty member whose appointment contract term is ending and will make recommendations to the Department chair regarding whether the contract should be renewed, and if so whether the faculty member should be considered for promotion to the next regular research-track faculty rank (in which case see Section 6).

The Department chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review if either party requests a meeting (such a meeting is required for probationary faculty members), and in any event the faculty member will be offered an opportunity to comment on the review. If necessary, the Department chair will prepare a response to the faculty member's comments, and a copy of this new statement will be sent to the faculty member. A copy of all summary statements and responses, if any, will be included in the faculty member's personnel file.

5. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

5.1. Criteria

A salary increase can consist of one or more of the following three components: mandatory (independent of merit), special "catch-up" or "market" salary adjustments, and merit. The procedures and criteria described below are related to the merit component of a salary increase.

The criteria for salary adjustments will be the same as those for promotion and tenure in Section 6. Salary recommendations will be based on performance during the past year and on the appropriateness of the salary level to the individual's overall record.

Faculty on leave for part or all of an academic year will be evaluated without prejudice for being on leave. If an individual is away for part of an academic year, then the evaluation of teaching will be based on any course(s) taught while present. A similar procedure will be followed for evaluation of Department and University service.

5.2. Procedures

Each faculty member, even one on leave, will be asked to submit an Annual Activity Report and current curriculum vitae to the Department chair, as described in Section 4. The Department chair will review this material and other pertinent information and will make recommendations to the dean of the College of Engineering in accordance with procedures established by the College and University during that year. Each faculty member will receive a written salary adjustment recommendation, in a timely manner, from the Department chair.

5.3. Documentation

Pertinent information for salary increases includes the Annual Activity Report and current curriculum vitae submitted to the Department chair by the faculty member. Supplementary information may be offered by the faculty member, or may be requested by the Department chair. A faculty member who fails to submit the required documentation, or who submits documentation insufficient to permit an informed evaluation of their performance, may be denied a merit increase.

6. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

6.1. Criteria

6.1.1. Promotion to Associate Professor With Tenure

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#).

The criteria for an appointment to an assistant professor position (Section 3.1.1) involve *potential*. The criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure involve *achievement* of a "very good" (see Section 6.3) record combined with the potential for higher and more sustained achievement. They are:

- the achievement of a very good record in teaching, both in the classroom and in student advising;
- the achievement of a very good record in scholarship, associated primarily with research that enhances the state-of-the-art in computing and that has led to the establishment of an independent research identity and reputation;
- the achievement of a very good record of service, both to the profession and to the university;
- professional and ethical conduct consistent with the [AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics](#); and
- strong potential to achieve higher and more sustained levels of accomplishment and thereby to advance to professor.

The Ohio State University is a world-class research university that requires each college, department, and program to maintain a distinguished research program. This requirement is the foundation for continual improvements in the quality of graduate and undergraduate education programs by timely introduction of new knowledge, new discoveries, and new innovations into the classroom. Most importantly, excellence in scholarship brings competitiveness and recognition to the department, the college, and the university so that we continue to attract strong

students, excellent faculty, and research grants. A high research expectation of junior faculty is therefore consistent with the overall mission of the institution.

Research will be a critical evaluation component in the tenure and promotion process. In this research-intensive department, a faculty member with an average research record will not be granted tenure even if he/she has an excellent teaching and service record. On the other hand, teaching and service are also important criteria in the evaluation. The candidate must show strong and sustained evidence of substantial promise for continued growth and productivity. In summary, tenure will be reserved for faculty members who have clearly demonstrated the ability and potential to become distinguished scholars and recognized leaders in their research fields, who are effective teachers in the classroom and in advising, and who provide high quality service to the university and to the community.

Section 6.3 lists the typical examples of evidence to support a case for promotion, and the methods that will be used to evaluate this evidence.

6.1.2. Promotion to Professor

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#).

The criteria for promotion to professor involve *sustained* achievement combined with the attainment of *distinction* in the field. They are:

- the sustained achievement of a very good record in teaching, both in the classroom and in student advising;
- the sustained achievement of a very good record in scholarship, associated primarily with research that enhances the state-of-the-art in computing;
- the sustained achievement of a very good record of service, both to the profession and to the university;
- professional and ethical conduct consistent with the [AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics](#); and
- a total body of high-quality work and recognition as a leader in the field that leads to national or international distinction.

Section 6.3 lists the typical examples of evidence to support a case for promotion, and the methods that will be used to evaluate this evidence.

6.1.3. Regional Campus Faculty

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-07](#).

Expectations for regional campus faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the main campus. The primary mission of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate education and serve the academic needs of their communities. Therefore, the relative emphasis on teaching and service expected of regional campus faculty will typically be greater. While the Department expects regional campus faculty to achieve a record of high-quality scholarship and publications, it recognizes that greater teaching and service commitments and less access to research resources for regional campus faculty require different research expectations. In

general, regional campus faculty are not expected to have a research output that is as high as that for main campus faculty, but the overall quality of this research is expected to be comparable.

6.1.4. Promotion of Regular Clinical-Track Faculty

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-7-05](#).

Promotion to Associate Professor of Practice

The criteria for an appointment to an assistant professor of practice position (Section 3.1.3) involve *potential*. The criteria for promotion to associate professor of practice involve *achievement* combined with the potential for higher and more sustained achievement. They are:

- the achievement of a very good record in teaching courses involving professional practice in computing, both in the classroom and in student advising, and a potential for excellence in teaching;
- the achievement of a very good record in scholarship, associated typically with leadership in academic program development involving professional practice in computing and related state-of-the-practice activities that directly engage students, and a potential for excellence in scholarship;
- the achievement of a very good record of service, both to the profession and to the university, and a potential for excellence in service;
- professional and ethical conduct consistent with the [AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics](#); and
- strong potential to achieve higher and more sustained levels of accomplishment and thereby to advance to professor of practice.

Academic program development and effective teaching will be the most critical evaluation components in the promotion process. On the other hand, service is also an important criterion in the evaluation. The candidate must show strong and sustained evidence of substantial promise for continued growth and productivity.

Promotion to Professor of Practice

The criteria for promotion to professor of practice involve *sustained* achievement combined with the attainment of *distinction* in the field. They are:

- the sustained achievement of a very good record in teaching courses involving professional practice in computing, both in the classroom and in student advising, and a potential for excellence in teaching;
- the sustained achievement of a very good record in scholarship, associated typically with leadership in academic program development involving professional practice in computing and related state-of-the-practice activities that directly engage students;
- the sustained achievement of a very good record of service, both to the profession and to the university;
- professional and ethical conduct consistent with the [AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics](#); and

- a total body of high-quality work and recognition as a leader in the field that leads to national or international distinction in at least one of teaching, scholarship, or service.

Section 6.3 lists the typical examples of evidence to support a case for promotion, and the methods that will be used to evaluate this evidence.

6.1.5. Promotion of Regular Research-Track Faculty

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-7-32](#).

Promotion to Research Associate Professor

The criteria for an appointment to a research assistant professor position (Section 3.1.3) involve *potential*. The criteria for promotion to research associate professor involve *achievement* combined with the potential for higher and more sustained achievement. They are:

- the achievement of a very good record in graduate student advising, and a potential for excellence in advising;
- the achievement of a very good record in scholarship, associated primarily with research that enhances the state-of-the-art in computing;
- the achievement of a very good record of service, both to the profession and to the university, and a potential for excellence in service;
- professional and ethical conduct consistent with the [AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics](#); and
- strong potential to achieve higher and more sustained levels of accomplishment and thereby to advance to research professor.

Research will be a critical evaluation component in the promotion process. The candidate must show strong and sustained evidence of substantial promise for continued growth and productivity.

Promotion to Research Professor

The criteria for promotion to research professor involve *sustained* achievement combined with the attainment of *distinction* in the field. They are:

- the sustained achievement of a very good record in graduate student advising;
- the sustained achievement of a very good record in scholarship, associated primarily with research that enhances the state-of-the-art in computing;
- the sustained achievement of a very good record of service, both to the profession and to the university;
- professional and ethical conduct consistent with the [AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics](#); and
- a total body of high-quality work and recognition as a leader in the field that leads to national or international distinction.

Section 6.3 lists the typical examples of evidence to support a case for promotion, and the methods that will be used to evaluate this evidence.

6.2. Procedures

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04](#) and [Faculty Rule 3335-7-08](#).

The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of the tenured faculty for whom the Department is the tenure initiating unit. The **eligible voters** in a particular case are (see Section 6.2.2 for further clarification):

- for cases of promotion to associate professor with tenure or professor, all members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee of higher rank than the candidate for promotion, except the Department chair;
- for cases of promotion to associate professor of practice or professor of practice, all members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee except the Department chair, plus all clinical-track faculty members of higher rank than the candidate for promotion.
- for cases of promotion to research associate professor or research professor, all members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee except the Department chair, plus all research-track faculty members of higher rank than the candidate for promotion.

Promotion and tenure reviews normally will take place in the Autumn semester; the schedule below assumes this. These reviews include all mandatory reviews for faculty in the final year of a probationary period, and all approved nonmandatory reviews. If a review will occur during any other semester, the normal schedule below may be adjusted accordingly to allow similarly adequate time for all steps.

Spring Semester of the Academic Year Preceding the Review

The Promotion and Tenure Committee chair will appoint a two-person **Liaison Subcommittee** of the eligible voters for each faculty member who will be undergoing review for promotion and tenure or for promotion in the next academic year. One of the two will be designated as the chair of that subcommittee. The faculty member undergoing review will be permitted to select one additional eligible voter in his/her case to serve on his/her Liaison Subcommittee, if desired. The Liaison Subcommittee members will explain and be available to answer questions the candidate may have concerning the preparation of the dossier. The Liaison Subcommittee also will be responsible for gathering any materials deemed relevant to the review, including a sealed list of names of potential external evaluators suggested by the candidate and known only to the candidate. Under no circumstances will the candidate solicit letters of evaluation or have contact of any type with prospective or actual evaluators regarding the review process.

The eligible voters in each case will identify appropriate external evaluators to whom requests for evaluation will be sent, using the following three-step method. First, the eligible voters will suggest names of potential evaluators. Second, the sealed list of names suggested by the candidate will be opened. Finally, the eligible voters will discuss and consolidate the two lists, paying careful attention to balance among the evaluators in all relevant respects and as indicated in the Faculty Rules. External evaluators shall not be close personal friends, research collaborators, or former academic advisors or postdoctoral mentors of the candidate.

Summer Semester

The Department chair will send official letters soliciting the evaluations, normally by early Summer semester. Each letter will be accompanied by a current curriculum vitae and up to five representative publications chosen by the candidate. The Department chair will monitor receipt of the evaluation letters to ensure that they are received by the beginning of the review semester.

Autumn Semester of the Review Year

The eligible voters in each case will receive the candidate's dossier early in Autumn semester from the Department chair, and will be expected to read and become familiar with it in anticipation of discussion and voting. The chairs of the Liaison Subcommittees will lead the discussions of the respective candidates' cases. The cases of all candidates for a given rank will be discussed before voting takes place on any of them.

6.2.1. Nonmandatory Reviews for Promotion and Tenure or for Promotion

Any faculty member in the Department may request in writing to the Department chair to have a formal promotion and tenure or promotion review that would not be mandatory: early consideration of promotion to associate professor with tenure, promotion to professor, or promotion within the regular clinical-track faculty ranks. Such requests must be filed by May 1 and be accompanied by a current curriculum vitae. Furthermore, any tenured associate professor will be considered for promotion to professor on the recommendation by May 1 of the Department chair or any tenured professor, assuming the candidate gives his or her consent to being nominated.

The eligible voters for a prospective case will consider the request and, by May 20, decide whether a formal review will be conducted. The affected faculty member will be notified of the decision and, if it is negative, the rationale.

6.2.2. Promotion and Tenure Committee Voting Procedures

An eligible voter who has a potential conflict of interest with a particular candidate under review should, if in doubt, seek advice from the Promotion and Tenure Committee and/or appropriate College or University offices. A member having a conflict of interest with a candidate will not participate in the review of that candidate and will be considered an ineligible voter in that candidate's case. A member who is on leave at the time of the review may choose to vote in the case of a particular candidate if he/she can attend the meeting; otherwise the member is considered an ineligible voter. Every eligible voter will be recorded as voting **yes**, **no**, or **not voting**. In the description below, *V* stands for the number of **eligible voters**.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee chair will announce to the Committee a meeting time for voting. The number of eligible voters present (in person or via teleconference) to vote must be at least $2V/3$; otherwise, a recorded vote is not taken at the meeting and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will set a new date for a meeting to obtain a vote.

Those who attend the voting meeting will vote by show of hands—yes (in favor of promotion and tenure or promotion) or no (against). Any eligible voter who fails to make his vote known to the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair at the meeting will be recorded as not voting. The Promotion and Tenure Committee chair will then record and announce the vote totals to the entire Committee.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation will be determined according to the following procedure. Let Y be the number of yes votes, and N the number of no votes, for a particular candidate's case. A positive recommendation for the candidate from the Promotion and Tenure Committee requires that $Y \geq 2N$ and $Y+N \geq 2V/3$.

The Liaison Subcommittee for a candidate, with the assistance of the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair, will be responsible for drafting the Committee's recommendation letter for that candidate. All members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will have the opportunity to examine and make suggestions regarding the letter before it is presented to the Department chair; but the final letter will come from, and will be the responsibility of, the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair.

6.2.3. Summary of Normal Promotion and Tenure Schedules

Spring: Requests due on reviews for nonmandatory promotion and tenure, and decisions made on requests for nonmandatory reviews; Liaison Subcommittees appointed for mandatory and nonmandatory reviews, and for fourth year reviews.

Late Spring/Early Summer: Evaluation letters solicited for tenure and promotion reviews.

Fall: Tenure and promotion reviews conducted.

Winter: Fourth year reviews conducted.

6.3. Documentation

Each faculty member being reviewed will complete the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier, and will make available to the Promotion and Tenure Committee copies of all publications authored or co-authored by the candidate and copies of all student evaluations of instruction for courses taught by the candidate. Other significant documents normally considered during the reviews will include external letters of evaluation, peer evaluations of teaching, and prior annual performance evaluations. Supplementary documentation may be offered by the candidate, or may be requested by the Liaison Subcommittee, the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair, or the Department chair.

In each of the three major categories and in a few specific subcategories of each (outlined below), ratings of the candidate's record will be provided on a scale ranging from **poor**, through **fair**, **good**, **very good**, to **excellent**. As noted in Section 6.1.1, a record rated as very good is tantamount to meeting expectations for promotion in that category. The Promotion and Tenure Committee rarely will rate the record of a promotion candidate as poor or fair, but these ratings may be seen more frequently in annual or fourth-year reviews in situations where substantial improvement is required to meet expectations. A record rated as good means that expectations have not been met; a record rated as excellent means that expectations have been exceeded.

6.3.1. Teaching

The teaching component of the review will include summary evaluations of classroom teaching, curricular development, and advising of students.

Classroom Teaching

Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the classroom teaching sub-category of teaching will include:

- Student evaluations of instruction
- Peer observations of instruction
- Awards for teaching
- Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from former students regarding teaching effectiveness
- Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from other faculty regarding teaching effectiveness

The CSE approach to teaching assessment and feedback has two components. Direct formal assessment of teaching will be conducted using the OSU student evaluation of instruction (SEI) questionnaires and the department's official peer evaluation of teaching forms. SEI's will be used in each regular course, and at least two peer reviews of teaching (by faculty selected by the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair) will be conducted within one year before the fourth year review and any promotion and/or tenure review. These will be part of the candidate's record to be considered in such reviews. Informal feedback intended for formative purposes can be provided using the CSE student evaluation of teaching (SET) questionnaires in each regular course and via informal reviews by peers. These will not be part of the candidate's record to be considered in promotion and tenure reviews unless SEI's are not available for the same course (which may be the case in some courses for candidates reviewed before about 2008, because CSE only recently adopted the OSU SEI's).

Each of the two peer reviewers will prepare a separate assessment. It is assumed that the person being observed will have been informed in advance when an assessment is to be conducted. A subsequent visit will be added if the candidate so requests. Classroom visits are expected during the years preceding the fourth year review, mandatory review for promotion and tenure, and review for promotion to professor. The total direct assessment, however, will be comprehensive, so that material from the range of courses taught by the candidate will be examined and evaluated. The candidate may obtain copies of peer reviews of teaching by request to the Department chair's office.

Curricular Development

Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the curricular development sub-category of teaching will include:

- Curricular and content development and innovations
- Textbook and course material development
- Pedagogical innovations
- Publications about teaching computing
- Awards for curricular development
- Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from other faculty regarding curricular contributions

Advising

Each faculty member is expected to perform his/her fair share of academic advising to undergraduate and graduate students, and to provide appropriate advice regarding course and program matters as well as career and graduate school choices. The primary distinguishing factor in this sub-category of teaching will be the role of the candidate in advising graduate

student research leading to Ph.D. and M.S. (thesis) degrees, and (to a lesser extent) senior honors theses by undergraduates. Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the advising sub-category of teaching will include:

- Achievements (e.g., publications and awards) of Ph.D., M.S. thesis, and senior honors thesis students advised
- Sustained progress toward the degree by Ph.D. and M.S. thesis students advised
- Service on Ph.D. dissertation and M.S. thesis committees of students who have other primary advisors
- Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from other faculty regarding advising contributions

6.3.2. Scholarship

Scholarship for tenure-track faculty involves primarily research that advances the state-of-the-art in computing. The scholarship component of the review will include summary evaluations of research quality, quantity, significance/impact, and funding.

Quality

"Quality" refers to the degree to which the candidate's research represents superior intellectual achievement: the originality, novelty, and intrinsic value of research contributions. Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the quality of research will include:

- Independent external evaluators' opinions of the quality of the work (when available)
- Promotion and Tenure Committee members' own opinions of the quality of the work
- Prestige (reputation and visibility), selectivity, and impact factors of publication outlets
- Patents, patent applications, and similar evidence of technological innovation
- Competitive peer-reviewed grants, contracts, and gifts for which the candidate is the PI or a critically important co-PI
- Invited presentations at other institutions
- Invitations to serve on editorial boards or program committees of prestigious journals or conferences
- Invitations to serve on government or professional organization policy-making panels and boards
- Special commendations and honors for research quality, e.g., professional society Fellow designation

Because of the wide range of applications of computing, research papers may appear in diverse journals and proceedings. In many areas of the discipline, conference publications are rigorously reviewed and prestigious, and can be as significant as publications in premier journals. The appendix of this document (Section 9) includes a discussion of legitimate and community-recognized publishing strategies for Computer Science and Engineering faculty members.

Quantity

"Quantity" refers to the total body of research results the candidate has produced and effectively disseminated to the broader community, typically through publication. Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the quantity of research will include:

- Number of equivalent papers (i.e., accounting for multiple authorship and paper length) appearing in or fully accepted by top publication outlets, and that can be attributed to the candidate's research publication efforts
- Number of publications appearing in other outlets
- Number of substantial work products other than traditional publications (such as software), if applicable

The number of other publications will be considered evidence of quantity, but generally will have less weight than publications in top publication outlets. Similarly, work products that have been taken into account in hiring the candidate generally will be of less importance in quantity-of-research determination than those produced later. For faculty members hired as associate professor or with years credited toward tenure, the totality of the record will be considered when assessing quantity, along with the expectation for productivity while at OSU.

Ohio State specifically asks the candidate to include in the dossier, for each publication that the candidate wishes to be considered as a serious contribution, a description of both the intellectual contribution (qualitative) and effort contribution (quantitative). The Promotion and Tenure Committee may contact non-student co-authors to confirm such descriptions, and will generally consider this information to be more authoritative than speculation about order of authorship in determining the candidate's contribution to joint work.

In some situations, non-traditional research products and methods of dissemination will need to be evaluated. For example, a candidate might have produced software disseminated to the community via network download. Data such as the number of downloads will be considered evidence of effective dissemination and therefore supporting evidence for quantity of research. The candidate should provide appropriate documentation to permit adequate evaluation.

Significance/Impact

"Significance/impact" refers to the degree to which the candidate's work is fundamentally important for the field, as well as the extent to which it has been recognized, cited, adopted, and/or built upon by others. Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the significance/impact of research will include:

- Independent external evaluators' opinions of the significance/impact of the work (when available)
- Promotion and Tenure Committee members' own opinions of the significance/impact of the work
- Citations of the candidate's work by others
- Actual adoption and use of the candidate's research results and techniques, or other work products (such as software), by others

Funding

As noted above, competitive peer-reviewed grants, contracts, and gifts to support research (and where they are from) will be considered in evaluating the quality of the candidate's research program. Such funding is also an independently important aspect of scholarship because of the expectation that the candidate will obtain funding to support graduate students to do research and will contribute to the financial stability of the department. Evidence that will be evaluated to assess funding of research will include:

- Grants, contracts, and gifts for which the candidate is the PI or a critically important co-PI
- Number of graduate students supported with external funding
- Total amount of external funding for the candidate's research program
- Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from collaborators, especially the PI, documenting the importance of the candidate's role in obtaining the funding and accomplishing the work for funded projects where the candidate is a co-PI

All external funding that supports students and for which the CSE Department and/or a CSE-related center gets appropriate expenditure credit will be considered equally important in rating the funding sub-category of research.

6.3.3. Service

The service component of the review will include summary evaluations of internal service and external service.

Internal Service

Every faculty member is expected to contribute to the effective governance of the department, and senior faculty are expected to contribute to the effective governance of the college and university as well. Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the internal (department, college, and university) sub-category of service will include:

- Effective involvement and active participation in assigned department, college, and university committees
- Demonstration of initiative and follow-through in identifying and helping to address specific departmental problems
- Observations made by Promotion and Tenure Committee members who have served with the candidate on committees and/or have been served by the candidate's activities

External Service

Evidence that will be evaluated to assess the external (professional and community) sub-category of service will include:

- Professional activities such as service on conference organizing and program committees, editorships, reviewing, etc.
- Reviewing of proposals for funding agencies
- Public service related to the candidate's professional expertise

- Consulting activities

6.4. Regional Campus Faculty

The procedures and documentation for regional campus faculty will conform to those for main campus faculty with the following differences. Regional campus faculty will be evaluated by the faculty and dean on the relevant campus using procedures established on that campus; this review should include peer evaluation of teaching required of main campus faculty. This review will occur first and focus primarily on the candidate's contributions in teaching and internal service. The dean will forward the evaluation report of the regional campus faculty and his or her recommendation to the Department chair and inform the candidate of his or her recommendation.

7. Appeals

Faculty rules regarding appeals will apply.

8. Seventh Year Review

Faculty rules regarding seventh-year review will apply.

9. Appendix: Publication Strategies for CSE Faculty

The Department of Computer Science and Engineering (CSE) Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) document includes this statement regarding judgments about research quality: "Because of the wide range of applications of computing, research papers may appear in very diverse journals and proceedings. In addition, in many areas of the discipline, conference publications are rigorously reviewed and prestigious, and can be as significant as publications in premier journals."

It is, nonetheless, tempting to try to rate a candidate's publication outlets. This analysis must be based on the outlets' overall quality or significance (as opposed to the quality or significance of the candidate's papers that are published there).

Research faculty in most disciplines are expected to publish the results of scholarly activities in "archival" publications, i.e., "place[s] or collection[s] containing records, documents, or other materials of historical interest" [*The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Third Edition*, Houghton Mifflin, 1992]. In many fields, the archival publications are academic journals and books. The obviously correct publication strategy is to publish in these outlets.

This is not the case in computer science (CS). Since about 1970—essentially from the time of establishment of the first university CS departments, and well before the age of digital libraries that now make nearly every publication "archival"—there have been many widely held and widely read series of conference¹ proceedings in CS. The consequence is that there is a second reasonable publication strategy for CS faculty: to publish papers in such conference proceedings in addition to, or even instead of, publishing similar papers in journals. Indeed, sometimes publications that are nominally journals devote special issues to the publication of major conference proceedings with which they ally themselves. Thus, it is not always clear whether a given paper is a journal paper or a conference proceedings paper.

But the distinction does not matter as much in CS as in most other academic fields. The important point is that papers in the best CS journals and those in the best CS conference proceedings are nearly indistinguishable in many important respects. The papers submitted to most CS conferences are typically 10 camera-ready pages, not short abstracts that are commonly reviewed and/or published by conferences in many other fields. These full papers are subject to peer review by three or more referees with rigor comparable to reviews for the best journals. The reputations of the best conference proceedings in CS are similar to those of the best journals. Acceptance rates for the best conferences are comparable to, or lower than, those of the best journals. Objective "impact ratings" based on citation rates to papers of the best conference proceedings are comparable to, or higher than, those of the best journals. The most respected researchers in the field publish in certain conference proceedings. And, of course, all the top conference proceedings are searchable and retrievable on-line from digital libraries run by the professional organizations serving computer science (e.g., ACM and IEEE). In fact, these societies are usually the main conference sponsors.

Why do many CS faculty prefer to publish papers in conference proceedings rather than in journals? There are three main reasons. First, the CS field is fast-moving, and the generally

¹ The word "conference" is used here to include any meeting that is self-described as a "conference", "symposium", "workshop", etc.

much shorter turn-around time of conference proceedings (submission to publication) makes for more timely publication of results. Second, an accepted paper is the faculty member's ticket to speak (for 20-30 minutes) in front of an audience of peers, to get rapid additional turn-around on ideas, and to establish new working relationships. The opportunity to meet new people and to have this sort of personal interaction is an important factor in much CS research, which tends to be interdisciplinary by nature. Finally, as top journals offer on-line access through society-sponsored digital libraries, the circulation of paper subscriptions—which other scholars might routinely browse for interesting papers—is declining. In fact, some professional society journals in CS are now exclusively on-line, with no print versions whatsoever. Conferences, with their opportunities for personal interaction, are thus becoming more rather than less important in terms of research visibility. We would not be surprised to see other fields move in this direction in the future, and for the same reasons.

Of course, not all CS faculty everywhere (even within our department) agree that papers published in top conference proceedings carry essentially the same prestige as those in top journals. There is divided opinion about what is the best strategy for publishing. However, we emphasize that the question of appropriate CS publication patterns was not invented here; nor was the prevailing belief that it is perfectly legitimate to focus one's publication efforts on major conference proceedings. This view is so widely held in our field that the Computing Research Association Board of Directors in 1999 approved *Best Practices Memo: Evaluating Computer Scientists and Engineers for Promotion and Tenure* (http://www.cra.org/reports/tenure_review.html). This report, written by David Patterson (University of California, Berkeley), Larry Snyder (University of Washington), and Jeff Ullman (Stanford University), explains the situation very clearly, although it stops far short of rating specific journals and conference proceedings. It was written after the much longer and more detailed 1994 report *Academic Careers for Experimental Computer Scientists and Engineers* (<http://www.nap.edu/catalog/2236.html>) by the National Research Council. Appendix B of that report is entitled "Comparing Journal and Conference Publications". It provides more foundation for the analysis above and does name a few specific publications in its examples, but also does not provide a list of ratings.

Not all conferences, and not all journals, are of comparable quality. A given journal or conference proceedings will be evaluated as a top publication outlet using the following criteria:

1. there is a consensus among knowledgeable members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee that its overall reputation for publishing quality work is excellent;
2. acknowledged leaders in the field consistently publish in it;
3. it consistently has a documented acceptance rate that suggests only the best submitted papers pass its peer review process;
4. it is among the top publication outlets in its subarea of CS in terms of the journal "impact factor" as defined by the ISI Web of Knowledge (<http://www.isiwebofknowledge.com>), or other "impact rating" services with credible approaches to assessing publication impact.