OPERATING PAPER

DEPARTMENT OF
COMPUTER SCIENCE

Effective January 1996
Amended September 2001; Approved by Chancellor October 2001
Amended April 2008; Approved by Chancellor March 2009
Amended December 2009; Approved by Chancellor February 2010
Amended May 2013; Approved by Chancellor May 2013

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY CARBONDALE
CARBONDALE, IL 62901

OPERATING PAPER

Department of Computer Science

I.   Purpose

This paper sets forth operating procedures for the department. The paper supplements policies of the University and the College of Science and the Statutes and Bylaws of the Board of Trustees.

This paper has six appendices:

Appendix I: Departmental promotion and tenure policies and procedures.
Appendix II: Departmental policies on merit pay.
Appendix III: Departmental policies and procedures for the evaluation of teaching.
Appendix IV: Departmental policy on the use of departmental equipment.
Appendix V: Departmental policies on academic dishonesty.
Appendix VI: Departmental polices regarding indirect teaching workload and credit hour equivalents

II.   Mission Statement

The Department provides quality instruction to both undergraduate and graduate students in the academic discipline of computer science. This is done within the context of a broad university education. The department's goals include the preparation of students for careers in computing and related fields and for further training in advanced academic programs. The faculty members of the department seek to advance the state of knowledge in computer science through scholarly and professional activities. Finally, the Computer Science Department supports the ideal of service to department, college, university, professional societies, and community as part of its mission.

III.   Department Membership

A. Department Faculty

1. The Department Faculty consists of all lecturers, instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors who have a current appointment in the Department, but excluding persons enrolled in a degree program of the department or in an interdisciplinary program involving computer science.

2. The Voting Faculty consists of the Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty who are currently budgeted to the Department at more than 0% or who are on leave and have been budgeted to the Department at more than 0% at some time within the previous 12 months.

3. New faculty members recruited by the Department must meet the qualifications set

forth in the associated position description. The position description must be approved by the Voting Faculty. New faculty shall be hired at a rank which is consistent with the criteria set forth in Appendix I.

4. New appointments to the Voting Faculty shall be identified through an appropriate search process. This process shall be managed by a committee appointed for the purpose. Following interviews with the finalists, the committee will recommend an appointment to the Voting Faculty. New appointments to the Voting Faculty shall not be made without the approval of two-thirds of the Voting Faculty. This approval must be obtained before the Chair makes a recommendation for appointment.

5. Appointment of new Term Faculty must be approved by the Voting Faculty.

B. Committee of the Whole

1. The Committee of the Whole consists of the Department Faculty and the Lab Director, together with two student representatives, an undergraduate majoring in computer science and a graduate enrolled in the department's Master's degree program.

2. The undergraduate representative should be elected by the undergraduates majoring in computer science. This student preferably should have a GPA of at least 3.5 in computer science courses and 3.0 overall. The graduate representative should be elected by the graduate students. If representatives are not elected as described above they will be chosen by the Chair. Student representatives will serve for a term of one year.

3. Motions in the Committee of the Whole shall be voted on by the Voting Faculty, except that the Lab Director shall also have a vote on motions from the Laboratory, Equipment, and Computing Facilities Committee.

4. For procedures not explicitly included in this operating paper, Robert's Rules of Order will apply. Agendas should be provided for meetings and minutes should be taken.

IV. Department Chair

The Department Chair is the chief academic, administrative, and fiscal officer of the department. The Chair shall be responsible for the administration of the Department and for implementing policies approved by the Committee of the Whole. Under broad department and university guidelines, the Chair makes teaching and other assignments.

A. Selection of Department Chair

After the official announcement that the Department Chair position will be vacated, a Departmental meeting of Voting Faculty will be called in a timely manner (if possible,

within 15 days) to decide whether an internal or external search will be requested. If the decision is for an external search, the Department works with the Dean to secure the approval of the University. In both searches, all appropriate university hiring procedures will be followed.

The Department shall elect a Search Committee consisting of at least three Voting Faculty. The Search Committee will draft the position announcement and seek approval of the Voting Faculty and the University.

The Search Committee will coordinate a pool of candidates. If the search is internal, the Committee will contact all eligible Faculty regarding their interest in serving as Department Chair. If the search is external, the Committee will coordinate the effort for nationwide publication of the announcement and for attracting quality applicants.

Among the pool of candidates, a finalist will be selected based on the procedures outlined below. The Search Committee shall submit the name of the finalist as the recommendation of the Department to the Dean. If the Dean has reasons not to offer the position in accordance to the recommendation of the Department, the Dean shall call a meeting of the Department to explain and analyze these reasons.

Internal Search

The Voting Faculty will return a secret ballot ranking the candidates in order of preference. Based on these rankings, the Search Committee shall identify the two highest-ranking candidates to be semi-finalists. In the event more than two candidates tie in their rankings, a runoff election will be held among them until there are only two semi-finalists.

The Search Committee will submit the names of the two semi-finalists to the Dean, with the request to initiate the interview process. Each of the semi-finalists should have an opportunity to present his/her views before the Voting Faculty. After the interview process, the Voting Faculty shall select a finalist by majority vote. The finalist is then recommended to the Dean.

External Search

The procedure to select a finalist is the same as the procedure for appointing a new faculty to the Voting Faculty (Section III.A Item 4).

B. Selection procedures for Interim Chair and Acting Chair

Department of Computer Science will be served by an Acting Chair when a permanent Chair is on leave for an extended period of time (e.g. sabbatical leave, health reasons).

An Interim Chair will serve the department when the Chair position is vacant on a permanent basis.

The following procedure will be followed to select both the Interim Chair and the Acting Chair:

1. Based on the notification from the current Chair, or the Dean, a Search Committee of three voting members of the department will be formed by the voting faculty.

2. Applicants must be tenured faculty members of the department and cannot serve on the Search Committee.

3. An application to the Search Committee must include a CV and a letter of intent.

4. The Search Committee will provide the voting faculty with the dossiers of the candidates and arrange a vote.

5. The name(s) of the applicant(s) who gets a majority vote will be sent to the Dean.

6. In case no individual receives a majority vote, the Search Committee may restart the search process or advise the Dean that the internal search has failed.

C. Review of Department Chair

1. The Department Chair serves a renewable term of three years. Normally, the term of the Chair will begin with a Fall semester. After the review (see below), if the Chair wishes to serve another three year term, the Voting Faculty will vote on a recommendation for renewal and report the vote to the Dean.

2. The Chair must be reviewed in a manner consistent with the College of Science Operating Paper. The Voting Faculty may request that the Dean initiate an early review of the Chair with a petition of at least 50% of the Voting Faculty. Whenever a review of the Chair of the Department is due, the Voting Faculty will elect a Polling Committee consisting of three members. This committee will poll (by secret ballot) the Voting Faculty on the question of whether the Chair's appointment should be continued. The results will be reported to the Department and to the Dean. In case a majority of the Voting Faculty responded negatively to the retention question, the Polling Committee will request the Dean to resolve the issue following the College of Science's Operating Paper protocol.

D. Office

1. The Department Chair organizes the functions of the office. The Chair shall appoint a Graduate Program Director and an Undergraduate Program Director from the Voting Faculty and may appoint other assistants as needed.

2. The Graduate Program Director and the Undergraduate Program Director will aid the Chair by administering policies of the respective programs. In particular, they

will advise students, make graduation certifications and jointly supervise the performance of teaching assistants. The Graduate Program Director will also make recommendations to the Chair for the admission and retention of graduate students and the awarding of assistantships and fellowships.

V.   Department Committees

A. General

1. The Committee of the Whole formulates departmental objectives, policies, and operating principles. It makes departmental decisions relating to curriculum, the expenditure of departmental money for laboratory and computing facilities, and general departmental policy. It may deliberate on any matter of importance to the department. It is chaired by the department Chair. It shall meet at least once in each of the Fall and Spring semesters to receive a status report from the Chair and to consider recommendations from the Chair and department committees.

2. Faculty appointments to standing committees are normally made in the fall for a term of one year. The Chair shall make nominations for each committee. Additional nominations may be made by other faculty members. All nominees are voted on by members of the Voting Faculty. Each nominee approved by a majority of the Voting Faculty shall be appointed to the committee.

3. The Department Chair may choose the chair of a committee; otherwise the chair will be elected by the committee members.

4. Except where stated otherwise, committee decisions are made by a majority vote of members voting. The chair has a vote, but should vote last in public votes.

5. Votes are by secret ballot if so requested by at least one voting member - otherwise the committee chair shall determine the method of voting.

6. A committee member who expects to miss a meeting may appoint a proxy by so notifying the committee chair in writing. If a ballot is scheduled in advance for a committee meeting, then a voting member may submit a sealed absentee ballot in advance to the committee chair, to be opened at the time of the vote.

B. Standing Committees

1. Undergraduate Studies Committee: The Committee will serve as a general policy committee for undergraduate programs. It will also be the curriculum committee for undergraduate programs and courses (those numbered 499 or less). Recommendations will be made to the Committee of the Whole. The Undergraduate Program Director will chair this committee.

2. Graduate Studies Committee: The Committee will serve as a general policy

committee for the graduate programs. It will also act as a curriculum committee for graduate programs and courses (those numbered 400 or above). Recommendations will be made to the Committee of the Whole. The Graduate Program Director will chair this committee.

3. Laboratory, Equipment and Computing Facilities Committee: The Committee will make recommendations for the acquisition and use of department computing facilities, laboratory space and laboratory facilities. Recommendations will be made to the Committee of the Whole. The Lab Director shall be a voting member of this committee.

C. Ad Hoc Committees

1. The Chair may appoint ad hoc committees as needed.

VI.   Appeals and Grievances

Appeals and grievances including those involving grades and departmental sanctions for academic dishonesty will be dealt with according to the procedures in Appendix V and the College of Science operating paper.

VII.   Amendments

Amendments to the operating paper require approval by two thirds of the Voting Faculty. Proposed amendments must be circulated at least one week in advance of the vote.

APPENDIX I
Policies, Procedures and Criteria for Departmental Promotion and Tenure

I.   Introduction

These guidelines are designed to provide the context for the evaluation of faculty who are under consideration for promotion and/or tenure. The policies outlined below are understood to exist within the framework of both the College and the University guidelines on Tenure and Promotion (see also the Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Handbook or SIUC Document Database). It is also assumed that a personnel file is maintained for each faculty member in accordance with the Personnel File Policy of the University. While the guidelines cannot, and should not, replace the individual judgments that each faculty member must make in each case under review, they should serve to provide a uniform procedural context for arriving at such decisions.

II. Tenure

University-wide standards require that the candidate for tenure demonstrate qualifications essential to the mission of the unit to which the candidate is assigned. It is expected that these qualifications will encompass teaching, research/creative activity, and service. All non-tenured faculty in tenure-track ranks must be evaluated annually and informed in writing regarding their professional performance. This evaluation shall be the responsibility of the Chair and Dean of the College of Science.

A. General Policy

1. Because of the time necessary to evaluate a person for tenure, the Department will not ordinarily consider a tenure recommendation for anyone prior to the end of the appropriate probationary period (6 years for Assistant Professor, 4 years for Associate Professor, 2 years for Professor). The Department will consider a tenure recommendation prior to the conclusion of the probationary period only when the faculty member requests, in writing, consideration for early tenure. If such a request is made, a tenure recommendation by the Department and an ultimate tenure decision by the University will be made. Such a decision will be final.

2. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor at SIUC implies a positive tenure decision. Consequently, a faculty member appointed initially as Assistant Professor will not be considered for early promotion unless it has been requested, in writing, by the faculty member.

B. Specific Criteria

1. Professor/Associate Professor: A candidate for tenure in either of these ranks would initially have been appointed in that rank. Tenure for such appointments shall be based on the same criteria as for promotion to the corresponding rank (see Section

III below).

2. Assistant Professor: The tenure decision shall be based on:
   a. Evidence of quality instruction at undergraduate and graduate levels;
   b. Demonstrated ability since joining SIUC to develop and maintain a
   c. recognized independent research effort; in addition, collaborative research is encouraged; and
   d. Demonstrated willingness and competence in service to the Department, University and the discipline.

C. Criteria to be considered in making the decision should include:

1. Contributions to Instructional Mission of the Department
   a. Positive teaching evaluations- the instructor should be able to demonstrate that they have done their best to convey their course content to their students and have established a good reputation among their students.
   b. Development of new curricula.
   c. Endeavor to generate funds for instructional improvement or equipment.
   d. Breadth of teaching competency.

2. Solid Research Productivity
   a. Strong and sustained evidence of substantial promise for continued growth and productivity
   b. Sustained and continued record of publishing peer-reviewed research results, such as peer-reviewed journals, refereed conference proceedings, books, book chapters, and patents. More weight is given to journal publications.
   c. Evidence of continuing record of submission of good quality grant proposals. Comments of the reviewers should be included in the annual Accomplishment Report.
   d. Extent of contribution in research (for example principal authorship, number of co-authors on papers, etc.)
   e. For faculty who will start work from fall 2010, the following criteria should also be considered:
      (1) Number of papers varies with field but in the field of computer science, an average of two to three refereed publications per year would be acceptable for a junior faculty.
      (2) Publications in leading specialty journals, e.g. IEEE, ACM, etc., are weighted more than less prestigious journals.
      (3) Primary funding of the research program should be derived from external funds generated by the applicant.
      (4) All funds in support of research are valuable but relative weighting depends on the level of competitiveness; for example, grants from federal agencies are generally more highly regarded than state or local grants.

3. Indications of National Recognition
   a. Papers cited by other workers in the field.

          b. Invitations to speak at scientific meetings and at other universities.

          c. Editor/Reviewer of manuscripts for journals, conferences, funding agencies.

    4. Other contributions to the Research Mission of the Department

          a. External support, e.g. grants (equipment, undergraduate research).

          b. Research director for graduate and undergraduate students.

          c. Internal support (including ORDA).

          d. Serving on graduate student committees.

III. Promotion

A. General Policy

Academic promotion is awarded to those faculty making continuing contributions to the department's mission. The preservation of quality requires that all persons recommended for promotion clearly satisfy the general criteria presented herein. Fairness requires that these criteria be applied as uniformly as possible.

A faculty member will be evaluated for promotion in any year at her or his request. A tenured faculty member below the rank of professor must have her or his dossier submitted for review by the Department at least every five years unless the faculty member requests in writing that it not be reviewed.

B. Specific Criteria

1. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Promotion from the rank of assistant professor to the rank of associate professor requires 1) a demonstrated record of effectiveness as a teacher; 2) a record of peer-reviewed publication/creative activity which has contributed to the discipline of computer science, to the candidate's intellectual development, and to the quality of the Department; 3) a record of professional service appropriate to the Department.

The criteria used here include those listed above for the tenure decision in the case of the Assistant Professor.

2. Associate Professor to Professor

For promotion to the highest academic rank, the candidate's academic achievements and professional reputation should be superior. This rank can be earned only by the faculty member who has demonstrated continued growth in, and has a cumulative record of teaching effectiveness, substantial peer- reviewed publication/creative activity, and professional contributions and service.

In addition to criteria used to judge Associate Professors, Professors should provide solid evidence of independence, originality and creativity that will continue into the

future. The candidate should be of national/international stature.

The following are some markers for fulfilling these criteria, in addition to those listed for Associate Professor status:

- Consistent peer reviewed publication record.
- Invitations to speak at scientific meetings.
- Demonstrated leadership role within the department.
- Chair/organizer of professional meetings.
- Demonstrated independence in research.
- Author or editor of monographs or books.
- Author of chapters in books.
- Research funding received.

IV.   Procedures on Decisions for Tenure and Promotion

A. Decisions regarding recommendations for tenure shall be made by a committee consisting of the tenured faculty members in the department. This committee shall ordinarily be chaired by the department Chair. Votes shall be by secret ballot.

B. Decisions regarding recommendations for promotion in rank shall be made by a committee consisting of those faculty members in the department having rank superior to that of the candidate. This committee shall be chaired by the department Chair, unless the Chair is not of higher rank than the candidate, in which case the committee shall elect a chair. Votes shall be by secret ballot.

C. In cases where a candidate for tenure or promotion is cross-appointed with another department or unit, the decision regarding recommendations will be made by the Department of Computer Science, in consultation with the other department or unit, if the major portion of the candidate's appointment is in the Department of Computer Science. No faculty member who is not already a tenured Professor will be given a 50% appointment.

D. It is the department Chair's responsibility to oversee appropriate execution of these procedures.

APPENDIX II
Departmental Policies on Merit Pay

The specific guidelines are:

1. Each year the Chair will meet with each faculty member and discuss the assignment of duties for the next year. The assignment will be put in writing and signed by both the faculty member and the Chair and will state the faculty member's responsibility in each of the areas of teaching, research and service.

2. Early in the spring semester of each year the Chair will evaluate the performance of each faculty member and the Lab Director for the preceding calendar year in order to make a merit salary increase recommendation to the Dean.

   The procedures to be followed for faculty members are:

   a. Each faculty member will be asked to provide the Chair with information. This should include teaching evaluations, an updated report on research activities (including preprints or reprints of any articles, books, and chapters in books), and a report on all external and internal service activities.

   b. The information from a) above will be merged with information that the Chair already has access to (such as records of classes taught, class sizes, and number of graduate students supervised). The Chair's perception of the faculty member's overall value and contributions to the department is also important.

   c. After discussion with the faculty member the Chair will make a merit salary increase recommendation to the Dean. The Chair's recommendation must reflect the agreed upon percentages in each of the areas of teaching, research and service and the quality of performance in each of these areas.

   The procedures to be followed for the Lab Director are:

   a. The Lab Director will be asked to provide the Chair with a written report outlining achievements (such as equipment and software installed, and services provided) in the previous year.

   b. The information from a) above will be merged with information that the Chair already has access to (such as effective utilization of departmental equipment).

   c. After discussion with the Lab Director, the Chair will make a merit salary increase recommendation to the Dean. The Chair's recommendation should be based on an assessment of the Lab Director's performance relative to the job description for this position.

3. The Chair will tell each faculty member and the Lab Director the actual salary increase when this information is received from the Dean.

APPENDIX III
Departmental Policies & Procedures for the Evaluation of Teaching

Teaching is evaluated by students, colleagues, and the Chair. The purpose of these evaluations is to maintain high quality instruction in the department. The evaluations will be used by the chair in making merit increase recommendations and by the appropriate faculty members in making tenure and promotion recommendations.

   a. Every instructor in the department is strongly encouraged to use a student evaluation form in each course each semester. The instructor must not be present when the evaluation form is completed by students. Completed forms must be handed in at the Department office for transmission to the Chair.

   b. Direct evaluations by the Chair and colleagues should involve observations of class lectures and other presentations, review of course handouts and exams, etc.

   c. The Chair will use these evaluations to assist in the assessment of the instructor's teaching and then give them to the instructor. If a specific or potential problem arises the Chair will discuss the problem with the instructor with the aim of resolving it.

   d. These evaluations are also available to faculty members who are responsible for making decisions on the tenure and promotion of colleagues within the department.

APPENDIX IV
Policy on Use of Departmental Equipment

Any use of departmental equipment must be consistent with the Policies, Procedures, and Regulations, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale and with the Policies of the Board of Trustees, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. Private use of departmental equipment is not normally permitted and this equipment is to be used for purposes of supporting an individual's instruction, research, and professional development activities. In the case of a faculty member, these activities are defined by the faculty member's assignment within the university together with consulting activity that has been approved by the president or designee. In the case of a student, these activities are determined by the student's courses and projects conforming to the student's degree objectives. Faculty members and graduate students from other departments may use departmental equipment only with the expressed approval of, and within the conditions established by, the Department's Laboratory, Equipment, and Computing Facilities Committee.

APPENDIX V
Departmental Policies on Academic Dishonesty

Departmental policies and procedures on academic dishonesty fall within the guidelines set forth in the Student Conduct Code (see the Undergraduate Catalog). It is the responsibility of faculty members in the department to bring these policies to the attention of students in their classes.

It is the responsibility of each student to identify the conceptual sources of his or her work. Whenever material from another source (such as a proof or a computer program) is reproduced in the work submitted by a student, failure to indicate the source with quotation marks or footnotes constitutes plagiarism and is subject to disciplinary action. This definition of plagiarism applies in all computer science courses unless modified by the course instructor.

Cheating includes but is not necessarily limited to:

1. The use of unauthorized materials including computer programs in preparation of an assignment or during an examination.

2. The submission or use of falsified data.

3. The submission of work that is not the student's own.

4. Plagiarism.

5. The use of an alternate/stand-in/proxy during an examination.

6. Supplying unauthorized data to another student for the preparation of an assignment or during an examination.

7. Collaboration in the preparation of an assignment unless it is specifically allowed by the instructor.

The decision as to whether a student has cheated depends on the intent of an assignment, the ground rules specified by the instructor, and the behavior of the student. Two guidelines help an instructor decide if cheating has occurred:

*   Program plagiarism will be suspected if, on an assignment that calls for independent development and implementation of a program, students submit two solutions so similar that one can be converted to another by a mechanical transformation.

*   Cheating will be suspected if a student who was to complete an assignment independently cannot explain both the intricacies of his or her solution and the techniques used to generate that solution.

It is unreasonable to expect a complete definition of cheating; each case is important enough to

be given careful, individual scrutiny. It is, however, helpful to have guidelines and precedents.

Here are some examples of cases that clearly are cheating and some examples that clearly are not cheating.

Cheating

∗   Turning in someone else's work as your own (with or without his or her knowledge).

∗   Allowing someone else to turn in your work as his or her own.

∗   Several people writing one program or part of one program and turning in multiple copies, all represented (implicitly or explicitly) as individual work.

∗   Using any part of someone else's work without proper acknowledgment.

∗   Stealing an examination or a solution from the instructor. This is an extremely flagrant offense.

Not Cheating

∗   Turning in work done alone or with the help of the course's staff.

∗   Submission of one assignment for a group of students if group work is explicitly permitted (or required).

∗   Getting or giving help on an operating system.

∗   High-level discussion of course material for better understanding.

∗   Discussion of assignments to understand WHAT is being asked for. "Work" in the above examples includes both algorithms and program source code.

A list of possible disciplinary actions is given below:

∗   Actions within the course: Negative credit for the assignment. No credit for the assignment and loss of a letter grade for the course. Makeup assignment over the same material; no credit. Forced drop in the course. Failure in the course.

∗   Actions within the Department of Computer Science: Suspension from department courses for a designated period. Expulsion from department courses.

∗   Actions by the University: Warning. Probation. Suspension from the University for a designated period. Expulsion from the University.

The department has formally adopted the following guidelines for maximal penalties in cases

where cheating or plagiarism is established.

   A. Penalties for Undergraduates in CS 200a/200b/201/202/215

      1. Copying without permission:
          1st offense: from negative weight to course grade F.
          2nd offense: course grade F and a suspension of up to one year from Computer
              Science courses. If the offense involves accessing files without permission, the
              penalty may include a suspension of up to a year of SIU computing facilities.

      2. Copying with permission (penalties apply to both copier and person whose work
          was copied):
          1st offense: from 0 on the specific lab/assignment/exam to course grade F.
          2nd offense: course grade F.

      3. Working collectively:
          1st offense: 0 on the specific lab/assignment/exam.
          2nd offense: course grade F.
          3rd offense: course grade F plus suspension from Computer Science courses.

   B. Penalties in Other Cases

      1. Undergraduates in courses numbered 399 or less:
          1st offense by students in this category corresponds to 2nd offense above.

      2. Undergraduates in courses numbered 400 or more:
          Same as for graduate students.

      3. Graduate students in any course:
          1st offense: suspension from program.

   C. Supplementary Comments

      1. Records of cheating and plagiarism will be maintained by the department.

      2. A penalty resulting from an accusation of plagiarism or cheating can be appealed
          through the appeal process described in the operating paper of the College of
          Science.

APPENDIX VI
Departmental Polices Regarding Indirect Teaching Workload and Credit Hour Equivalents

I.   Introduction

The Department of Computer Science workload guidelines are based upon 24 credit hour equivalents per academic year or 12 credit hours per semester. The base workload consists of teaching, research and service components. The Chair, and the Department as a whole, have a duty to maintain quality education for our students as well as a fair balance of load and opportunity among the faculty. Course offerings and workload considerations should also be mindful of accreditation requirements.

II.   Indirect Teaching

Indirect teaching duties undertaken by Computer Science faculty encompass many activities including but not limited to: advising, mentoring and guiding students through independent readings and research, chairing and serving on student academic committees, curriculum development and support, and evaluating, selecting and maintaining software and equipment for teaching and training purposes. Chairing a dissertation committee shall have a credit hour equivalent ranging from 0 to 0.5 credit hours per student per semester. All other students guided through thesis, projects, readings, internships, etc. shall have an equivalent ranging from 0 to 0.3 credit hours per student per semester. The indirect teaching load is generally expected to be 0.5 to 1.0 CHE per semester. A typical limit for a faculty member's indirect teaching assignment will be 4 CHE per regular academic year. In order to make equitable workload assignments and/or address departmental needs, the chair may, in consultation with the faculty member, make an overall indirect teaching assignment that is outside of the typical range and/or beyond the typical limit. Criteria to be considered by the chair include but are not limited to: student needs, curricular demands, faculty interests and expertise, research productivity, student-support and advisement needs, and overall balance of the faculty member's workload assignment.

Indirect teaching activities may vary from semester to semester and are difficult to quantify, often overlapping with other aspects of faculty workload. Aside from academic supervision, indirect teaching may include other significant amounts of effort that occur from time to time. For instance, a professor may be asked to create a new course or make significant revisions to an existing course or sequence. When assessing credit hour equivalents for these and other indirect teaching activities, the chair should consider faculty input (i.e. from an ad hoc committee, elected by the faculty) prior to assigning workload.