1 Academic Objectives and Philosophy

The Personnel Plan for the Department should be viewed in light of the following objectives and philosophy. The principal goals of the Department are to provide a program of academic excellence and quality within the evolving discipline of Computer Science, to prepare students for entry level career placement, to prepare students for advanced degree programs in the field and to serve the University and larger community as its needs pertain to Computer Science. The Department subscribes to the notion that Computer Science is a broad discipline which reflects both in-depth technological expertise and the extensive spectrum of uses to which society has applied the computer. The curriculum that implements these objectives is embodied in the Master Plan for the Department.

To promote the above, the Department faculty members are encouraged to stay current in their respective areas of specialization, to initiate and develop courses that reflect new theoretical and experimental results, and to initiate and utilize innovative educational techniques where applicable.

The Department will support the activities of its faculty in seeking professional growth by encouraging the use of sabbatical leaves, differential pay leaves, faculty exchanges with other institutions and industry and other leaves with or without pay. The number of leaves allowed during a given semester or academic year should be constrained only by the necessity for meeting curricular commitments.

The Department may on occasion appoint Visiting Professors. The recommended term of such an appointment will be for one to three years, with the teaching area determined by the Department Hiring Committee and the Department Chair, subject to approval by a majority of the faculty.

The Department will use released time generated by faculty through innovative grants, research grants, leaves, etc., to support graduate students who will teach and assist in appropriate courses.

2 Department Hiring Committee

Since matters may come up whereby committee members may feel insecure in their role because of real or perceived pressures which can affect their decisions, the constituent membership of the Department Hiring Committee shall be three (3) tenure/tenure-track faculty members elected by the entire faculty to serve for the following year plus compliance to University policies and the CBA*, if appropriate.

3 Recruitment of New Full-Time Faculty

As a position becomes available, the Department Chair and Department Hiring Committee shall write position qualifications to reflect the type of candidate desired, taking into consideration the present capabilities of the faculty as a whole, the Master Plan, curriculum requirements, and areas which have low or null

---

coverage. Appropriate advertisements will be placed in widely distributed publications such as the Communications of the ACM, the IEEE Computer, and other sources that are read by academicians and practicing professionals.

Notification of position openings should be sent to those universities and colleges that offer a computer science program and to temporary faculty currently employed in the Department. All recruitment activities will comply with existing University Affirmative Action directives. The availability of positions should be made known during the Fall semester whenever possible. It is unrealistic to expect to maintain sound educational programs with temporary faculty, therefore, full-time faculty should be hired on tenure track.

### 3.1 Selection of New Faculty

For full-time faculty selection, all applications and resumes received by the Department shall be available in the Department Office for faculty review.

The initial screening of the candidates will be done by the Department Hiring Committee and the Department Chair. Criteria used for screening will be formulated by the Hiring Committee and will be the same as those used for recruitment. One of the processes of evaluation of potential faculty is his/her giving a lecture, laboratory demonstration, or detailed reporting of his/her current research.

In the event the Department cannot, for reasons of financial exigency, evaluate the applicants through a campus visit, a thorough investigation by phone and mail will be made by the Department Hiring Committee and Department Chair to verify and rank-order the qualifications and merits of the considered applicants. The Department Hiring Committee and Department Chair will make the final choice. The Department Chair shall then seek the appointment of the selected candidate(s).

It is preferred that new faculty bring in a different academic perspective in order that the faculty as a whole have a diversified experience base. Thus, it requires a 2/3 majority approval of the faculty in order for the Department to hire its own recent graduates to fill full-time positions.

### 4 Evaluation of Faculty

All faculty, whether full-time or part-time, will be evaluated periodically according to the following rules.

#### 4.1 Full-Time Lecturers

Evaluation of full-time temporary faculty will follow the Periodic Evaluation procedures for tenure-track faculty. The timetable for evaluation of full-time Temporary Faculty, regardless of the number of years the individual has served, shall follow the schedule of Periodic Evaluation for probationary faculty, with evaluation notice to the individual due on or before May 15.
The Periodic Evaluation of full-time temporary faculty will result in a performance report, but no recommendation regarding future employment will be made.

4.2 **Part-Time Lecturers**

Part-time lecturers moving within ranges will normally be evaluated following the procedures and guidelines in this section.

4.2.1 **Criteria for Evaluation**

The primary mission of this university is teaching, which shall be the primary criterion for evaluating part-time and fifteen-unit base faculty.

In evaluating teaching effectiveness the following shall be the main criteria for evaluation:

1. Organization
2. Scholarship: knowledge in the field
3. Effective communication

In addition to the primary criterion of teaching, part-time faculty shall be evaluated with respect to the following:

1. Their engaging in professional activity in the field appropriate to their teaching field as determined by department criteria
2. Their duties as defined by their assignment
3. Their professional ethics and conduct
4. Other contributions which may not have been specified in the job description but which represent positive assistance to the department

4.2.1.1 **Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness**

In evaluating teaching effectiveness, such evidence will be used as outlined in Section 18 of the FPPP.

4.2.2 **Evaluation Procedures**

All part-time faculty will undergo an annual review for the initial two personnel cycles, followed by biennial rather than annual reviews. If the candidate's course assignment changes, the review process returns to the initial two-year annual followed by either annual or biennial review cycle. At the discretion of the Personnel Committee, Department Chair, or upon
the candidate's petition, a review may be scheduled in a year succeeding an annual or biennial review.

All part-time faculty will participate in the normal Student Evaluation of Faculty process at least once each year they teach.

The Personnel Committee shall notify the temporary faculty at the beginning of each personnel cycle that it is the responsibility of the faculty member to update his/her personnel file and supporting materials, on an annual basis, regardless of whether the faculty member is scheduled for review during that cycle.

At least one classroom visit shall take place at least once each academic year.

A Department Personnel Committee shall submit a report to the candidate and to the Department Chair. The Department Chair shall concur, with or without attached comments, or not concur, with attached comments. The Department Chair will transmit the Report and his/her attached comments, if any, to the appropriate Dean for review and entry into the PAF. The Report shall contain a written evaluation of teaching effectiveness and a statement as to whether the teaching performance is satisfactory.

4.3 Probationary Faculty

In an academic year or work year in which a probationary faculty unit employee is not subject to a Performance Review for retention, the probationary faculty unit employee shall be subject to Periodic Evaluation. Periodic Evaluation of probationary faculty shall include sequential evaluations by the Department Personnel Committee, the Department Chair, and the College Dean. Department Chairs may participate as members of the Department Personnel Committee. In such cases, the written evaluation shall be considered a Department report, and the Department Chair will not be considered a subsequent separate evaluation.

For those probationary faculty with instructional assignments, student evaluations must be used (if available) with such other kinds of information the Department normally uses in assessing teaching effectiveness. It must also include consideration of professional growth and achievement and other service to the University.

While a Performance Review will necessarily contain both developmental and judgmental components, the Periodic Evaluation should be primarily developmental in nature. It shall consider the faculty member's past performance and future plans in the areas of teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and service to the University. The probationary faculty member may meet with each level of review participating in the Periodic Evaluation to discuss his/her strengths and weaknesses in these
areas. The report issued by each level should summarize this discussion and include suggestions, if any, for the probationary faculty member's improvement in the areas of teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and service to the University.

A written record of each level of the Periodic Evaluation shall be made with one copy from each level given to the probationary faculty member being evaluated before the evaluation moves to the next level and a final cumulative copy placed in the faculty member's PAF after the appropriate five-day notice.

The Periodic Evaluation shall begin no sooner than March 15 and shall be concluded, with copies delivered to the faculty member and the file, on or before May 15.

4.4 Tenured Faculty

4.4.1 Definition and Purpose

For the purpose of maintaining and improving a tenured faculty member's effectiveness, tenured faculty shall be subject to Periodic Evaluation at intervals no greater than five years (CBA, Article 15.29). This policy shall apply to faculty at the rank of Professor (or equivalent) and faculty in ranks below that of Professor (or equivalent) who have not undergone Performance Review for four years. Hereafter, a faculty member undergoing such evaluation is referred to as the “evaluatee.”

The Dean, following consultation with the Department Chair, may initiate an early Periodic Evaluation. Periodic Evaluations for tenured faculty shall not occur more frequently than once per year.

The Periodic Evaluation shall include assessment of responsibilities as defined in FPPP 32.4.

4.4.2 Composition of Evaluation Committees

The Periodic Evaluation shall be conducted by a committee of at least two tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the person being evaluated and the Department Chair. The committee members shall be elected by the tenured and probationary faculty of the Department. A majority of the committee should come from the Department of the evaluatee except in cases in which there are too few eligible faculty to provide a majority. Committee members may come from other departments within the College or from departments external to the College but with related subject matter.

If the Department Chair is not tenured he/she shall not participate in the Periodic Evaluation of tenured faculty.
A faculty member undergoing Periodic Evaluation is ineligible to serve as a member of his/her own evaluation committee, but may participate in the Periodic Evaluation of other faculty as well as in personnel actions if otherwise eligible to do so.

The Committee shall follow procedures developed by the Department and approved by the College Dean.

4.4.3 Data Gathering

The evaluatee shall provide course syllabi, course examinations, copies or abstracts of publications, evidence of participation in scholarly meetings, copies of papers presented at scholarly meetings, letters of commendation, evidence of committee service, evidence of participation in funded projects, and additional information he/she may wish to have considered. The evaluatee shall also provide a copy of his/her most recent vita, if these are not already available in the PAF.

The Committee shall collect other pertinent data that shall include, but is not necessarily limited to, peer and student evaluations of instruction for courses representative of the evaluatee's responsibilities during the evaluation cycle.

The Committee also may invite signed, written commentary and evaluation statements from students, faculty, and administrators regarding performance during the evaluation cycle.

4.4.4 The Periodic Evaluation Process

The Committee shall evaluate the data collected and, based upon it, shall write a definitive report which addresses in detail teaching effectiveness and currency in the discipline, scholarship and creative activity, and service to the University. Other responsibilities identified in CBA, Article 20 and deemed relevant to the position should also be evaluated. Faculty whose performance does not include assignments in all of the relevant areas identified in Article 20 shall be evaluated on the basis of their performance in the specific areas of their assignment.

After assessing the data, but before writing its final report, the Committee shall meet with the evaluatee to provide an opportunity to clarify any unresolved questions. The Committee's Report shall include any recommendations it may make.

The Committee's report, together with any minority Report(s) by members of the Committee, shall be forwarded to the Dean. The Dean shall either concur with the Committee's Report or shall submit an independent Report which shall include any recommendations he/she may make. The Dean and the Committee Chair shall then meet with the evaluatee to discuss the
Committee's Report and the Dean's Report. The Dean shall then place the Reports into the PAF following appropriate notification to the evaluatee.

The evaluatee may place a response or rebuttal statement in his/her PAF and/or request removal of any material pursuant to the established process for doing so.

The final report of the Periodic Evaluation shall consist of the Committee's Report, the College Dean's Report, supporting documentation (if any), and the evaluatee's response (if any). Materials submitted by the evaluatee but not used in the Report shall be returned to him/her. Other materials gathered but not used in the Report shall be destroyed.

5 Faculty Leaves

Faculty requesting a leave without pay must submit an application to the Department Personnel Committee. The faculty-at-large will be solicited for input on the impact of granting the leave. Such leave requests are to be reviewed for their impact on the Department annually.

6 Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Department Standards

One of the most striking features of a faculty position in a comprehensive university is its multidimensionality. Teaching, scholarship, and service are critical components of every faculty member’s job. The mission statement of CSU, Chico affirms the importance of instruction, research, and public service. New hires to tenure-track positions in the Department of Computer Science should be aware of the many facets of their position and the expectations of the university, college, and department. Candidates for retention, tenure, or promotion (RTP) are expected to fulfill all University requirements for retention, tenure, or promotion. Section 18 of the FPPP outlines these general requirements, while specific requirements of the Department are outlined herein.

In addition to the general requirements, the Computer Science candidate for retention, tenure, or promotion must meet one of the following requirements in the field of computing:

1. a doctorate in an appropriate discipline
2. a graduate degree in Computer Science, and a significant professional career and/or a national or international reputation as an expert in the field

Any exceptions to these requirements and the timetable for meeting the requirements as they relate to retention, tenure, and/or promotion will be spelled out in the hiring letter.

The following standards are those required by the department for retention, tenure, and promotion. The distinction among the three RTP categories is only in the degree of achievement in each standard. Reports at all levels of review should
indicate whether or not progress toward retention, tenure, and/or promotion is satisfactory, and if not, what corrective action or additional accomplishment is required.

6.1 Additional Requirements for Promotion

In order for a candidate to be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the individual shall normally possess tenure or be awarded tenure simultaneous to promotion. In order for a candidate to be considered for promotion to the rank of Professor, the individual shall possess tenure or be awarded tenure simultaneous to the promotion.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and full Professor should have demonstrated both achievement and potential for growth in each of the areas of evaluation; and in addition, candidates for promotion to Professor must also clearly demonstrate substantial professional recognition at and/or beyond the University itself.

6.2 Instruction

6.2.1 Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching effectiveness is the primary and indispensable requirement for retention, tenure, and ultimately, promotion. The goal is a sustained record of growth in teaching effectiveness. It is required that the faculty member demonstrate his/her teaching effectiveness. Evaluation of teaching will be consistent with the Memorandum of Understanding (CBA) for Unit 3 employees of the University. Here are some of the means by which faculty can demonstrate teaching effectiveness:

1) Teaching courses at an appropriate level and using course materials of appropriate rigor
2) Being qualified to teach some Computer Science courses at the graduate level
3) Maintaining high standards of student achievement as demonstrated by exams, reports, projects, and grade records
4) Receiving student teaching evaluation ratings and comments which indicate that the majority of students perceive that the faculty member is an effective teacher
5) Obtaining peer evaluations from a cross-section of faculty (preferably not all from within the department) which assess the student learning experience positively.

It is also desirable for the faculty member to demonstrate that they are engaged in activities that help sustain effective teaching and growth as an instructor. Some of the activities that cultivate effective teaching and enhance the teaching profession include:
1) Developing innovative teaching techniques and strategies which enhance the learning process
2) Curriculum and program development
3) Student advising
4) Assisting in professional organizations, including contests and competitions
5) Attending seminars, workshops, or short courses which address effective teaching methods and techniques
6) Supervising students working on honors, research, or thesis projects

6.2.2 Student Outcomes Assessment

In view of the current and growing demand for assessment of student learning, a well-organized plan for student assessment should be demonstrated. This assessment will include taking steps to insure that the relevant skills are being taught in core courses, and that pertinent, up-to-date material is covered in the courses the individual teaches. Whether by traditional exams, projects, written works, or by other means such as student portfolios, the details of and the results from the assessment of student learning and how it, in turn, has affected teaching should be documented. In addition to the assessment of student learning in his/her particular courses, the faculty member should link his/her assessment plan with the department or program assessment plan.

6.2.3 Contributions in Support of the Strategic Plan

There are numerous ways that effective teaching supports the University Mission and stated priorities. Priority one is “to create and enhance innovative, high quality, and student-centered learning environments.” It is suggested that the faculty member review the University Strategic Plan, and discuss with peers how his/her teaching plan can enhance the University’s stature as a center for active, student-centered learning. The faculty member should demonstrate how his/her teaching activities contribute to the department, college and university strategic plans. Such contributions may include but not be limited to: involvement with General Education, enhancement of instructional technology, introducing new material into the curriculum, etc.

6.3 PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT

Professional growth and achievement are essential characteristics of effective faculty. It is by this means that faculty remain current in their discipline, maintain credibility with students and peers, and sustain their intellectual vitality. It is expected that the faculty member demonstrates and documents activities that contribute to his/her professional growth.
6.3.1 Scholarship

Scholarship, in all its varied forms, has the common attribute of the creation of something that did not exist before which is then validated and communicated to others. Areas such as teaching and learning, and the discovery, integration or application of knowledge are all fundamental activities that constitute scholarly activities. The forms of scholarship that support professional growth and achievement in Computer Science include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Publications in computer science related journals, preferably refereed journals, and conference proceedings as well as textbooks. The documentation for this form of scholarship would be the publication itself.

2. Relevant consulting activities, funded projects, funded release time, and/or industrial experience. The documentation for this form of scholarship would be the consultant’s or principal investigator’s report, presentation materials, and/or evaluations/recommendations of the contracting body/employer.

3. Participation in professional development courses, seminars, conferences, or summer institutes. The documentation for this form of scholarship would be the certificate of attendance or other evidence of attendance.

4. Membership and/or participation in professional society functions and activities, including editorial responsibilities for professional publications and other professional activities in support of the various functions of professional organizations. The documentation for this form of scholarship would be membership verification materials and other evidence of participation in activities in support of professional organizations.

6.3.2 Contributions in Support of the Strategic Plan

There are ample opportunities for linkage between an individual’s scholarship or professional activities and the University’s Strategic Plan, as outlined in the Mission and Priorities statements. It is suggested that the faculty member review the University Strategic Plan, and discuss with peers how his/her scholarship and professional activities can support the University’s Strategic Plan. The faculty member should demonstrate how his/her professional activities contribute to the department, college and university strategic plans.

6.3.3 Professional Responsibility

It is expected that the faculty member should maintain high technical, professional, and ethical standards in their interaction with students, colleagues, staff, administration, the community, and the profession. If this standard is met at a satisfactory level, it need not be addressed by the faculty member or by the department Personnel Committee in its RTP report or recommendations.
6.4 OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY

6.4.1 Curriculum and Program Development

There should be evidence of activity in developing the curriculum in the department, through productive, cooperative interaction with other faculty. This includes activities that enhance the curriculum or that serve to link the curriculum with program assessment and the assessment of student outcomes. This also includes cooperative activities that support program review and program accreditation.

6.4.2 Contributions in Support of the Strategic Plan

In addition to effective teaching, good scholarship and professional growth, there are other ways to support the strategic objectives of the department, college and university. Examples of such activities include:

1) Student recruitment
2) Fund-raising
3) Development of relationships with industry or government which lead to employment opportunities for students, donations of cash or equipment, or research and development opportunities for faculty
4) Development of relationships with K-12 students, teachers, and administrators that positively affect the university, the profession, and technical education, in particular
5) Activities in support of student organizations
6) Hosting professional meetings, workshops or seminars on campus
7) Involvement in community service activities
8) University service through activities such as service on university or college committees

6.4.3 Cooperative Interaction with Faculty, Staff, and Community

In addition to a faculty member’s responsibility to maintain high ethical standards, it is meaningful to recognize the importance of maintaining a demeanor of respect for, and cooperative interaction with colleagues, staff, and the administration in carrying out the mission of the university. Whether it is in connection with committee work, outreach activities, curriculum development or program assessment, faculty are expected to function cooperatively with others to further the stature of the program, department, college, and university. If this standard is met at a satisfactory level, it need not be addressed by the faculty member or by the department Personnel Committee in its RTP report or recommendations.
7 Selection of Department Chair

The election, term of office, and appointment by the University Administration is well specified in the Faculty Manual, and will become the basis for the selection and recommendation of the Department Chair.

7.1 Procedures

7.1.1 Department Chair Selection Committee

Definition of the committee. The committee will be elected for the academic year. It will consist of three members of the faculty holding a TSA in Computer Science. It will take no action on behalf of the faculty when the University is not in full-time session.

Electing the committee. Nomination for membership on the committee will be received at a faculty meeting for which notice and purpose have been announced one week in advance. Voting rights are those prescribed in the Department of Computer Science's voting rights, Section 8. A minimum of four faculty members will be placed in nomination for the committee. Voting will be held by secret ballot and nominees receiving a majority of the vote will be elected to the committee.

7.1.2 The Task of the Selection Committee

The committee will hold an organizational meeting and elect a chair.

The committee will establish criteria and procedures for selection of the department chair. These procedures may be established by amendment of current policy or initiation of new policy. Policy adopted must be ratified by the faculty of the department as a whole and copies furnished to appropriate administrative officers.

The committee will meet with the Dean of the College of Engineering, Computer Science, and Technology to clarify and identify possible constraints in the selection process.

The committee will prepare a position announcement subject to constraints identified in Section 7.2, Criteria for the Position of Department Chair. The announcements will be sent to all reasonable sources of prospective candidates. The committee will receive and respond to letters of inquiry and/or applications from prospective candidates.

The committee will screen letters of application and seek additional data on candidates of promise. Verification of credentials is appropriate for off-campus candidates. Under normal circumstances, an off-campus candidate of promise will be expected to visit the campus and to make himself available for meetings and interviews with the committee, faculty, and administrative officers.

The committee will prepare a list of a minimum of two (2) acceptable candidates, provided that two such candidates have applied. Candidates may be added to the
list by petition of twenty-five percent of the faculty. The list of candidates will be
prepared and communicated to the faculty at least one week in advance of the
election so that the petition process will have adequate time to function.

The committee will call and preside over a faculty meeting called to acquaint the
faculty with the candidates. Each candidate may give a short (five minute)
presentation as to his qualifications and plans for the department. The candidate
will be expected to respond to concerns and questions from the attendees. All
faculty of the department and concerned administrative officers are encouraged to
attend this meeting.

One week after the interview meeting, the election will be held. A secret ballot
will be held. Voting rights are described in Section 8 of this document. Voters
are to vote for one of the candidates or vote “none are acceptable.” The tally of
the vote will be supervised by one or more members of the committee, plus
representatives of the candidates, at the option of the candidate. In the event that
there is a majority vote for “none are acceptable,” the selection process will be
referred to the committee for initiation of a new nomination cycle. In the event
that no candidate receives a majority and the preceding paragraph does not
pertain, a runoff election will be held involving the two top candidates. The
committee will recommend that the winner of the election be appointed as
Department Chair. Otherwise, the results of the election, together with the
committee's recommendation will be forwarded to the Dean of the College of
Engineering, Computer Science, and Technology for his recommendation, after
which he will forward it to the VPAA for action. Readers should note that the
inability of the department to make a majority decision will result in appointment
of a department chair by outside sources.

7.2 Criteria for the Position of Department Chair

7.2.1 Professional Qualifications

The Chair should have considerable and varied computer science experience
either with private industry or public agencies.

The Chair should have evidenced concern with the professional aspects and
growth of computer science. The Chair should be an active member of a leading
technical society in his/her field of interest.

7.2.2 Academic Preparation

It is highly desirable that the candidate has an earned doctorate (Ph.D.) in an
appropriate field.

The Chair should have had considerable computer science teaching experience,
preferably in more than one four-year institution of higher learning. Computer
science teaching on the graduate level coupled with research activity is highly
desirable.
Quality publications in leading journals in his/her field of interest would be considered an asset.

The Chair should have demonstrated interest and ability in furthering their knowledge in their academic area.

7.2.3 Administrative Ability

A. The Chair should have demonstrated the capacity to make decisions and to pursue them to conclusion.

B. The Chair's background should indicate the ability to guide the development of the computer science curriculum.

C. The Chair should have the capability to deploy to best advantage whatever resources are at their disposal, both human and material.

D. The Chair should have demonstrated administrative ability, both academic and professional, in directing personnel, engineering, or research projects (bearing in mind that a department chair will normally be the first official administrative position in academia).

E. The Chair should be able to attract and maintain a highly qualified faculty.

F. The Chair should be capable of initiating adequate budget proposals and of making effective use of funds allocated to the department.

7.2.4 General

Candidates will be given consideration on an overall basis. A deficiency in one area may be offset by superior qualifications in other areas.

7.3 Term of Appointment

In accordance with approved university policy, the term of appointment of the department chair will be three years.

8 Voting Rights

8.1 Election of Department Chair and Hiring Committee

The election of department chair and members of the department hiring committee will be consistent with the guidelines set forth in the Memorandum of Understanding (CBA) for Unit 3 employees of the university.

8.2 Voting rights for all other department matters except those outlined in Section 8.1

The current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and Faculty Policies and Procedures (FPPP) documents are the primary authorities for determination of voting rights. For those voting rights not addressed by the CBA or FPPP the following voting rights apply for the Department of Computer Science -
A faculty member in the Department of Computer Science who is seeking or holds his/her tenure in the Department of Computer Science will have one vote provided he/she:

a) is a member of UNIT 3
b) has his/her primary teaching assignment in CSCI
c) teaches at least 1/2 time in the Department of Computer Science.

Faculty who hold their tenure in another department do not have the right to vote in the Department of Computer Science.

Tenured/tenure track faculty members who have been absent from the Department for a period greater than one year lose their right to a vote until they return to the Department. Examples of such extended absences could include but are not limited to a leave of absence without pay or a full off-campus buyout.

Part-time faculty members do not have the right to vote in the Department of Computer Science.