

## **B. Thomas Gollisano College of Computing and Information Sciences Guidelines for Faculty Portfolio Selection**

GCCIS Portfolio Committee<sup>1</sup>  
Eydie Lawson, Chair  
August 2003

### **Section 1. Purpose**

The purpose of this document is to define the mechanism by which the College will comply with the Institute Policies and Procedures on Professional Activities and Scholarship, as defined in Section 5 of Faculty Employment Policies (E4.0).[1] This document outlines three different portfolios, which are reflective of both the Institute and the College. The College broadly recognizes two types of activities that faculty should be engaged in to fulfill the goals of the Institute policy, categorized here as Scholarship and Professional Activities. The nature between Scholarship and Professional Activities is seen as a sliding scale, meaning that some faculty may choose activities that are more formally scholarship, and others may meet their portfolio obligations primarily through professional activities, or any appropriate mixture of the two. The primary goals of the College in recognizing the importance of both scholarship and professional activities as they pertain to faculty workload is that engaging in such activities will (a) enhance and improve the academic activities offered by the faculty, and (b) enhance and maintain the professional visibility of the Institute. Anything left unspecified here is left up to the individual departments to decide with the Dean.

NOTE: This policy is not intended for administrators, and applies to tenured and tenure-track faculty only.

### **Section 2: Definition of External Validation**

External validation means acceptance by a professionally-related peer organization or group that has the ability to accept or reject submitted work for dissemination in a forum whose intended audience is wider than the RIT community.

External validation of professional activities should be publicly visible beyond the Institute. Professional positions should be elected or appointed based on the professional merit of the individual.

In all cases, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to document that their activities are consistent with these definitions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Eydie Lawson, Michael Lutz, J. Fernando Naveda, Andrew Phelps, Margaret Reek, Evelyn Rozanski, Walter Wolf

## B. A Sampling of Professional Activities

The following list, while not intended as a complete set, offers a starting point for the types of activities that the College views as recognized professional activities.

- Popular writing, interviews, invited speaking engagements, radio show, etc.
- Editorial Activities (such as: reviewing articles, papers or books; being on a editorial board, etc).
- Session Chair
- Leadership in a regional / national professional organization
- External program review
- Consulting\*

\*Consulting performed by a faculty member must still meet the definition of external validation set forth in section 2, and must contribute either to the faculty member's scholarship activities or their classroom teaching. Documenting that the work performed meets the goals of this policy is left to the faculty member proposing such activity, and is subject to the approval of the department chair.

## Section 5: Enabling Activities

Several other activities are seen as supportive of teaching, scholarship, and professional activities, and may be proposed by faculty through their plans of work. Such activities include, but are not limited to: Ph.D. studies, conference attendance, training seminars, and taking courses from RIT or other institutions.

## Section 6: Portfolio Definitions and Selection Process

### A. Vision of Portfolios

The College offers these portfolios, and the ability to switch between them, with the following understanding: faculty are expected to develop a long-term specialty. A faculty member of the College should focus on a specialty for a number of years, and should not select random, unrelated activities. Thus, the plan of work, regardless of portfolio, should be indicative of a coherent, focused plan to make progress on a discrete set of goals and objectives. Faculty are strongly encouraged to discuss their plans with their department chair and thus make the best possible choice with regard to the portfolio selection process and supporting activities.

Portfolios define a number of "courses" that define the teaching portion of the overall portfolio. A number of activities are included in this definition and should not be taken only as a literal 'course'; such activities include Master's Thesis/Projects, independent studies, honors projects, labs, etc. The exact form that the teaching load takes will be negotiated between the faculty member and the department chair.

### C. Selection of a Portfolio.

To meet the needs of the College and the Institute, the College has identified three separate portfolio options. Faculty may choose any portfolio option, subject to the needs and resources of their department and the College, as identified by the department chair. (NOTE: The “Educator” portfolio is not available to non-tenured faculty). This selection should occur through the plan of work submitted to the department chair, and is regarded as a negotiated process. Once selected, a faculty member will operate under a given portfolio for a period of three (3) years, at which time they will either select a different portfolio or request to continue in their current option. Any current faculty member selecting the “Researcher” portfolio must already have secured the necessary funding. The “Blended” and “Researcher” portfolios are renewable given that the faculty member has adequately performed in the prior three years.

Portfolios are selected based upon three time periods within a faculty member’s career: startup, pre-tenure, and post-tenure (see Figure 1). Faculty in their first three years of service (startup) are expected to be new to teaching, and therefore have a one (1) course reduction to establish their teaching credentials. All untenured faculty (startup and pre-tenure) are also expected to establish a record of scholarly activities, and are thus restricted to either the “Blended” or “Research” portfolio.

#### References

- [1] The policy that inserted the “Scholarship” section into the Faculty Employment Policies (E4.0) was approved by the Senate on January 9<sup>th</sup>, 2003.
- [2] These are based in part on the definitions contained in the Boyer report, “Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate”.

## IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GCCIS GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY PORTFOLIO SELECTION

### Introduction

The college is in the process of adopting a policy concerning faculty selection of portfolios (GCCIS Guidelines for Faculty Portfolio Selection). This document is intended to accompany the policy statement and to give a plan for implementation of the suggestions contained therein.

### Assumptions

There are several assumptions we will make. First, the "years of service" of each faculty member is the total of the years taught (in a tenure line at RIT) plus the years credit negotiated upon hiring. Second, next year's POW (Plan of Work) will reflect the new scholarship policy (see below). Third, the service, teaching load and scholarship recommendations will start this winter. Service will be as written in the Guidelines, teaching load and scholarship as negotiated within resource limitations. The minimum level of scholarship will be implemented immediately and applies to all portfolios in accordance with Institute policy. Fourth, the three-year period in which accomplishments are measured will begin at the start of the winter quarter. All departments will fully implement portfolios. Finally, as the Research option is not available currently, it is not included.

It is further expected that course releases will be distributed across the academic terms in context of the curricular needs and budget constraints of the departments.

### Implementation

Years of Service	Implementation (All require minimum scholarship)
0	Start Blended.
1	Enter start up (six course) Blended portfolio and expected to complete the minimum scholarship requirement in 2 years.
2	Placed in pre-tenure (seven course) Blended portfolio for 4 years.
3	Enter Blended portfolio.
4	Enter pre-tenure Blended portfolio and expected to complete the minimum scholarship requirement in 2 years. Tenure review will primarily be judged on previously established criteria; however, in addition one must demonstrate tangible effort toward development of a scholarship/professional activities portfolio.
5	Eligible for Educator or Blended portfolio and judged for tenure on previously established criteria.
Tenured	With Dept Chair, choose Educator or Blended (revisit every 3 years).