RUSS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

MINIMAL CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

(Revised and Approved by Dean on May 14, 2010)

This document is to be reviewed every four years.

GENERAL STATEMENT
Promotion and/or tenure is earned by demonstration of overall excellence in the functions of a faculty member and not automatically granted due to seniority or longevity. The principal functions of the Engineering and Technology faculty are the transmission of analysis and design skills through effective teaching and training, and the advancement of engineering and technology through creative research/scholarly activities or other appropriate professional activities. All faculty members are expected to engage in all of these interrelated activities. However, the relative weighting of these functions in determining promotion or tenure is not necessarily the same for every faculty member or every department. The candidate’s balance of development and total contribution to the department and college is what is considered in the final decision.

Apart from salary considerations, the recognition of the exemplary performance in teaching effectiveness, research/scholarly accomplishments, and service comes chiefly by way of the granting of tenure and promotion in rank. Equity requires that those faculty members failing to perform these functions in a proper manner should be denied such recognition. Equity likewise requires a similar performance level for the granting of tenure and/or promotion to a given rank among the departments.

COLLEGE-WIDE CRITERIA
In all disciplines, except Aviation, the Ph.D. or equivalent degree is a prerequisite to the granting of tenure and for promotion above the rank of assistant professor. In Aviation, a candidate should hold at least an earned master’s degree. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) certification as a commercial pilot for both single and multi-engine aircraft, as well as credentials as an FAA certified flight instructor (CFI), FAA certified light instructor – instrument (CFII) and FAA certified flight instructor – multi-engine (MEI).

The early award of tenure is defined as the award of tenure before the penultimate year. Although early tenure is not discouraged, the criteria for tenure are the same regardless of the time of application. Applicants for early tenure should understand that it is more difficult to establish an expectation of sustained high performance during an abbreviated probationary period.

Three major categories are used in evaluating the performance of each candidate: teaching effectiveness, research/scholarly accomplishments, and service. To successfully satisfy promotion and tenure requirements, a candidate must satisfy an acceptable level of performance in each category. A deficiency in one category cannot be outweighed by superior performance in one or both of the other categories. The Russ College of Engineering and Technology has established metrics for the evaluation of departments, programs and faculty, and for establishing college workload policy. These serve as guidelines for those making promotion and tenure decisions in the college but candidates must recognize that other factors are taken into account as well. For example, the quality of
publications must be considered as well as the quantity. Promotion to the associate professor rank is based upon actual professional accomplishments to date, as well as the rate at which professional growth is taking place. Promotion to the rank of full professor is based upon sustained leadership, maturity, and national reputation in scholarship. Candidates for full professor from programs with graduate degrees should also have developed a research program of high repute and demonstrate sustained success in research funding.

Documented evidence of behavior that is disruptive to others in their performance of the mission of the college and university may be considered in the promotion and tenure decision.

The awarding of tenure is to be granted to those whose performance during the probationary period is judged to project a career of sustained high performance in the three major categories. Assistant Professors in their penultimate year should have a record consistent with both the criteria for promotion and tenure. In the extraordinary case where tenure is recommended without promotion, the reviewing body must clearly document the reasons that tenure should be granted so that the strongest tenure case can be made as the dossier is reviewed at higher levels.

**Teaching Effectiveness** -- Emphasis is placed on high-quality, effective teaching. Evidence of effective university-level teaching, derived from data as may be pertinent, e.g., student evaluations, colleague evaluation, technological competence in specialty, versatility, demonstrated success of students, classroom attitude, respect for students, etc., shall be given significant emphasis in tenure and/or promotion decisions.

**Research/Scholarly Accomplishments** -- Research/scholarly performance susceptible to assessment by experts in a particular discipline is an important factor in the consideration of promotion and the granting of tenure. Judgments of research/scholarly accomplishments are based upon recognition given to these works by peers outside the college. Research/scholarly accomplishments include: publications of journal papers, refereed publications and books; success in the procurement and performance of research grants and contracts; patents received; number and quality of theses and dissertations directed; peer reviews of research work, etc. Research/scholarly accomplishments also can result in changes in engineering practice and improvement in the design of products. The Russ College of Engineering and Technology recognizes that engineering research/scholarly accomplishment is typically accomplished through team efforts; consequently, collaboration with colleagues in and outside the university is valued. In instances where a majority of a full professor candidate’s research/scholarly activity is collaborative in nature, the candidate must demonstrate leadership in the collaboration.

Since the Department of Aviation does not have a graduate program, aviation faculty will not be required to demonstrate research activity as part of consideration for promotion and the granting of tenure. Scholarly accomplishment, however, is required and can be accomplished through various activities that serve to enhance and improve teaching. Specifically, activity in three areas are considered: 1) achievement of national recognition in flight instruction; 2) publishing in aviation journals; 3) commercial flight activity other than flight instruction. Each of these activities requires the faculty member to expand and enhance their knowledge and skills as pilots and instructors and thus benefits the teaching mission of the department, college and university.

**Service and Professional Activities** -- Faculty members are expected to participate in an appropriate mix of service activities. Examples of appropriate activities include serving on department, college, and university committees, serving on thesis or dissertation committees of students other than their own, and participating in student enrichment and outreach activities. Candidates for the rank of
professor are expected to have been active on committees at all levels of the university. Candidates are also expected to participate in appropriate professional activities. Achievement of professional registration/certification in the U.S. is very strongly encouraged.

COLLEGE PROMOTION AND TENURE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
The college promotion and tenure advisory committee will be composed of six members, with no more than one representative from each department except Aviation which will have no representative. The departments appoint representatives to serve on the College P&T committee for a 4-year term. Typically, this representative is the chair of the department P&T committee. The members will serve staggered terms and a minimum of one-third of the members should be retained on the committee for one year to the next for the purpose of continuity. The committee will advise the dean by reviewing and evaluating the dossier(s) submitted by the departments. Promotion and/or tenure dossiers from the Department of Aviation may be referred to the Advisory Committee at the discretion of the dean or by the request of the candidate.

If a candidate’s department is not represented on the Russ College P&T advisory committee, the candidate may elect to be represented by a senior faculty member of his/her department appointed for this purpose by the dean. The representative will summarize the case to the committee, and provide additional information as requested, but will not take part in the committee’s final discussion and voting process.

DEPARTMENT CRITERIA
Department recommendations for promotion and/or tenure represent recognition of levels of achievement in accordance with department and college expectations. Therefore, an individual faculty member should be aware that achievements more specifically defined and exceeding those described under these college-wide criteria may be required by a department. It is noted that department criteria also must reflect the aforementioned college metrics. The department P&T committees are responsible for annual assessments of probationary faculty regarding their progress towards tenure and promotion. The results of this assessment are reported in the chair’s annual evaluation letters.

MAKEUP OF THE DEPARTMENT COMMITTEES
Department promotion and tenure committees will be comprised of a minimum of three eligible members. As a general rule, the eligible members of a department promotion committee are those full-time Group I faculty at a rank above the candidate, and the eligible members of a tenure committee are those full-time Group I faculty with tenure. The chair(s) of the department promotion and tenure committee(s) is to be appointed by the department chair. The department chair is not to be a member of either committee. If there are insufficient numbers of senior or tenured faculty in a department, the department chair, after consultation with the dean of the Russ College, will appoint an ad hoc committee consisting of the eligible members of the department plus members from other departments of the college.

PROCEDURE
The department chair will charge the department promotion and tenure committee(s) with the task of nominating those faculty members who should be considered for promotion or tenure during the current annual review cycle. The department P&T committee may request information from potential candidates to perform this screening task. The department P&T chair will notify the department chair of the faculty members being nominated for promotion and/or tenure by October 15. The department
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P&T chair will notify the appropriate faculty member of their nomination and that they may, if they choose, prepare a dossier for tenure and/or promotion consideration. Also, the department chair will place before the committee the names of any faculty members who are serving the last year of probationary service and for whom a consideration for tenure is mandatory.

It should be noted that a faculty member cannot "apply" or initiate the P&T process alone but must be nominated according to the above process.

The candidate will prepare a dossier summarizing the achievements and submit this documentation to the department chair by the end of the first week of the Winter Quarter. The dossier format must adhere to the guidelines outlined in this document.

The department P&T committee will review the formal dossier and vote on whether to recommend the candidate for promotion and/or tenure. The candidate and the department chair will be notified of the results of the department P&T vote in accordance with the procedures of the Faculty Handbook (See II.E.) The department P&T committee may suggest changes to make the dossier compatible with the college guidelines, and to strengthen the dossier. If the departmental committee does not recommend promotion or tenure for a faculty member, no further evaluation is required, except in the event of an appeal. If the departmental committee recommendation is positive, the department chair will attach his/her recommendation to the dossier and deliver the dossier to the dean no later than February 15. A copy of the chair’s recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.

The college P&T committee will evaluate all dossiers sent to the dean. The evaluation will conclude with a secret ballot. The chair of the committee will provide the dean with the result of the vote and a brief summary of the committee’s discussion and conclusions. The dean will meet with the committee to discuss the results of the deliberations upon the request of the Advisory Committee chair.

The dean will review each dossier in light of the college P&T vote and conclusions and make a recommendation. A copy of this recommendation will be given to the candidate. If the dean does not recommend promotion or tenure for a faculty member, no further evaluation is required, except in the event of an appeal. If the dean’s recommendation is positive, it is inserted into the dossier and the dossier is forwarded to the provost by April 1.
GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROMOTION/TENURE DOSSIERS

The following outline stipulates the form for dossiers of faculty members that are candidates for promotion and/or tenure. The dossier must be prepared according to these guidelines. The goal of the dossier is to present the record and achievements of the candidate in a logical, clear, organized manner. In case of marginal presentation, the dean may return the dossier to the department for expansion.

It is not required for a candidate to have significant achievements in every subcategory or topics listed under the subheadings. In the case of a heading or subheading for which there is no Department criterion (e.g., "Educational Publications"), the heading is to be copied and “N/A” (not applicable) entered under it. If criteria have been generated which reflect unique Department expectations, they are to be inserted with validating evidence as subheadings under section II-M, III-M, IV-C, or appendix D as appropriate.

Each department must provide evidence relative to the appropriate criteria and evaluation of that evidence, so that reviewers beyond the department level (dean, provost, president) may discern the essential "fit" and arrive at independent judgments concerning the "match" between Department criteria and faculty performance. To ensure completeness of materials available for consideration, the candidate for promotion and/or tenure is to be afforded the opportunity, before formal consideration takes place at any stage of the promotion/tenure process, to supply any information, data documents, publications, etc., that bears upon his/her candidacy.

Should the Department P&T Committee recommend promotion and/or tenure, the candidate’s dossier together with the Department P&T Committee’s recommendation and the Department Chair’s independent evaluation are sent forward. The information comprising the case should be prepared such that successive reviewers may be satisfied as to the congruence of accomplishments with expectations. The Department P&T Committee will provide a written recommendation and a summary of the dossier not to exceed two pages, to be attached to the cover page.

The format for presentation of the dossier is to be a single three-ring, loose-leaf notebook with dividers for the four major categories and the appendices listed below. You may obtain the binder and dividers from the dean’s office. The cover page of the notebook must be the "REVIEW FORM FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE" form and must be submitted to the dean by February 15th for each candidate. This cover page must be followed by a one page summary sheet (Attachment 1 to these Guidelines), and the recommendations of the department chair and the department P&T committee. Only the supporting material specified by this document should be included in the dossier. However, the candidate may be requested by either the college or department P&T committees to produce other documentation to support accomplishments claimed in the dossier.

SUMMARY SHEET

A summary sheet conforming to the format of the example in Attachment 1 to these Guidelines will be the first sheet in the dossier. This summary sheet will be prepared initially by the candidate. The chairman of the department Promotion and Tenure Committee will make pen-and-ink changes if the P&T Committee does not agree with the candidate’s summarization.
I. EXPERIENCE

A. Academic Preparation
List institutions, degrees, and dates in reverse chronological order.

B. Professional Experience
List teaching, professional, and consulting experience in reverse chronological order.

C. Professional Registration and Certification
List the State, type, and date.

D. Leaves and Short-term Internships
List how and where the leave or internship was spent, also list dates and length. Describe in a few sentences how the leave or internship enhanced the career.

II. TEACHING ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. Teaching Load
Specify the course number, title, and enrollment for courses taught over the past five years. Also note whether multiple sections of the course were taught and if graduate or laboratory assistants were used. List the duties performed to support instructional laboratories.

B. Course Development
Describe in a few sentences all the courses and formal laboratories introduced. List any books and manuals that were written to support courses.

C. Teaching Innovations and Delivery
Describe in a few sentences any teaching innovations or unique delivery techniques developed.

D. Grants and Gifts
List grants and/or gifts obtained to support course or instructional laboratory development. Specify, the amounts, the type of support (in kind match, actual monetary funds, etc.), sponsor, dates, etc. Describe in a few sentences what was done and the educational implications.

E. Teaching Evaluations
List in tabular format a summary of the student evaluations of the courses taught over the past five years. Specify the course number and title, the median grade awarded, the average of questions 1-7, the results of questions 10, 11, and 12 on the College’s student evaluation for the course, and the average of questions 1-7 along with the results of questions 10, 11, and 12 for the department. A sample table is given below. If no evaluation information is available for a course, it still must be listed.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number and Title</th>
<th>Class Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Evaluations</th>
<th>Median Grade Awarded</th>
<th>Candidate's Average Score for the Student Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>The Department's Average Score for the Student Evaluation Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>10 11 12</td>
<td>1-7 10 11 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F. Awards and Recognition**

List any awards or recognition related to teaching.

**G. Academic Advising**

Describe activities such as academic counseling, direction of independent study, direction of student competitions, co-op advising, Honors Tutorial advising, etc.

**H. Other**

Describe any other factors that should be considered in the evaluation of teaching performance. This section is limited to 5 pages.

III. RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

**A. Articles in Refereed Journals**

List title, co-authors, journal, volume number, date, page numbers, etc., of articles that have been published or have been accepted for publication but not yet published. Attach a copy of the refereeing policy of the journals listed in appendix B.3.

**B. Other Refereed Publications**

List title, co-authors, where published, volume number, date, page numbers, etc.

**C. Non-Refereed Publications**

List title, co-authors, where published, volume number, date, page numbers, etc.

**D. Articles in Review**

List title, co-authors, where submitted, date first submitted, whether the article will be fully peer reviewed and current status.

**E. Books or Portions of Books Published**

List the title of the book, co-authors, volume or proceeding, publisher, date, and the contribution, e.g., author, co-author, edited, wrote a chapter, etc. The listing should only be made after the work has appeared in print.
F. Journal, Book or Proceedings Editorship
List the title, co-editors, publisher, and date of any book or conference proceeding edited. List the journals that you are an editor for; briefly describe your responsibility as editor.

G. Sponsored Research Grants and Contracts
List title, sponsor, dollar amount, all investigators, the candidate’s role or percent of responsibility, dates. Describe in a few sentences the purpose of the grant and the significant results. If the grant was used to develop a research laboratory list it here, if the laboratory is educational it should be listed in section II.I.

H. Awards and Recognition
List any awards or recognition related to research/scholarly accomplishments.

I. Proposals not Funded
List title, co-investigators, sponsor, and date the proposal submitted during the past two years. Explain in a couple of sentences why the proposal was not funded. All reviews sent to the candidate of the proposals listed here must be included in the appendix B2.

J. Presentations
List the title, date, place, circumstance (plenary, conference, invited), and scope (regional, national, international) of all the presentations given in the past three years.

K. Graduate Student Advising and Supervision
List theses/dissertations directed -- student, title, date of graduation.
List theses/dissertations committee served on -- student, title, date of graduation.
List projects directed -- student, title, date.

L. Paid Consulting
List how and where the consulting time was spent, also lists dates and length. Describe in a few sentences how the consulting was career enhancing.

M. Other
Describe any other factors that should be considered in the evaluation of research performance.

IV. SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. University
List department, college, and university committees as well as student organizations served. Specify dates and roles.

B. Accreditation Activity
Describe your efforts in accreditation assessment and review preparation.
C. Professional
List and briefly describe professional awards, society membership and participation, office held, etc. Specify dates and duration.

D. Other
Describe any other factors that should be considered in the evaluation of service performance.

Appendix A. TEACHING SUPPORTING MATERIAL

1. Course Syllabi
Copies of three course syllabi.

2. Teaching Innovation
Include documentation of any innovative teaching techniques you employ. This should be limited to 10 pages.

3. Evaluation Summary Sheets
Include copies of the computer printout of the "Teaching Evaluation Question Results" for the most recent 10 courses taught.

4. Student Comments
All written comments received on teaching evaluations for the past three years must be included.

Appendix B. RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY SUPPORTING MATERIAL

1. Most Significant Publications
Include copies of no more than five significant research publications.

2. Reviews of Proposals not Funded
Include reviewers comments of all proposals listed in section III.I., “Proposals not Funded,” of PART III of the dossier.

3. Refereeing Policies
Attach a copy of the refereeing policy of all journals listed in section III.A.

Appendix C. Reference Letters

Reference Letters
All letters solicited must be included in this section of the dossier. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will not give much weight to letters that are general in nature and do not provide specific information about the candidate’s capabilities or contributions. Each reference should identify the
basis for their evaluation and their professional relationship to the candidate. The reviewers should not be related to, a close friend of, or the thesis/dissertation advisor of the candidate. The candidate may submit a list of no more than three names of people who cannot be solicited for recommendation letters. All letters are to be solicited by the department P&T chair. The department P&T chair must provide a written statement regarding the outside reviewers that includes the following information: 1) why they were chosen; 2) how they were contacted; and 3) what they were sent to review. Each letter must also be accompanied by a short biographical summary of the reviewer.

1. Recommendations of Grant and Contract Sponsors
Include at most three letters from the program manager of grants or contracts that the candidate is the principal investigator. Do not solicit letters from managers who only administer the grant and do not have detailed knowledge of the work performed. The candidate must supply the names of these reviewers to the department P&T chair who will solicit the letters.

2. Recommendations of Principal Investigators
Include at most three letters from the principal investigator of grants that the candidate is a co-investigator for. These letters should state the level of contribution of the candidate towards the grant. Specific information on the percentage of the grants funds that supported the candidate, the number of students that were advised by the candidate, etc., should be documented in these letters. The candidate must supply the names of these reviewers to the department P&T chair who will solicit the letters.

3. Other Recommendations
Include letters from others who are familiar with the teaching ability and/or research performed by the candidate. These letters should ask the reviewer for comments on the quality of the research performed by and/or the teaching ability of the candidate. The reviewers should be recognized experts from other peer universities or research organizations. The reviewers must be at a higher academic rank (or equivalent if from a research organization) than the candidate. The candidate can supply up to five names to the department P&T chair (no more than one from within the university). The department P&T chair must solicit these people. The department P&T chair must select two to four other external reviewers. The department P&T chair must send these reviewers the candidate’s vita and several articles chosen by the candidate for their consideration.

Appendix D. OTHER SUPPORTING MATERIAL
Include other supporting material; this appendix should be limited to 20 pages.

Appendix E. APPOINTMENT
Copy of original appointment letter and any other documents that stipulated conditions for this particular tenure and/or promotion.

Appendix F. DEPARTMENT CRITERIA
Copy of the Department Criteria, Practices, and Procedures Governing Recommendations for Promotion and Tenure that is being used to evaluate the candidate. If it is not the current criteria, state why this one was used.
Appendix G. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

For faculty being considered for tenure, copies of the chairperson's annual evaluation letters to the nominee.

DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE LETTER

A letter from the department/school promotion and tenure committee summarizing the deliberations of the committee and the resulting decision(s).

CHAIR’S SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

Based upon personal knowledge of the individual and the accompanying documentation, the department chairman is to provide an independent professional judgment of the candidate. Judge teaching effectiveness on the following basis: student learning or outcomes, quality of course presentation, quantity of work in relation to course credit hours, level of work in relation to level of course, etc. This judgment should indicate a perception of strengths and weaknesses with respect to all criteria of the department. Where this judgment is not related to material covered in the form, supply supporting data to justify statements, or else identify that they are subjective and/or unsupported summations.

The department chair should evaluate the contents of the dossier and determine if the presentation in the dossier is acceptable or requires improvement. It should be noted that the dean may return a dossier to the department if the presentation in the dossier is not satisfactory.

Data in response to the following questions, when amplifiable, provide the kinds of supporting material needed here:

- Why should he/she be promoted or granted tenure this year and not earlier?
- Were there serious shortcomings earlier and since remedied?
- Was there work in progress earlier and now completed?
- Why should he/she not be promoted or granted tenure next year instead of this year?
- Is it evident that the candidate has reached a high level of maturity in teaching and research and further development in not warranted for establishing a strong case for tenure?
- Are there shortcomings not sufficiently remedied? Is there work still in progress?
- In consideration of tenure, will the candidate continue to grow and develop professionally and maintain a high level of performance in teaching, research/scholarship, professional activities and service?
- In case of a recommendation for early tenure, has the candidate achieved goals that meet or exceed very clearly the department requirements for the probationary period?
- Will the candidate continue enhancing the curriculum in the discipline and working on timely research problems in ten years?
- How does this candidate "measure up" to the view of the ideal faculty member in the discipline?
- What is the percentage-value of the candidate's salary increment during the past three years, and how does it compare with those increments received by other faculty members in the department?
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Have in mind while preparing this summary statement that it is your professional judgment as chair which is sought; the documentation provided by students, colleagues, committees, and the individual's vita will speak for itself. If promotion is not being requested at the same time as tenure, a full explanation of why separate action is being taken must be provided. **What is needed here is independent professional assessment by the chair.**
ATTACHMENT 1

Dossier Summary

Name ________________________________
Department ____________
Years in Rank ______________
Years at OU ______________
Professional Registration (list state) __________

Teaching
Number of 100-200 level courses taught (since last promotion) _______
Number of 300-400 level courses taught (since last promotion) _______
Number of graduate level courses taught (since last promotion) _______
Number of courses developed (since last promotion) _______
Average of questions 10, 11 and 12 for all undergraduate courses taught _____/_____/_____
Average of questions 10, 11 and 12 for all graduate courses taught _____/_____/_____

Student Supervision
Number of Master students you graduated
(total/since last promotion or coming to OU) _____/_____
Number of PhD student you graduated
(total/since last promotion or coming to OU) _____/_____
Number of Masters students you are now the major advisor for _______
Number of PhD students you are now the major advisor for _______

Publications
Number of refereed publications (total/since last promotion) _____/_____
Number of refereed conference publications (total/since last promotion) _____/_____
Number of other publications (total/since last promotion) _____/_____
Number of books authored (total/since last promotion) _____/_____
Number of book chapters authored (total/since last promotion) _____/_____
Number of presentations at professional meetings in the last three years _______

Grants and Contracts
Number of projects you were the PI for (total/since last promotion) _____/_____
Number of projects you were a Co-PI for (total/since last promotion) _____/_____
Number of summer quarters in the last five years you received grant support _______
Number of quarters in the last five years you used grant support for course release _______
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Number of proposals you submitted in the past three years

Service (Last three years)

Number department committees you (chaired/served)  _____/_____
Number college committees you (chaired/served)  _____/_____
Number university committees you (chaired/served)  _____/_____
Number of Conferences you helped organized/chaired sessions  _____
Number of professional organization committees (chaired/served)  _____/_____
Number of professional organization offices held  _____

Awards (List significant awards you received with dates)