

RUSS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

Promotion and Tenure Procedure for Tenure Track and Instructional Faculty

(Revised and Approved by the Faculty in November 29, 2022)

This document is to be reviewed every five years.

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING DOSSIER FOR PROMOTION/TENURE OF TENURE TRACK FACULTY

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 included in the dossier.

The format for presentation of the dossier is to be electronic and include the four major categories and each of the appendices listed below. The cover page of the file must be the "REVIEW FORM FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE" (this form can be obtained from the

dean's office). This cover page must be followed by the two-page summary sheet (Attachment 1 to these Guidelines entitled "Dossier Summary"), 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 (entitled "Dossier Summary") shall 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 or since last promotion or initial appointment (whichever is less). 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 in the last five years or since last promotion or initial appointment (whichever is less). 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 in the last five years or since last promotion or initial appointment (whichever is less).

D. Professional Development in and Contributions to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Accessibility, Belonging (DEIAB) in Teaching

List teaching-focused professional development activities related to DEIAB. Describe how DEIAB considerations have been incorporated into teaching activities. The memo from the Russ College DEIAB Committee, Appendix A in the “Criteria for Promotion and Tenure” document, provides illustrative examples of activities in support of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Accessibility, and Belonging in a professional context in teaching activities.

E. Grants and Gifts

List grants and/or gifts obtained to support course or instructional laboratory development in the last five years or since last promotion or initial appointment (whichever is less). 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.

F. 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 1.1 through 2.3, the results of questions 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5 on the College’s student evaluation for the course, and the average of questions 1.1 through 2.3 along with the results of questions 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5 for the department. A sample table is given below. If no evaluation information is available for a course, it still must be listed.

Course Number and Title	Class Enrollment	Number of Evaluations	Median Grade Awarded	Candidate's Average Score for the Student Evaluation Questions				The Department's Average Score for the Student Evaluation Questions			
				1.1 thru 2.3	3.3	3.4	3.5	1.1 thru 2.3	3.3	3.4	3.5

G. Awards and Recognition

List any awards or recognition related to teaching over the past five years or since last promotion or initial appointment (whichever is less).

H. Academic Advising

Describe activities over the past five years or since last promotion or initial appointment (whichever is less) such as academic counseling, direction of independent study, direction of student competitions, co-op advising, Honors Tutorial advising, etc. Include the results of any advising evaluation tools (e.g., surveys) that have been conducted during this period.

I. Publications

List relevant peer-reviewed journal and conference papers published over the last five years (or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less) related to pedagogy or other relevant areas of education. Include the journal’s impact factor (or equivalent journal ranking data) and the number of citations of the article(s).

J. 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 (last five years only or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less)

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. Include the journal’s impact factor (as given by the Journal Citation Reports from the Web of Science) or equivalent journal ranking (must list source of ranking) and the number of citations of the article(s). Attach a copy of the refereeing policy of the journals listed in appendix B.3.

B. Other Refereed Publications (last five years only or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less)

List title, co-authors, where published, volume number, date, page numbers, etc. Include the number of citations of the article(s) and, if possible, evidence of the ranking/impact of the publication/venue.

C. Non-Refereed Publications (last five years only or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less)

List title, co-authors, where published, volume number, date, page numbers, etc. Include the number of citations of the article(s) and, if possible, evidence of the ranking/impact of the publication/venue.

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 (last five years only or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less)

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 (last five years only or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less)

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 (last five years only or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less)

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. Professional Development in and Contributions to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Accessibility, and Belonging (DEIAB) in Research and Scholarship.

List research-focused and researcher-mentoring-focused professional development activities related to DEIAB. Describe how DEIAB considerations have been incorporated into research and scholarly activities. The memo from the Russ College DEIAB Committee, Appendix A in the "Criteria for Promotion and Tenure" document, provides illustrative examples of activities in support of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Accessibility, and Belonging in a professional context in research and scholarly activities.

I. Awards and Recognition (last five years only or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less)

List any awards or recognition related to research/scholarly accomplishments.

J. 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. Although rejected proposals can be meritorious (e.g., an NSF proposal that is highly ranked but rejected due to lack

of funding), candidates must understand that a large number of rejected proposals does not make up for a lack of funded research.

K. Presentations (last five years only or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less)

List the title, date, place, circumstance (plenary, conference, invited), and scope (regional, national, international) of all the presentations given.

L. Graduate Student Advising and Supervision (last five years only or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less)

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.

M. Paid Consulting (last five years only or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less)

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.

N. Other

Describe any other factors that should be considered in the evaluation of research performance. This section must be limited to no more than 10 pages.

IV. SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. University (last five years only or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less)

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

B. Accreditation Activity (last five years only or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less)

Describe your efforts in accreditation assessment and review preparation.

C. Professional (last five years only or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less)

List and briefly describe professional awards, society membership and participation, office held, etc. Specify dates and duration.

D. Professional Development in and Contributions to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Accessibility, Belonging (DEIAB) in Service

List professional development activities related to DEIAB relevant to your service roles.

Describe how DEIAB considerations have been incorporated into service activities. The memo from the Russ College DEIAB Committee, Appendix A in the "Criteria for Promotion

and Tenure” document, provides illustrative examples of activities in support of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Accessibility, and Belonging in a professional context in service activities.

E. Other

Describe any other factors that should be considered in the evaluation of service performance. This section must be limited to no more than 5 pages.

Appendix A. TEACHING SUPPORTING MATERIAL

1. Course Syllabi

Copies of three course syllabi for courses taught within the past five years or since last promotion or initial appointment (whichever is less).

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.

5. Colleague/Professional Evaluations of Teaching (last five years only or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less)

If colleague and/or other professional evaluations of the candidate’s teaching have been performed, include the results here.

Appendix B. RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY SUPPORTING MATERIAL

1. Most Significant Publications (last five years only or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less)

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. All letters are to be solicited by the department P&T chair. The names of potential reviewers identified by the candidate (see below) must be provided to the department P&T chair no later than September 1 of the year in which the candidate is going to submit their dossier. The three subsections of letters (see below) must be separately tabbed.

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.

When the candidate submits the list of potential reviewers, the candidate may also submit a list of no more than three names of people in a request that they not be solicited for recommendation letters. This request must be made in writing to the department P&T chair and must explain, in detail, the basis for the request. Acceptable bases may include such things as demonstrated conflicts of interest. The department P&T chair, in collaboration with the department chair and dean, will make the final decision regarding whether or not to contact the disputed potential reviewer(s).

1. Recommendations of Grant and Contract Sponsors

The candidate may 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

The candidate may 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. Independent Reviews from Outside Experts in the Candidate's Field

The department P&T chair shall solicit 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 (none from within the university). The department P&T chair must solicit letters from 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.

Appendix H. CURRICULUM VITA

A copy of the candidate's vita that was sent to the independent outside reviewers.

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 is 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?

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 1000-2000 level courses taught¹ _____

Number of 3000-4000 level courses taught¹ _____

Number of graduate level courses taught¹ _____

Number of courses developed¹ _____

Average of questions 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5 for all undergraduate courses
taught¹ _____/_____/_____

Average of questions 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5 for all graduate courses taught¹
_____/_____/_____

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/recent¹) _____/_____

Number of refereed conference publications (total/recent¹) _____/_____

Number of other publications (total/recent¹) _____/_____

Number of books authored (total/recent¹) _____/_____

Number of book chapters authored (total/recent¹) _____/_____

Number of presentations at professional meetings¹ _____

Grants and Contracts

Number of projects you were the PI for (total/recent¹) _____/_____

Number of projects you were a Co-PI for (total/recent¹) _____/_____

¹ Over the last five years or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less

Number of summer semesters you received grant support¹ _____

Number of academic year semesters you
used grant support for course release¹ _____

Number of proposals you submitted in the past two years _____

Service (Last five years or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less)

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) (Last five years or since last promotion or initial appointment, whichever is less)

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROMOTION DOSSIERS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL CANDIDATES

Instructional promotion candidates shall submit an electronic dossier that is adapted from the dossier guidelines aforementioned for tenure track faculty. Specifically, Instructional faculty candidates shall submit a dossier that only contains the following sections:

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.

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 over the past five years. 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. 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 1.1 through 2.3, the results of questions 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5 on the College’s student evaluation for the course, and the average of questions 1.1 through 2.3 along with the results of questions 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5 for the department. A sample table is given below. If no evaluation information is available for a course, it still must be listed. NOTE: The Department of Aviation’s Instructional promotion guidelines specify an expanded version of the teaching evaluation table. Department of Aviation candidates shall include this expanded version in their dossier.

Course Number and Title	Class Enrollment	Number of Evaluations	Median Grade Awarded	Candidate's Average Score for the Student Evaluation Questions				The Department's Average Score for the Student Evaluation Questions			
				1.1 thru 2.3	3.3	3.4	3.5	1.1 thru 2.3	3.3	3.4	3.5

E. Professional Development in and Contributions to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Accessibility, Belonging (DEIAB) in Teaching

List teaching-focused professional development activities related to DEIAB. Describe how DEIAB considerations have been incorporated into teaching activities. The memo from the Russ College DEIAB Committee, Appendix A in the “Criteria for Promotion and Tenure” document , provides illustrative examples of activities in support of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Accessibility, and Belonging in a professional context in teaching activities.

F. Other

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

III. SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. Accreditation Activity (last five years only)

Describe your efforts in accreditation assessment and review preparation.

B. Supervision of TAs (last five years only)

Describe your work in the supervision of teaching assistants.

C. Professional Development in and Contributions to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Accessibility, Belonging (DEIAB) in Service

List professional development activities related to DEIAB relevant to your service roles. Describe how DEIAB considerations have been incorporated into service activities.

D. Other

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

IV. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Describe your professional development efforts over the past five years. These can include participation in conferences, short-courses, graduate courses and the like that help the individual to maintain currency of their technical competence.

Appendix A. TEACHING SUPPORTING MATERIAL

1. Course Syllabi

Copies of three course syllabi of courses taught over the past five years.

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.

5. Colleague/Professional Evaluations of Teaching

If colleague and/or other professional evaluations of the candidate's teaching have been performed over the past five years, include the results here.

Appendix B. OTHER SUPPORTING MATERIAL

Include other supporting material; this appendix should be limited to 20 pages.

Appendix C. APPOINTMENT

Copy of original appointment letter and any other documents that stipulated conditions for this promotion.

Appendix D. DEPARTMENT CRITERIA

Copy of the Department Criteria, Practices, and Procedures Governing Recommendations for Promotion that is being used to evaluate the candidate. If it is not the current criteria, state why this one was used.

Appendix E. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

Copies of the chairperson's annual evaluation letters to the candidate (last five years only).