

RUSS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

MINIMAL CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

(Revised and Approved by the Faculty on September 21, 2015)

This document is to be reviewed every five 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 independent external recognition of work 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. Among engineering departments, equity likewise requires a similar performance level for the granting of tenure and/or promotion. The guidelines contained in this document represent the minimum criteria for evaluating candidates for promotion and/or tenure at the department and college levels. Individual departments may impose additional requirements on their respective candidates that are more specifically defined and exceed those described under these college-wide criteria.

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 flight 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 at least satisfy an acceptable level of performance in each

September 21, 2015

category (details are listed later in this document). A deficiency in one category cannot be outweighed by superior performance in one or both of the other categories.

Regarding pedagogy, promotion to the rank of associate professor requires evidence of effective teaching and commitment to the educational mission of the department, college and university. Candidates for full professor are also expected to have a consistently strong record in this regard.

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 and impact of publications must be considered as well as the quantity. Specifically, the quality/reputation of a given journal or refereed conference (e.g., impact factor) will be considered along with impact of a given paper (e.g., citation count).

Promotion to the associate professor rank is based, in part, upon actual professional accomplishments, as well as the rate of professional growth towards a national reputation in scholarship. Promotion to the rank of full professor is based upon quantified and sustained success, including leadership in their discipline, maturity, and a 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 and publications.

The expectations regarding university service and professional activity differ depending upon rank. Candidates for promotion to associate professor are not expected to become heavily involved in service duties at the college and university levels. Candidates for promotion to full professor are not only expected to serve at the college and university levels (in addition to department service) but are also expected to take leadership roles in some of these activities. Candidates for promotion at both ranks are expected to engage in professional activities. Candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to demonstrate leadership in some aspects of their professional activities.

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.

Teaching Effectiveness – The Russ College emphasizes high-quality, effective teaching. Evidence of effective university-level teaching, derived from data as may be pertinent, e.g., student evaluations, colleague evaluations, technological competence in specialty, versatility, demonstrated success of students, classroom attitude, respect for students, course development, student advising, educational publications and educational grants or gifts, shall be given significant emphasis in tenure and/or promotion decisions.

Research/Scholarly Accomplishments – Research/scholarly performance as assessed by independent external 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; quantifiable impact of intellectual property; number and quality of theses and dissertations directed; peer reviews of research work; notable presentations; and

September 21, 2015

research awards and recognition. 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 at least some aspects of 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. Specific criteria are delineated in the Department of Aviation's tenure and/or promotion guidelines.

Since the Department of Engineering Technology and Management (ETM) does not have a graduate program, the criteria for tenure and/or promotion are based on peer institutions and programs accredited by the Association of Technology, Management and Applied Engineering (ATMAE). Specific criteria are delineated in the ETM department's tenure and/or promotion guidelines.

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. For candidates from engineering programs, 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 criteria must meet or exceed the minimum college-wide criteria specified in this document. Department recommendations for promotion and/or tenure represent recognition of levels

September 21, 2015

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.

At the request of the department chair and/or college dean, the appropriate department P&T committee shall conduct a vote to recommend non-reappointment of a probationary faculty member. This vote is advisory only but provides input to the chair and the dean in the case of probationary faculty members who are clearly making inadequate progress towards tenure.

MAKEUP OF THE DEPARTMENT COMMITTEES

Department promotion and tenure committees will be comprised of a minimum of five 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 the last day of Spring semester classes. The department 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 day of November. 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

September 21, 2015

promotion or tenure for a faculty member, no further evaluation is required, except in the event of an appeal. The departmental committee, through its chair, shall report the results of the evaluation, either positive or negative, to the candidate in writing (with a copy to the department chair) no later than the last day of Fall semester exams. If the departmental committee recommendation is positive, the department chair shall attach his/her recommendation and the departmental committee's letter to the dossier and deliver the dossier to the dean no later than the first day of Spring semester. A copy of the chair's recommendation shall also be forwarded to the candidate by this date.

The college P&T committee shall 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 no later than March 1. 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 executive vice president and provost by March 1.

September 21, 2015

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 included in the dossier.

The format for presentation of the dossier is to be a single three-ring, loose-leaf notebook with tabbed dividers for the four major categories and each of 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" (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.

September 21, 2015

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. 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.

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 1.1 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.

September 21, 2015

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

F. 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).

G. 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.

H. 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).

I. 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.

September 21, 2015

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. 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.

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. 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.

J. 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.

September 21, 2015

K. 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.

L. 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.

M. 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. 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.

September 21, 2015

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.

September 21, 2015

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.

September 21, 2015

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

September 21, 2015

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.**

September 21, 2015

ATTACHMENT 1**Dossier Summary**

Name _____

Department _____

Years in Rank _____

Years at OU _____

Professional Registration (list state) _____

TeachingNumber 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 _____

PublicationsNumber 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) _____/_____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 _____

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

September 21, 2015

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)

September 21, 2015

MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR THE PROMOTION GROUP II FACULTY

in the

RUSS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

The policy, procedures, and criteria for promotion of Group II faculty are summarized herein. This document does not replace or supersede the policies and procedures for promotion outlined in the "University Faculty Handbook" (Section II.C.3.b) but outlines specific requirements and procedures for Group II faculty in the Russ College of Engineering and Technology.

1. GENERAL STATEMENT

The Faculty Handbook states "Group II [faculty] consist of experienced persons holding part-time or full-time appointments, who are primarily considered instructional personnel and may also have service responsibilities, related to the teaching mission of the department, college or university but no expectation for research or creative activity." Promotion is not an automatic process due to longevity. Promotion is awarded to individuals based on demonstrated accomplishments related to the teaching mission of the School, College and University.

2. GENERAL ELIGIBILITY FOR PROMOTION

Initial appointments are typically made at the rank of Lecturer. Promotions to Associate Lecturer and then Senior Lecturer are then possible. The Faculty Handbook states that an "individual is expected to spend a minimum of five years in a given rank before being considered for promotion."

3. GENERAL CRITERIA OF EVALUATION

Each candidate will be evaluated using three categories: (1) teaching effectiveness, (2) service activities, and (3) professional development. Typical items of evaluation for each category are shown below. The list is not all-inclusive, and the order of topics within these subdivisions is not significant; all are factors bearing on the evaluation of the individual's effectiveness or accomplishments within the specified category.

Teaching Effectiveness:

- a) flexibility
- b) new courses
- c) innovations
- d) availability to students
- e) competence in specialty
- f) student evaluation of teaching
- g) grading standards
- h) faculty and student comments
- i) teaching awards

Service Activities:

September 21, 2015

- a) Assessment and accreditation related activities
- b) Supervision of TAs
- c) Service duties assigned by the department Chair

Professional Development:

- a) Participation in conferences, short-courses, graduate courses and the like that help the individual to maintain currency of their technical competence

4. PROCEDURES

The following describes how department P&T Committees are formed.

- a) Promotion to Associate Lecturer Committee All Group II faculty with a rank above Lecturer and all full-time Group I tenured faculty with a rank above Assistant Professor with a minimum of one year of service are eligible to serve on the Promotion to Associate Lecturer Committee. The committee consists of three members (including the P&T chairperson) appointed by the Department Chairperson and is chaired by the Department P&T Chairperson. One of the remaining two members shall be an Associate Lecturer or Senior Lecturer if there is at least one serving in the Department. The other member(s) shall be selected from the list of eligible Group I faculty members in the department.
- b) Promotion to Senior Lecturer Committee All Group II faculty with a rank above Associate Lecturer and all full-time Group I tenured faculty with a rank above Assistant Professor with a minimum of five years of service are eligible to serve on the Promotion to Senior Lecturer Committee. The committee consists of three members (including the P&T Chairperson) appointed by the Department Chairperson and is chaired by the Department P&T Chairperson. One of the remaining two members shall be a Senior Lecturer if there is at least one serving in the Department. The other member(s) shall be selected from the list of eligible Group I faculty members.

5. GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROMOTION DOSSIERS FOR GROUP II CANDIDATES

Group II promotion candidates shall submit a dossier that is adapted from the dossier guidelines aforementioned for tenure track faculty. Specifically, Group II 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.

September 21, 2015

E. 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. 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.

September 21, 2015

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).