

Speed School of Engineering Personnel Document
Approved by Faculty Senate
April 6, 2005

April 22, 2005

11 November 2004

PERSONNEL POLICY AND PROCEDURES

J.B. Speed School of Engineering

Table of Contents

Article 1. Faculty Appointments and Tenure	1
Section 1.1 Types of Appointments	1
Section 1.2 Non-Tenurable Appointments	1
A. Temporary Appointments	1
B. Part-time Faculty	1
C. Term Faculty	1
Section 1.3 Probationary Appointments	1
A. Assistant Professor	1
B. Associate Professor	2
C. Professors	2
Section 1.4 Tenure Appointments	2
Article 2. Faculty Personnel Reviews	2
General Criteria	2
Section 2.1 Annual Reviews (PBSI)	4
Section 2.2 Criteria for Tenure	5
A. Special Faculty	6
1. Graphics Faculty	6
2. Cooperative Education Faculty	6
3. Term Appointed Faculty	6
B. Pre-tenure reviews	7
C. Evaluation for tenure	7
D. Proficiency for tenure	8
Section 2.3 Criteria for Promotion in Rank	9
Section 2.4 Periodic Career Review	9
A. Faculty with Tenure Contract Review	10
B. Periodic Career Review: Stage 1	10
C. Periodic Career Review: Stage 2a	11
D. Periodic Career Review: Stage 2b	12
Section 2.5 Procedures for Promotion and Tenure	13
A. Overview	13
B. Support Data for Recommendations	14
C. Responsibilities and Authority	15
D. Schedule for Promotion and Tenure	16

Article 3. Conditions of Faculty Employment	18
Section 3.1 Annual Work Plan	18
Section 3.2 Compensation	20
Article 4. Amendments	21
Appendix	22

Article 1. Faculty Appointments and Tenure

Section 1.1 Types of Appointments

Faculty appointments are "Full-time", "Part-time", "Emeritus", or "Other", as described in The Redbook, Section 4.1.1.

Section 1.2 Non-Tenurable Appointments

A. Temporary Appointments

Temporary appointments to the various academic ranks may be made for specifically limited time periods less than one year or for special purposes. In no case shall temporary appointments or renewals result in the acquisition of tenure. Temporary appointees shall not be eligible for tenure or count toward time for acquisition of tenure, regardless of assignment or seniority.

B. Part-time Faculty

Faculty members holding part-time appointments in the J.B. Speed School of Engineering shall not be eligible for acquisition of tenure as long as they have part-time appointments.

C. Term Faculty

Term faculty shall be full-time faculty appointments without tenure for a stipulated contract period not to exceed three years. Such appointments are not probationary appointments and no such appointments, continuation, or renewal thereof shall result in acquisition of tenure or implied renewal for subsequent terms. Term faculty shall meet the standards for probationary appointment to the designated rank and shall participate in annual and career reviews for faculty of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering. Term faculty may apply for promotion in rank according to the criteria of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering. Term faculty appointments may be renewed if the Dean determines that the services of the incumbent are needed for the renewal term. Faculty on term appointments shall be eligible to transfer to probationary appointments.

Section 1.3 Probationary Appointments

Probationary appointments shall be appointments of full-time faculty members without tenure, provided, however, that no probationary appointment to the J.B. Speed School of Engineering shall extend beyond the period when tenure is normally granted.

A. Assistant Professor

Probationary appointments to the rank of Assistant Professor shall be for stipulated terms not to exceed two years on the initial appointment, nor three years for appointments made thereafter. In normal circumstances, persons appointed as Assistant Professors shall hold the recognized terminal degree in their field of specialization, or shall present evidence of having completed a body of research, scholarship or other creative activity equivalent in scope and quality to the similar

component of such degree. They shall, in any event, give promise of proficiency in all areas of activity listed in Article 2.

B. Associate Professor

Probationary appointments to the rank of Associate Professor shall be for stipulated terms not to exceed two years on the initial appointment, nor three years for appointments made thereafter. In normal circumstances, persons appointed as Associate Professors shall hold the recognized terminal degree in their field of specialization, or shall present evidence of having completed a body of research or other creative activity equivalent in scope and quality to the similar component of such degree. Additional criteria for appointment (or promotion) to Associate Professor can be found in Section 2.3.

C. Professors

In normal circumstances, persons appointed or promoted to the rank of Professor shall hold the recognized terminal degree in their field of specialization, or shall present evidence of having demonstrated a level of research and/or service equivalent in scope and quality to the similar component of such degree. Professors shall be awarded tenure if employed subsequent to the initial probationary period. Additional criteria for appointment (or promotion) to Professor can be found in Section 2.3.

Section 1.4 Tenure Appointments

All personnel who have acquired tenure are subject to the criteria herein regarding tenure (Section 2.2) and the provisions governing termination only in their capacities as faculty members.

Article 2. Faculty Personnel Reviews

General Criteria

The Redbook document requires unit documents to classify faculty activities into the areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service. This classification is vital since a null performance in an area can result in a denial of tenure. However, there are sure to be activities omitted from any list, no matter how lengthy.

Criteria for promotion and tenure in J.B. Speed School of Engineering are based on, but not limited to, the following areas (The Redbook, 4.2.2.F and 4.2.3.A, respectively):

- Teaching;
- Research or creative activity;
- Service to the profession, the unit, the University or the community;

- Collaboration with colleagues and rapport with students;
- Adherence to professional standards.

In addition to the above university criteria, the J.B. Speed School of Engineering will also consider:

- Level of the highest degree, appropriate to job function,
- Registration/Licensure as a Professional Engineer or other forms of certification where appropriate,
- Overall professional development, including education and experience prior to University employment, and subsequent efforts to maintain and advance professional competency, and,
- University leadership capability and experience.

A positive record in these areas should strengthen a candidate's case for promotion or tenure.

The areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service form a continuum of scholarship, which dynamically interact to form an interdependent whole. The individual may propose a classification for any activity, subject to a ruling of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure (PAT) Committee. Generally, it is the intent of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering that classifications be flexible according to the wishes of the candidate. Activities which are ambiguous may be classified into any area, or distributed among areas, as desired by the candidate as long as the PAT Committee agrees that the classification is reasonable. Some examples are:

- Advising and counseling of students (Teaching/Service)
- Development of course or laboratory materials including textbooks (Teaching/Research and Creative Activity)
- Supervision of student research and/or design activities (Teaching/Research and Creative Activity)
- Supervision of Teaching Assistants (Teaching/Service)
- Industrial consulting or sponsored research (Research and Creative Activity/Service)

- A presentation before a national, state or local group (Teaching/ Research and Creative Activity/Service)
- A paper on education methodology (Teaching/Research and Creative Activity/Service)
- Professional society activity (Service).

Most forms of administration and committee work will be classified as service. All forms of teaching and research and creative activity will be acceptable for review. Reviewers will evaluate their quality and relevance in their recommendations.

Section 2.1 Annual Reviews

Each full-time and term faculty member shall be reviewed annually, and the annual reviews shall become part of the record for periodic career reviews as well as tenure and promotion files.

By January 31, faculty members will submit an annual work report to describe their efforts for the previous year to the department chair or appropriate non-departmental faculty administrator (henceforth referred to as the reporting official). All faculty activity during the year, including proposals prepared but not yet funded and papers written and submitted but not yet accepted for publication, should be included. Also included should be annual work plans and information relevant to quality of instruction for the review period. It is the faculty member's responsibility to attach supplemental information, which becomes part of this report, to assist the reporting official in evaluating these activities.

After receiving the faculty activity reports, the reporting official shall evaluate each faculty member's performance for the period. This evaluation will be based on the annual work report and merit, including contributions to the missions of the department, the J.B. Speed School of Engineering and the University. The reporting official will make every effort to ensure uniform and professional standards in assessing the submitted documentation. Annual performance reviews will be based on a 1 to 6 rating scale system that defines performance as "not proficient (rating of 1 or 2)", "proficient (rating of 3 or 4)", or "exceptional (a rating of 5 or 6)". Overall annual performance reviews will be rated as "not proficient" (a rating of less than 3), "proficient" (a rating of 3 to less than 5) and "exceptional" (a rating of greater than or equal to 5). The reporting official will also prepare a cover letter to the Dean.

Performance ratings of "not proficient" or "exceptional" must be explained in the cover letter, and performance ratings of "proficient" require no justification. If appropriate, the reporting official should acknowledge extraordinary effort and suggest improvements. When the annual review identifies weaknesses and/or deficiencies, the reporting official's summary must include specific recommendations for improvement or for possible adjustments in workload concentration.

Each faculty member will meet with the reporting official to discuss the evaluation. These meetings will be held by April 1. In the event a faculty member is dissatisfied with his/her evaluation, then the process is for the faculty member to attach a letter of rebuttal concerning the evaluation.

When all evaluations, meetings, and relevant letters have been completed, the reporting official will forward them, along with the annual work reports, to the departmental Faculty Activity Committee. This Committee will look for serious disparities in evaluations and examine letters of rebuttal, and will discuss its findings with the reporting official within two weeks of receipt of the materials. If concerns remain after this discussion, the committee and reporting official will write separate letters to the Dean, who shall assist in resolving the committee's concerns before receiving the evaluations. Whatever the Committee's concerns and whatever their state of resolution when presented, the Dean has disposition authority for the matters under discussion.

The reporting official's evaluations along with the annual work reports, relevant letters, and a summary report will be sent to the Dean, with appropriate copies to each faculty member, by May 1.

A committee consisting of the non-student members of the Administrative Plans and Policies Committee and chaired by the Dean shall review the performance evaluations for school-wide consistency. Evaluations of some reporting officials may require adjustment to achieve this consistency.

The performance of reporting officials will be evaluated as described above, but with the following differences:

The Dean will play the role of the reporting official.

Reporting officials' workloads and evaluations for a given year will center on the accomplishments of their administrative unit's mission and goals for the year. An annual faculty review of the reporting official will be used as part of the evaluation.

Disagreements between the Dean and a reporting official regarding the reporting official's workload or evaluation will be resolved by the University Provost, if necessary.

Section 2.2 Criteria for Tenure

In normal circumstances, tenure shall be recommended for persons promoted to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor who already hold academic appointment in the J.B. Speed School of Engineering at the time of promotion. Tenure may be recommended for persons whose initial appointment is at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor.

In normal circumstances, persons recommended for tenure shall hold the recognized terminal degree in their fields of specialization, or shall present evidence of having completed a body of research or other creative activity equivalent in scope and quality to the similar component of such degree. They shall meet the same General Criteria as well as the specific criteria for those appointed as Associate Professor or Professor, depending upon their initial appointments. All waivers or accords about credit toward tenure shall be stipulated in the Provost's letter of appointment.

A. Special Faculty

Individual criteria for a particular position may be prepared in letter form by the Dean of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering. To provide faculty input, the letter requires the approval of the PAT Committee. A letter from the individual accepting the terms is required. These letters will not form a part of this document, but will be maintained in the files of the Office of the Dean and the PAT Committee. Individual criteria must meet The Redbook and Minimum Guidelines document standards.

1. Graphics Faculty.

The following different criteria will be utilized for evaluating Graphics Faculty in recognition of their different objectives and educational preparation. The Master's degree is the terminal degree in accordance with Accreditation Board For Engineering and Technology (ABET) criteria. Other criteria will remain the same.

Performance in teaching is rated as the highest priority for evaluation, since good teaching is recognized as the principal objective for the Graphics Faculty. Hence, service and research and creative activity should be oriented to further this objective.

2. Cooperative Education Faculty

The following criteria will be utilized for evaluation of Cooperative Education Faculty in recognition of their different objectives and educational preparation.

The Master's degree is the terminal degree for this category.

Performance in service is rated as the highest priority for evaluation, and is recognized as the principal objective for the Cooperative Education Faculty. Hence, teaching, research and creative activity should be oriented to further this objective. Other criteria will remain the same.

3. Term Appointed Faculty

As cited in The Redbook (Sections 3.3.1 and 4.1.2.B) term appointed faculty positions are not eligible for tenure. Term appointed faculty shall meet the standards for probationary appointment to the designated rank and shall participate in annual and career reviews for the faculty of J.B. Speed School of Engineering. Further, term appointed faculty may apply for promotion in rank according to the criteria of Section 2.3 of this document.

B. Pre-tenure reviews

Pre-tenure review is a procedure whose purpose is to determine whether or not a faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward achieving tenure. A positive pre-tenure review is not a promise of an eventual tenure grant.

A pre-tenure review will take place at the mid-point of a faculty member's probationary period. No later than October 1 of the academic year in which the review is to take place, the reporting official shall inform the faculty member, in writing, that the review is to take place. The reporting official is responsible for the review. All such correspondence shall become a part of the faculty member's documentation. In the event that an individual's career pattern does not fit the normal progression (i.e., the case of an individual coming to the University with three or more years of credit toward tenure) that case shall be treated on its own merits, determining whether or not the hiring process constituted a pre-tenure review.

The standard for a positive pre-tenure review shall be a determination that continuation of activity, as documented, is expected to fulfill the stated tenure criteria. In the event that the departmental evaluation is negative, the written evaluation must include recommendations to the faculty member for changing the situation documented in the course of the review.

Pre-tenure review shall involve an examination of activity in the areas outlined in "General Criteria". Standards of judgment for the areas of activity shall be the same as those outlined in Section 2.3, and in departmental statements of criteria for tenure. For the purpose of pre-tenure review, extramural review is optional. This option may be exercised by either the faculty member or the departmental personnel committee. The record compiled for pre-tenure review shall be maintained intact as part of the evidence to be considered in tenure review.

C. Evaluation for tenure

Each faculty member eligible for tenure must be evaluated within twelve months after five years of service applied to tenure. (This process is described in The Redbook, 4.2.2.H.) Completion of the probationary period with positive annual performance evaluations and pre-tenure review shall not in and of itself constitute sufficient grounds for tenure. Faculty members on probationary status shall be affected by any amendments to or changes in the criteria for tenure subsequent to their appointment. In such evaluations, appropriate consideration will be given to the amount of time remaining in their probationary period when the change becomes effective.

If the recommendation of the University Provost, the Dean, or the chair of the department is negative the faculty member may request a hearing before the University Faculty Grievance Committee. Any such request must be delivered on or before the tenth working day following the action challenged.

D. Proficiency for tenure

Possible methods for evaluating proficiency in teaching include, but are not limited to: publications in peer reviewed journals, monographs, textbooks, conference proceedings, etc., on teaching methodology; evaluation of teaching based upon student questionnaires, letters from current or former students, classroom visitations by chairs or colleagues, or comments spontaneously received by the chair; syllabi and course material; the submission of proposals and success in obtaining funding of research directed toward improved teaching methods and/or the acquisition of equipment and instrumentation to enhance teaching effectiveness.

Proficiency in research and creative activity may be evidenced by publications in peer reviewed journals, monographs, edited books, textbooks, conference proceedings, and technical reports; oral or videotape presentations; computer software; the submission of proposals and success in obtaining funding of research directed toward the discovery of new knowledge. Publications of all kinds directly provide this type of evidence. Oral presentations may be evaluated in writing for the file by witnesses. Research in progress should likewise be documented by a colleague.

Proficiency in research also may be evidenced by any forum that demonstrates effectiveness in linking knowledge across fields of specialization. This would include presentations; computer courseware; public speeches, and television presentations. Proficiency in research and creative activity may also be evidenced by: publications in peer reviewed journals, monographs, textbooks, conference proceedings, etc., on teaching methodology; and the submission of proposals and success in obtaining funding of research directed toward improved teaching methods and/or the acquisition of equipment and instrumentation to enhance teaching effectiveness.

Additional evidence may be documentation of how faculty members have shared their expertise with the University, profession, or community, regardless of the method of compensation, if any. Such documentation would include and the submission of proposals, with success in obtaining funding, for research directed toward making knowledge useful as a guide for policy or practice. It is imperative that the quality as well as the quantity of the research be considered. External review of research is required as specified in the Minimum Guidelines (Section IV.D.5).

Evaluations of service should be done like those of teaching and research to the extent possible. Most commonly, service does not automatically produce documentary results. Thus, written statements by witnesses, the people or organizations benefiting from the service, or colleagues evaluating such service may be obtained. Also included would be any products resulting from service activities along with evidence regarding the nature of the candidate's contribution. Minor activities, such as committee work of short duration, should have a less formal, aggregate evaluation.

Faculty members are expected to collaborate with colleagues and students. Faculty members are expected to adhere to statements of professional behavior and to the Engineers' Code of Ethics.

Section 2.3 Criteria for Promotion in Rank

The General Criteria and the following specific criteria represent the minimum levels of achievement for promotion to the following ranks:

Associate Professor - In order to be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate shall have shown evidence of having attained proficiency in teaching, research, and service. The evidence of proficiency must include extramural evaluation as specified in the Minimum Guidelines (Section IV.D.5).

Professor - In order to be promoted to the rank of Professor, the candidate shall have shown evidence of (a) having maintained proficiency in teaching, research, and service; (b) superior achievement in at least one of the three areas, consisting of teaching, research, and service; and (c) having achieved professional recognition. The evidence of achievement in research, and the evidence of professional recognition, must include extramural evaluation as specified in the Minimum Guidelines (Section IV.D.5).

Achievement of these minimum levels does not imply that a promotion must be made. The level of performance above the minimum must be considered as well as the general criteria listed above. Candidates should be considered individually and not in competition with others. Seniority (normally six years in rank) is a consideration for all promotions, but lack of seniority alone shall not be grounds for a negative recommendation.

For promotion to a given rank, the number of faculty in that rank, or the number of candidates for that rank, either in the department or the school, should not work to the detriment of the faculty member being considered for promotion. In addition, the gap between the salary of the faculty member being recommended and the average salary of the next higher rank should not work to the detriment of the faculty member. Where feasible, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor should be synchronized with the award of tenure, although these may take effect in different years.

Section 2.4 Periodic Career Review

Periodic career review includes pre-tenure review, review for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Professor, and other performance reviews conducted on a five-year cycle as defined below. Annual reviews of each faculty member shall be made available as part of the periodic career review.

Faculty members with tenure shall undergo a career review in every fifth year of service. When the review period ends in a sabbatical or other leave, the career review shall be deferred until

the next academic year. A promotion shall replace a career review for the period in which the promotion occurs.

A. Faculty with Tenure Contract Review

All faculty shall be evaluated annually according to the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Performance Based Salary Increase (PBSI) policy as described in Section 2.1. In addition, all faculty shall undergo career review to evaluate their contribution to the University, J.B. Speed School of Engineering and Departmental missions. These reviews shall promote the continued professional development of the faculty member reviewed. The J.B. Speed School of Engineering assumes that faculty will ordinarily discharge their professional responsibilities by proficient performance in all areas of scholarship as specified in "General Criteria" and in accordance with their annual work plans. Such holistic judgments should be made in the context of departmental mission. The periodic career review process is intended to confirm this assumption by examination of evidence and reviews compiled over a five-year cycle for faculty with tenure and over a three-year cycle, coincident with contract renewal, for term faculty. In those unusual cases where this assumption is shown to be mistaken, the review process provides mechanisms to support the faculty member by returning performance to or above the level of proficiency specified in the departmental guidelines and required by the J.B. Speed School of Engineering.

Copies of all evaluations, including any forms used, and all letters written by reporting officials, committees, individual faculty, or the Dean as described in this document shall be forwarded to the Office of the Dean, where they will be kept in a master file for J.B. Speed School of Engineering. Files for an individual will be maintained until the individual's next periodic career review is completed.

The main purpose of a Stage 1 review is to identify those few faculty members whose performance is not satisfactory, and to facilitate a more extensive review and remedial plan, as needed. Stage 1 reviews also provide an additional mechanism to identify those faculty members whose performance is consistently superior during their five-year review period.

Stage 2 reviews are of two types. One, Stage 2a, describes review procedures to be followed when a faculty member has been identified as "unsatisfactory: not meeting department criteria" during Stage 1. The second, Stage 2b, describes review procedures for those faculty members whose performance is consistently superior and who would like to be considered for supplemental merit raises.

B. Periodic Career Review: Stage 1

Each department will develop a statement of expectations for "proficient performance" by tenured faculty. This statement will then form the basis for periodic career reviews. Statements will be reviewed by the Dean to insure consistency with the mission of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering. After approval, each department will submit the statement to the Promotion and Tenure Committee so that Stage 1 and Stage 2 reviews will have a contextual framework.

Annual reviews and the documentation supporting them will be used as the evidentiary base for periodic career reviews. The department Faculty Activity Committee will review the five prior annual reviews. If a faculty member has five satisfactory reviews, the department Faculty Activity Committee will forward a current curriculum vita, a recommendation and summary of their examination of the record reviewed to the department chair. The chair will review this material and send the summary and the chair's recommendation to the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee. This committee will review materials provided by the department, and forward their recommendation to the Dean. The review will then be complete, and the next five-year cycle will begin.

Under ordinary circumstances, proficient performance in teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service, specified in the annual work plan, will be expected; however, the policy allows for some variations in proficiency, which may arise from new teaching assignments, the initial development and preliminary stages of research, projects, or unusual service obligations. Therefore, if a faculty member has one unsatisfactory review during the five-year period, the departmental Faculty Activity Committee and chair will conduct a Stage 2A review to identify problems.

These recommendations of the Faculty Activity Committee and chair will be forwarded along with the summary of the review period to the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee. The documentation supporting the recommendation, for instance, PBSI letters and the evidentiary base from which they were written, will be made available to the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee if requested. The J.B. Speed School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee will review summary materials and other requested documentation, and forward their recommendation for Stage 2 review to the Dean.

C. Periodic Career Review: Stage 2a

Stage 2a review will focus on tenured faculty selected for review during Stage 1 as not having met expected performance criteria. In general, the purpose of this review is to provide useful feedback and appropriate intervention and assistance to these faculty members.

The department chair will inform those selected for Stage 2a review. The faculty member will compile detailed information pertinent to the review. This information will in all cases include: (1) an up-to-date curriculum vitae, (2) annual reviews and annual work plans for the past five years; (3) Stage 1 documentation and recommendations. Other evidence supporting areas of activity as listed in "General Criteria" may also be included by the faculty member, or may be requested by any of the reviewing bodies. If requested by the faculty member or the department chair, any materials may be sent out for extramural review, following all procedures outlined in Section 2.5.B.

The Faculty Activity Committee will review all documentation and reviews and make a recommendation to the department chair. This recommendation can either state that the Stage 2A review is unwarranted, based on their professional judgment concerning the nature of the

deficiencies and reasons for them, and that the faculty member is proficient, or that the Stage 2A process should continue. In all cases, the purpose of this review is to identify weaknesses, and make recommendations for their correction. Therefore, the department review must reflect the nature of the individual's field of work and must conform to fair and reasonable standards for performance. Also, in all cases, the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee should be provided with copies of the department expectations for proficient performance, so that the J.B. Speed School of Engineering assessments can be balanced against those. This procedure must not conflict with The Redbook (Section 4.2.4.A.2).

Because its purpose is developmental, not punitive, the department review should identify strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member and define specific goals or outcomes that would help the faculty member improve. The faculty member then can review and rebut this recommendation. All documentation is then forwarded to the chair. The chair will respond to the documentation provided by the departmental committee in writing and, with the faculty member, develop a specific plan to overcome deficiencies. This plan will identify the specific weaknesses, define specific expected outcomes, outline the activities that will be taken to correct deficiencies, set timelines for accomplishing this work, and specify how the new activities will be monitored and assessed. The Redbook specifies (Section 4.2.4.A.2) that this plan is for one year unless the Dean approves a longer period.

All documentation will be forwarded to the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee for review, and their recommendation that the plan be accepted, modified, or rejected will be sent to the Dean. The Dean will give final approval to the plan.

The faculty member's plan will be monitored as part of the annual review. If the faculty member has not achieved the stated goals of the plan within one year, and is again evaluated as "unsatisfactory: not meeting unit criteria," the documentation will be sent to the Dean for appropriate action.

A faculty member can appeal this process, if and only if the disagreement meets at least one of the four causes stated in The Redbook (Section 4.4.3).

D. Periodic Career Review: Stage 2b

Stage 2b will focus on review procedures for faculty members whose performance is consistently superior and who would like to be considered for supplemental merit raises. The purpose of this review is to assess the appropriateness of performance-based salary increase awards over a longer period than annual reviews permit. Where evidence of outstanding performance over a long period warrants, reviewing bodies may recommend a supplementary salary increase to reward career demonstrations of professional excellence.

A faculty member may initiate a Stage 2b review by informing his/her departmental chair, or such a review may be initiated by the department chair or departmental Faculty Activity

Committee. The faculty member will compile a triptych containing detailed information pertinent to the review. This information will in all cases include: (1) an up-to-date curriculum vitae, (2) PBSI reviews and annual work plans for the past five years; (3) Stage 1 documentation and recommendations. Other evidence supporting areas of activity listed in "General Criteria" might also be included by the faculty member, or may be requested by any of the reviewing bodies.

If requested by the faculty member or the department chair, any materials may be sent out for extramural review, following all procedures in the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Personnel Policy.

The department Faculty Activity Committee and chair will review the documentation and make a recommendation. This, and all relevant documentation, will be forwarded to the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee for their recommendation. All documentation will be forwarded to the Dean for a final recommendation and approval.

A faculty member can appeal this process, if and only if the disagreement meets at least one of the four causes stated in The Redbook (Section 4.4.3).

Section 2.5 Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

A. Overview

The faculty member, administrative officer* or PAT Committee chair who initiated the review for promotion or tenure shall be responsible for compiling the evaluation file. Individuals under review may include any material they wish in their file, however, summaries should be substituted for voluminous material. The administrative officer and other reviewers within the J.B. Speed School of Engineering may also include other materials as long as they are made available to the individual and previous reviewers so that prior recommendations may be reconsidered.

Tenure and promotion files must be compiled with the aid of the faculty member under review and the faculty member must be able to add evidence at any time before the file is advanced to the University Provost (The Redbook 4.2.H.4). A faculty member must be permitted to see, copy, and respond to the material in his or her promotion and/or tenure file with the names and affiliations of the evaluators masked.

A faculty member may request only one evaluation for early tenure.

* The terms "administrative officer", "chair", and "chairperson" hereafter are meant to be equivalent. However, it is necessary that the Dean designate someone to assume this role for non-departmental faculty.

As previously stated, departmental faculties may develop individual procedures for processing promotion and tenure recommendations. If they do not, the general procedure in this paragraph will be used. The departmental tenure committee will consist of those faculty in the department who have tenure. The departmental promotion committee will consist of the faculty of higher rank than the individual under consideration. The recommendations of these committees will speak for the departmental faculty on the respective matters. Departmental faculty should take special care to review the individual's file and not assume that they are familiar with all of the person's work.**

After the departmental faculty have made their recommendation, the chair will make a recommendation and will forward the file to the Promotion and Tenure (PAT) Committee. The committee will add its recommendation to the unit file and will forward the file to the Office of the Dean. The Dean of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering will add a recommendation and will forward the file to the University Provost. A faculty member has the right, as provided in The Redbook (Section 4.2.2.H.4), to rebut any recommendation at the time it is placed in the file, or before it is advanced to the provost.

B. Support Data for Recommendations

Promotion and tenure recommendations at all levels shall be based on documented facts and written opinions. Data should be quantified where appropriate. Such evidence should permit recommendations on the most objective basis possible. Recommendations shall be in written form and presented with a clear and concrete explanation supported by the evidence in the evaluation file.

The evaluation file shall include at least five reference letters from qualified persons who are familiar with the candidate's professional performance. At least two letters must be from sources not suggested by the candidate. However, the candidate must approve the use of any individual as a referee and may insist on the inclusion of reference letters from anyone. The candidate's approval of individual referees must be sought at least one week prior to contacting the referees. When letters of reference are requested, internal and external referees must be warned that they will not have anonymity, although their names and affiliations will be masked to the candidate. The faculty member under review may respond to these external reference letters. At least two external reviews are to be included.

All evidence used as support data must be unbiased and capable of providing a defensible measure of proficiency as outlined in Section 2.2.D. The choice of methods is delegated to the individual and the department with the following constraints. It is undesirable that comments spontaneously received by the chair be given undue weight. Further, the results of a school-wide questionnaire system developed by the Instruction and Learning Committee and approved by the

** Faculty who have appointments in more than one department should be evaluated by each department.

faculty must be a part of the evaluation. These questionnaires must be gathered and tabulated under secure conditions. While the questionnaires are not to be released except to the individual and the department chair, a summary of the results, developed jointly by the chair and the individual, will form a part of the file used for promotion and tenure evaluations. The questionnaires themselves are considered to be too voluminous for inclusion in the file. Other aspects of instruction such as advising of students, thesis and dissertation supervision, etc., should also be considered.

C. Responsibilities and Authority

The PAT Committee shall serve as the representative faculty body on all matters pertaining to promotion, tenure, and when necessary, career review. When appropriate, it will advise the Dean and the faculty and prepare courses of action.

The committee will function in an advisory capacity. None of its recommendations for promotion, tenure, or career review will be considered binding on the Dean. The committee members have the right to bring before the committee any matter relating to promotion, tenure, and career review. The committee has the right to obtain information as complete as possible on any matter brought before it. The committee shall obtain all available information required by The Redbook about a candidate for promotion, tenure, or career review.

The committee shall base its recommendations on a comparison of the record of accomplishment in the evaluation file to the criteria which appear in The Redbook, this document, and their addenda. Members should not act as advocates for any person or constituency, but rather as judges of the meeting of criteria. It should be emphasized that salary information relative to the individual and to the rank to which the individual is being recommended will not be considered by the committee since it is irrelevant to the criteria for promotions, tenure, and career reviews.

The committee shall grant a hearing to any faculty member on matters pertaining to promotions, tenure, and career reviews.

The committee meetings shall be held strictly confidential and the committee's recommendations will be given only to the Dean, the individual affected by the recommendation, and his or her administrative officer. The recommendation will also become a part of the promotion, tenure, and career review file.

The committee shall act on any claim for promotion, tenure, or career review brought before it by a faculty member or his/her administrative officer. Self initiation of the claim shall not work to the detriment of the candidate. However, the committee will not act upon a request for promotion, tenure, or a career review evaluation without prior referral to the appropriate departmental faculty committee and administrative officer for recommendations. Such recommendations must be made in a timely manner.

The committee shall, with the concurrence of the individual involved, initiate similar promotion review for any faculty member it deems deserving of such review, if such action is not initiated from another source.

Whenever a promotion, tenure, or career review evaluation must be made for a member of the PAT Committee, that member shall resign and be replaced according to J.B. Speed School of Engineering Bylaws.

Candidates for promotion and tenure may challenge the participation of no more than two members of the PAT committee. If a majority of the remaining members agree that the challenged members are prejudiced against the candidate, the challenged members shall not participate in the recommendation.

D. Schedule for Promotion and Tenure

Dates given should normally be followed unless circumstances warrant alterations. The majority of the cases considered by the committee relates to promotion effective on July 1; tenure dates are set by the individual's appointment. Steps in the evaluation procedure are described below and begin on September 15. Each year, after the Central Administration has notified the Dean of the final date for receiving the files of nominees from J.B. Speed School of Engineering, a schedule will be set for the remaining evaluation steps. The Dean shall formulate the schedule in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee and Department Chairs. The schedule will be published no later than September 15.

Promotion and early reviews for tenure may not be stopped except with the permission of the faculty member involved.

The committee will receive memoranda from administrative officers indicating the names of faculty members who are under consideration for promotion or tenure by the departmental faculty. A copy of the memorandum will also be transmitted to the Office of the Dean, and to the individual faculty member under consideration.

The committee will receive memoranda from all faculty members who plan to submit claims for promotion or tenure on their own behalf. A copy of the memorandum will also be transmitted to the Office of the Dean, and to the appropriate administrative officer.

The committee will issue memoranda to the appropriate administrative officers indicating that it plans to initiate a promotion review. A copy of the memorandum will also be transmitted to the Office of the Dean and to the concerned faculty member.

The committee will forward a complete evaluation file to each appropriate administrative staff officer for cases initiated by the PAT Committee or by the individual under consideration.

A copy of the memorandum of transmittal shall also be forwarded to the Office of the Dean and to the faculty member.

If the PAT Committee has not received a complete evaluation file from subject claimant prior to the cutoff date, the committee will transmit a memorandum to that effect to the appropriate administrative officer, to the Office of the Dean and to the individual faculty member concerned.

The committee will receive all evaluation files initiated by administrative officers. A separate confidential copy of both the recommendations of the departmental faculty, and of the chair will be forwarded to the individual faculty member.

The committee will have returned to them by the administrative officers all evaluation files which had previously been channeled through the PAT Committee by claimants for self-initiated promotion or tenure, or which had been initiated for promotion review by the PAT Committee. A separate confidential copy of both the recommendations of the departmental faculty, and of the chair will be forwarded to the individual faculty member. The Office of the Dean will not be informed of either the departmental faculty's or chair's recommendations at this juncture, but shall receive a copy of the letter of transmittal.

The committee will make its recommendations on the nominations and claims for promotion and tenure, and will forward the evaluation file to the Office of the Dean. A confidential copy of their recommendation will be forwarded to the individual faculty member under consideration and to the appropriate administrative officer.

The committee will be advised by the Dean of all actions taken on the committee's recommendations, and will be given an opportunity to respond for placement in the file before it is sent to the University Provost.

Each individual being considered for promotion or tenure will receive a confidential copy of the Dean's recommendation to the University Provost. The appropriate administrative officer will also receive a copy.

The Dean will forward the files to the University Provost.

It is recognized that in certain cases a nomination or a claim for promotion or tenure which is to be effective at a time other than July 1 may be received by the committee. In such cases, the committee will make its recommendation within two months from the date it receives the nomination or claim. One month after the committee's recommendation is made, the Dean will inform in writing the committee, the faculty member, and his or her administrative officer of the Dean's recommendation.

Article 3. Conditions of Faculty Employment

The performance of each faculty member shall be evaluated in accordance with the annual review. The goals of these reviews are to reward performance in the short term, to reinforce desirable patterns of career advancement, and to foster the development of excellence in J.B. Speed School of Engineering. Performance evaluations shall be based on merit, including contributions to the missions of the department, J.B. Speed School of Engineering, and the University.

During the spring semester of each calendar year, each full-time faculty member shall develop an annual work plan that describes the distribution of effort planned for the calendar year. Evaluations of performance must be made in accordance with annual work plans.

Every faculty member under review for a Performance Based Salary Increase (PBSI), upon being informed in writing of the recommendation at any stage of the review, may enter rebuttals in writing.

Each department and the non-departmental faculty shall have a Faculty Activity Committee consisting of at least three tenured faculty who are not administrators. This same committee will be referred to as the Departmental Faculty Activity Committee in this document. However, no person may participate during deliberation of his/her own case. Each department should develop a method for alternate selection, when needed.

The J.B. Speed School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee will act as the school-wide Committee on Appeals. Any faculty member may request a review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the Dean's decision on a PBSI review. The result of that review will then be forwarded to the Dean as a recommendation.

Dates given in this section should be followed unless circumstances warrant their change.

Section 3.1 Annual Work Plan

In December of each year the reporting official provides his or her faculty with a list of proposed instruction and other duties for the upcoming calendar year. Each faculty member then drafts an annual work plan agreement and submits it to the reporting official by January 31. This plan shall define faculty activity based on teaching, research, and service. Evaluations must consider only those areas of activity for which the approved annual work plan indicates a faculty member's responsibility.

Annual work plans shall be initiated in the department where the faculty member holds primary appointment. For faculty appointed to administrative positions and non-departmental faculty, annual work plans will be negotiated with the Dean or his/her representative and the individual.

By March 1, the reporting official shall evaluate the annual work plans and meet with each faculty member to negotiate a mutually agreeable plan. The plan should describe the faculty member's role in carrying out the mission and goals of the department while seeking to accommodate the individual's professional goals. If the reporting official and faculty member cannot agree on a common annual work plan, the reporting official will submit a plan, and the individual may choose to attach a letter stating and explaining points of disagreement. This attachment becomes an integral part of the annual work plan.

When all annual work plans have been completed, the reporting official will forward them to the Faculty Activity Committee. The committee will look for serious disparities in workload and examine letters of disagreement and discuss its findings with the reporting official within two weeks of receipt of the plans. If concerns remain after this discussion, the committee and reporting official will write separate letters to the Dean, who shall assist in resolving the committee's concerns before receiving the annual work plans. Whatever the committee's concerns and whatever their state of resolution when presented, the Dean has disposition authority for the matters under discussion.

Annual work plans may be revised during the year by mutual agreement, and should be revised if a significant change in a faculty member's situation occurs.

In every personnel action, the accomplishments of the faculty member shall be reviewed against the background of the agreed upon distribution of effort for each year of the period under review. Accomplishments in proportion to the allocation of effort to each area of activity shall be required.

Annual work plans must be consistent with the program needs of Speed School and its departments, and fall within the limitations imposed by the budget.

The distribution of effort shall be expressed in terms of percent of effort allocated to each activity as defined in "General Criteria". The standard, in comparison to which the allocation of effort to any activity shall be estimated, is that normally a three-credit-hour lecture course requires ten percent of the work load of a faculty member on twelve month appointment. To allocate other than ten percent to a three-credit-hour course, or to allocate other than in proportion to this standard for courses carrying fewer or more hours of credit, shall require justification acceptable to the Dean. Each faculty member in full-time status for the year must account for 100 percent of a full work load by allocation of effort, in some combination, in the areas of activity listed in "General Criteria". Justification for allocations of effort shall take the form of listing the activities (e.g., courses to be taught, committee assignments, etc.).

All approved annual work plans shall respect both the individual faculty member's need to shape his or her own career and the School's various needs, and shall accordingly permit or require the faculty member to perform various functions at different stages in his or her career. In order to

achieve this flexibility, a policy shall be applied to all tenured faculty in Speed School with appropriate adaptations when necessary to reflect Speed School's specific needs.

Subject to ordinary review, and to curricular and budgetary constraints, the allocation of effort for a specified period to special projects consistent with the objectives of the School shall be accommodated. Examples of such projects are: carrying a research project through some critical stage; completion of a significant writing project; special assignments in the area of course or curriculum development; or a career development program associated with periodic career review. In all such cases, the allocation of effort to such projects should be reflected in the plan, and such concentration should not work against the interest of the faculty member in salary considerations. In cases where grant or contract funds are used to pay a part of the base salary, the whole base salary obligation, including any increased allocation to any category, shall be shown on the agreement.

Section 3.2 Compensation

If there are funds for salary increments beginning July 1 of the year, merit increments for all faculty shall be subject to the following guidelines:

Faculty whose overall performance is proficient or better shall get a nonzero salary increment.

Increments should be based on a cumulative performance that takes into account the performance for the two preceding years as well as that for the current year, with the current year counting no less than previous years.

After distribution of PBSI funds to departments, awards to individuals will be made according to the approved departmental policy. No departmental policy shall be implemented until approved by the Dean.

In the event a faculty member is dissatisfied with his/her salary increment, the faculty member may submit a letter of appeal to the chair who must forward this to the Dean. The Dean has dispositional authority.

Departmental or unit performance assessments will be a significant factor in determining salary increments for reporting officials who administer departments and academic support units, but will not be used in determining salary increments for faculty. Salary increments for faculty will be based solely on how well the individual contributed to the department or unit mission as reflected in that person's evaluation.

Faculty who have outstanding post-tenure periodic career reviews but have not received the designated supplemental salary increases will receive the supplement.

The Dean will inform each faculty member in writing of his or her final performance evaluation and salary increment and, if appropriate, specific suggestions for improvement. An attachment to this will describe the procedure used to determine salary increments and the distributions of performance evaluations and salary increments for all Speed School faculty.

In years when funds for salary increments are budgeted, an individual's recommendation by the Dean for no salary increase must be submitted to the Provost for approval, and must include reasons for performance considered to be unsatisfactory, as well as specific suggestions for improving performance.

Article 4. Amendments

Amendments to this document must be approved by the J.B. Speed School of Engineering faculty. The vote will be made by mail ballot after discussion at a faculty meeting. Approval requires two-thirds of those voting but no less than a simple majority of all the faculty.

Appendix

A. Purpose

The Redbook requires units to adopt policy and procedure documents on faculty appointment, promotion, tenure, as consistent with its Minimum Guidelines. This document is intended to fulfill that requirement.

B. Scope

The criteria and procedures in this document apply on a school-wide basis, except that established departments may adopt procedures compatible with this document for processing their evaluations and recommendations. When, and if, such departmental procedures are developed, they should be made an addition to this document. J.B. Speed School of Engineering faculty not in an established department may vote to establish a (single) similar addendum for faculty at large.

C. Definitions

1. Teaching

Teaching includes all work that involves the use of the faculty's expertise to communicate subject matter to students. The essential element of teaching is the didactic relationship between teacher and students. Good teaching also involves the ability to interact effectively with students. Pedagogical procedures must be carefully planned, continuously examined, and directly related to the subject taught. Good teachers stimulate active, not passive, learning; and encourage students to be critical, creative thinkers with the capacity to go on learning after their college days are over.

2. Research and Creative Activity

For most faculty, research, basic or applied, is delving into some question in that faculty member's field and seeking to add to the reservoir of knowledge. Such endeavors not only result in the creation of knowledge, but also invigorate student-faculty relationships inside the classroom and out. Research includes the act of knowledge creation through the publication or dissemination of original or innovative theoretical, empirical, or creative work. The intellectual excitement and progress that are generated by research are vital to a university such as ours.

Research also means making connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in a larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way, and/or educating non-specialists. There is a need for scholars who give meaning to isolated facts by putting them in perspective. Research is also serious, disciplined work that seeks to draw together, interpret, and bring insight to bear on new developments.

Research also occurs when one applies information, interpretation, or techniques characteristic of one's discipline to consequential problems in the real world. The key to defining

application is that the activity must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge and relate to one's professional activity.

As a scholarly enterprise, teaching begins with what the teacher knows. Those who teach must be, above all, well informed, and steeped in the knowledge of their fields. Hard work and serious study underpin good teaching. Good teaching means that faculty, as scholars, are also learners. Research and creative activities aimed at teaching involve not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming and extending it as well.

3. Service

Service is the application of general academic expertise that results from experience as a university educator, as when one participates in faculty governance within the university or when service activities outside the university are linked to one's general academic expertise. Service is distinguished from research in that service does not require that the activity be related to one's area of professional expertise. Additionally, service does not include activities that one might engage in as a citizen of a civic community, but is restricted to those activities required by the students, department, college, university or profession.

4. Tenure

Tenure is the right of certain full-time faculty personnel who hold academic rank to continuous full-time employment without reduction in academic rank until retirement or termination as provided in Section 4.5.3 of The Redbook. Tenure is granted in an academic unit in accordance with the procedures established in Section 4.2.2.H of The Redbook.

5. Proficiency

Whenever used in this document, the word "proficient" shall be understood to mean "to satisfy capably all the special demands or requirements of a particular situation, craft, or profession."