

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. Full-time Appointments | 1 |
| B. Part-time Appointments | 1 |
| Section 1.3 Probationary Appointments | 2 |
| A. Assistant Professor | 2 |
| B. Associate Professor | 2 |
| C. Professor | 2 |
| Section 1.4 Tenure Appointments | 2 |
| Section 1.5 Graduate Faculty Membership | 2 |
| Article 2. Faculty Personnel Reviews | 3 |
| Section 2.0 General Criteria | 3 |
| Section 2.1 Annual Reviews (PBSI) | 4 |
| Section 2.2 Criteria for Tenure | 6 |
| A. Pre-tenure reviews | 6 |
| B. Evaluation for tenure | 7 |
| C. Proficiency for tenure | 8 |
| Section 2.3 Criteria for Promotion in Rank | 9 |
| Section 2.4 Periodic Career Review | 10 |
| A. Periodic Career Review: Stage 1 | 10 |
| B. Periodic Career Review: Stage 2 | 11 |
| Section 2.5 Procedures for Promotion and Tenure | 12 |
| A. Overview | 12 |
| B. Support Data for Recommendations | 13 |
| C. Responsibilities and Authority | 13 |
| Article 3. Conditions of Faculty | 16 |
| Section 3.1 Annual Work Plan | 16 |
| Section 3.2 Compensation | 17 |
| Article 4. Amendments | 18 |
| Appendix | 19 |

1. Faculty Appointments

Section 1.1 Types of Appointments

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

Section 1.2 Non-Tenurable Appointments

A. Full-Time Appointments

1. 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 a temporary appointment or a renewal thereof result in the acquisition of tenure.

2. Term Appointments

- a. Term faculty may be appointed for a contract period not to exceed 3 years. Such appointments shall not be tenurable. No term contract, continuation, or renewal shall result in the acquisition of tenure or imply renewal for subsequent terms.
- b. Term faculty appointments may be funded through general funds, restricted funds, or clinical revenues. In each unit, term appointments funded through general funds must number less than 50% of the total number of probationary and tenured appointments in that unit.
- c. A nontenurable faculty member shall be eligible to apply for and be appointed to a tenurable position. The Executive Vice President and University Provost's letter of appointment shall state whether and to what extent the new appointment shall consider time served in nontenurable status as prior service.
- d. 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. Temporary, part-time or term appointments to the rank of instructor shall be for stipulated terms of one year or less. Term faculty may apply for promotion in rank according to the criteria of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering defined in Section 2.3. Term faculty appointments may be renewed by recommendation to the President or President's designee by the Dean, upon initiation of the department chair after recommendation by the department faculty or faculty committee.

B. Part-time Appointments

Part-time faculty shall be appointed by contract to teach specified courses or to engage in specified instruction, research or service less than full time for a designated period. No such appointment, continuation, or renewal thereof shall result in acquisition of tenure or implied renewal for subsequent periods. Part-time faculty may qualify for certain benefits as authorized by the University. Such service shall be accounted for and recognized in the individual contract. Part-time faculty shall hold rank according to education and experience. Part-time faculty shall

have an appeal process as provided for in the terms of appointment. The Dean or Dean's designee may appoint or reappoint part-time faculty for each academic term at the convenience of the University on standard contract terms approved by the Executive Vice President and University Provost. Part-time faculty appointments shall not be eligible for tenure or count toward time for acquisition of tenure.

Section 1.3 Probationary Appointments

Probationary appointments shall be appointments of full-time faculty members without tenure other than those described in Section 1.2, provided that such appointment shall not 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. Professor

Probationary appointments to the rank of 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 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

Personnel who have acquired tenure are subject to the regulations herein on tenure (Section 2.2) and the provisions governing termination of faculty members.

Section 1.5 Graduate Faculty Membership

The Graduate Faculty of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering will be responsible for the teaching, training, and mentoring of graduate students and postdoctoral students within the Speed School. Further description of the responsibilities, qualifications, *ad hoc* appointments and review of Graduate faculty are defined in the Minimum Guidelines for Graduate Education in the J.B. Speed School of Engineering that are part of the Guidelines for Graduate study at the University of Louisville.

Graduate Faculty Membership will be granted to any tenured or tenure-track faculty in the J.B. Speed School of Engineering at initial appointment.

Article 2. Faculty Personnel Reviews

Section 2.0 General Criteria

The Redbook requires unit documents to classify faculty activities into the areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service. This classification is vital since proficient performance in all areas is a minimum condition for tenure.

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

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

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
- University leadership capability and experience.

A positive record in any of 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. In this regard, if a department has

duly established guidelines for evaluating its faculty, then all evaluations shall take these guidelines into account.

Additionally, the individual may propose a classification for any activity, subject to a ruling of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC). 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 FAC 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)
- Presentations before national, state or local groups (Teaching/ Research and Creative Activity/Service)
- Publications 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 faculty member shall be reviewed annually. The annual reviews shall become part of the record for periodic career reviews as well as tenure and promotion files.

According to the schedule in Appendix IV, faculty members will complete and submit their faculty activity report to describe their efforts for the previous year to the department chair, in the format adopted by the J. B. Speed School of Engineering for these submissions. 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. Information relevant to quality of instruction for the review period should also be included. It is the faculty member's responsibility to include supplemental information, which becomes part of this report, to assist the department chair in evaluating these activities.

After receiving the faculty activity reports, the department chair shall evaluate each faculty member's performance for the period. This evaluation will be based on the annual activity report and merit, including contributions to the missions of the department, the J.B. Speed School of Engineering and the University. The department chair will make every effort to ensure uniform, objective and professional standards in assessing the submitted documentation. Annual performance reviews will be based on a 0 to 6 rating scale system that defines performance as "none (rating of 0)", "not proficient (rating of 1 or 2)", "proficient (rating of 3 or 4)", or "exceptional (rating of 5 or 6)". The overall annual performance score is calculated as the sum of the percentage weight in each effort category multiplied by the performance score in that effort category. The overall annual performance reviews will be rated using this score as "not proficient" (a rating of less than 2.5), "proficient" (a rating of 2.5 to less than 4.5) and "exceptional" (a rating of 4.5 or greater).

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

The department chair's evaluations along with the annual work reports, relevant letters, and a summary report must be completed for review by the Dean, with appropriate copies to each faculty member, by the date specified in Appendix IV. This information may be transmitted electronically using the format adopted by the J. B. Speed School of Engineering for these submissions.

Each faculty member will meet with the department chair to discuss the evaluation. These meetings will be held by the date specified in Appendix IV. In the event a faculty member is dissatisfied with the evaluation, then the faculty member may attach a letter of rebuttal concerning the evaluation to be included in his/her file.

Additionally, a faculty member may request that the department chair forward all evaluations, meetings, and relevant letters, along with the annual work reports, to the departmental Faculty Activity Committee (DFAC), which is appointed in each department as defined in Article 3. This committee will look for serious disparities in evaluations and examine any letters of rebuttal, and will discuss its findings with the department chair within two weeks of receipt of the materials. If concerns remain after this discussion, the committee and department chair 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 committee will then notify the faculty member and the department chair of the final disposition.

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

- The Dean will play the role of the department chair.
- Department chairs' 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 review of the department chair using faculty member metrics shall be used as part of the evaluation.

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

Section 2.2 Criteria for Tenure

This section only applies to faculty holding a probationary appointment in the J.B. Speed School of Engineering (see Section 1.3).

Tenure shall be recommended for persons promoted to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor who already hold a probationary 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.

Persons recommended for tenure shall meet the same General Criteria (see Section 2.0) as well as the specific criteria for those appointed as Associate Professor or Professor, depending upon their initial appointments. All waivers or accords regarding credit toward tenure shall be stipulated in the Provost's letter of appointment.

A. Pre-tenure reviews

Pre-tenure review, described in Section 4.2.2.G of The Redbook, 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 eventually granting tenure.

The pre-tenure review will take place following the third year of service counted towards tenure and shall be completed before the midpoint of the fourth year of service counted towards tenure. No later than two months following the 3rd year of service counted towards tenure, the department chair shall inform the faculty member, in writing, that the pre-tenure review is to take place. The department chair 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 (e.g., 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. In accordance with The Redbook, Section 4.2.2.G, the pre-tenure review is not final until approved by the Dean of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering.

Pre-tenure review shall involve an evaluation of activity in the areas outlined in General Criteria (Section 2.0). 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 faculty activity committee. If pursued, the department chair shall specify the number of external reviewers and the manner of their solicitation; the procedures specified in Appendix V may be used but are not required. The record compiled for pre-tenure review shall be maintained intact as part of the evidence to be considered in tenure review.

B. 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 Section 4.2.2.H of The Redbook. The five years of service may extend longer than five calendar years in cases where extensions were granted as specified in Section 4.2.2.C of The Redbook. 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 Executive Vice President and Provost, Dean, or department chair is negative, the faculty member must be notified by certified mail before it is forwarded to the next level of review. If the recommendation of the Executive Vice President and Provost, or Dean, is negative, the faculty member may request a hearing before the University Faculty Grievance Committee. This request must be delivered to the Faculty Grievance Officer on or before the tenth working day following notification by certified mail.

In case the initial recommendation to deny tenure is by the President, the candidate shall first be notified of the reason in writing by the President and may appeal for reconsideration before the Board of Trustees takes action. If requested by the candidate on or before the tenth working day following the President's notice, the University Faculty Grievance Committee shall provide a hearing. The report of the committee, which shall summarize the case and make a recommendation for tenure or denial, shall be forwarded to the Board of Trustees, the President, and the candidate together with the record of the hearing. The President and the candidate shall have ten working days to submit a written response to the Board of Trustees.

Faculty members not recommended for tenure shall be informed by the President within seven days after the decision has been reported to the Board of Trustees. If appeal or grievance procedures delay a final tenure recommendation at the time notice of nonrenewal must be given, the President may give notice of nonrenewal of the appointment but such notice shall not prejudice later award of tenure.

C. 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.

The “quality” or “impact” of journals where work is placed should be referenced; while external reviewers often speak to this, the letter from the department faculty activity committee (DFAC) (as specified in Section 2.5) or department chair should speak to the quality of the publications and the quality of the journals in which they are published. Further, it is the responsibility of the candidate to include evidence to support claims that work is “accepted,” and both the departmental and unit committees should evaluate this evidence. In particular, monographs or chapters accepted for publication by an editor may or may not be accepted by a publisher; in these cases, the candidate should provide letters from both the editor and the publisher of the book.

Proficiency in research also may be evidenced by any forum that demonstrates effectiveness in linking knowledge across fields of specialization. These would include but are not limited to presentations; computer courseware; public speeches, and television and radio 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 include documentation of how faculty members have shared their expertise with the University, profession, or community, the preparation and the submission of proposals and success in obtaining funding, and completing 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 Section IV.D of the Minimum Guidelines for Faculty Personnel Reviews (addenda to The Redbook, Chapter 4, henceforth referred to as Minimum Guidelines).

Evaluations of service should be done in a manner similar to that for 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.

Evaluation of service should incorporate criteria for assessing work that the university has asked faculty to perform but that is not necessarily rewarded within individual unit cultures; specific examples may include, but are not limited to, work on i2a activities, work on signature partnerships and other community engagement teaching, research, or service, and entrepreneurial activities.

Section 2.3 Criteria for Promotion in Rank

The General Criteria (Section 2.0) 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 as evidenced by the opinion of the majority of the extramural reviewers. 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).

The level of performance above that specified in the Minimum Guidelines 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.

Term faculty may apply for promotion in rank according to the criteria of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering. The resulting promotion reviews will be based upon the same documentation, standards, and schedule used for probationary or tenured faculty at the same rank. However, term faculty promotion assessment will be proportionately based upon performance only in the areas (i.e., teaching, research/creative activity, and/or service) established in their annual work plans in effect during the review period.

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

All tenured faculty shall undergo periodic career review (PCR) to evaluate their contribution to the University, J.B. Speed School of Engineering and Departmental missions 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.

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 (Section 2.0) 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. 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 department chairs, committees, individual faculty, or the Dean as described in this document shall be maintained by the Office of the Dean of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering.

PCR begins with a Stage 1 review, one purpose of which is to identify those few faculty members whose performance is not satisfactory, and to facilitate a more extensive review and a remedial plan, as needed. If a Stage 1 review identifies a faculty member as “unsatisfactory: not meeting department criteria” then a Stage 2 review is undertaken.

A. 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 ensure consistency with the mission of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering. After approval, each department will submit the statement to the J.B. Speed School Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) 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 (DFAC), a committee appointed in each department as defined in Article 3, will review the five prior annual reviews. If a faculty member has five satisfactory reviews, the DFAC will forward a current curriculum vitae, a recommendation and summary of their examination of the record reviewed to the department chair. The chair will review this material and send the DFAC examination summary and the chair’s recommendation to the Dean of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering; copies will also be provided to the reviewed faculty member and the chair of the FAC. 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. If a faculty member has one or more unsatisfactory reviews during the five-year period, the DFAC and department chair will consider whether a Stage 2 review is warranted. If it is not warranted, the PCR will be considered complete with items forwarded as above.

If the DFAC and department chair conclude that a Stage 2 review to identify potential concerns or problems is warranted, this recommendation will be forwarded along with the summary of the review period to the FAC. The documentation supporting the recommendation, for instance, annual reviews and the evidentiary base from which they were written, will be made available to the FAC if requested. The FAC will review summary materials and other requested documentation and forward their recommendation regarding the Stage 2 review to the Dean. The Dean will review the materials and decide if a Stage 2 review is warranted (proceed to Section 2.4.B) or not (the PCR is concluded in the manner previously described).

B. Periodic Career Review: Stage 2

Stage 2 reviews 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 2 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 (Section 2.0) 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 DFAC will review all documentation and reviews and make a recommendation to the department chair. This recommendation can either state that the Stage 2 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 2 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 review materials should include copies of the department expectations for proficient performance, so that the J.B. Speed School of Engineering assessments can be balanced against those.

Because its purpose is developmental, not punitive, the departmental 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 Stage 2 procedure must not conflict with The Redbook (Section 4.2.4.B); that section also states that the 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 FAC 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).

Section 2.5 Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

A. Overview

The faculty member, department chair or Department Faculty Activity Committee (DFAC) 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 department chair 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 within the J.B. Speed School of Engineering so that prior recommendations may be reconsidered.

Tenure and promotion files must be compiled with the cooperation of the faculty member under review. 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. Additionally, the faculty member may add newly available material evidence for reconsideration by the previous evaluators or rebuttals at any time before the file is advanced to the Executive Vice President and University Provost (The Redbook 4.2.2.H.4).

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

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. In tenure review cases, the DFAC will consist of those faculty in the department who have tenure. In promotion review cases, the DFAC will consist of the faculty in the department of higher rank than the individual under consideration. If eligible to do so, the department representative to the J.B. Speed School Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) will vote as a member of the DFAC. 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. Faculty who have appointments in more than one department shall be evaluated by each department.

After the DFAC have made their recommendation, the chair will make a recommendation and will forward the file to the Speed Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC). The FAC 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 Executive Vice President and University 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 4-6 extramural evaluations from qualified persons who are familiar with the candidate's professional performance. Reviewers should be selected with the goal of providing unbiased assessment of the candidate's work. The candidate should be involved in the selection of potential reviewers, but the candidate should not be informed of the identity of reviewers actually chosen to evaluate the record. See Appendix V for details and procedures regarding selection of extramural reviewers. At least two evaluations must be from sources not suggested by the candidate. The faculty member under review may respond to these extramural evaluation letters at the time of their inclusion into the file.

All evidence used as support data must be unbiased and capable of providing a defensible measure of proficiency as outlined in Section 2.2.C. 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 school-wide student teaching evaluations approved by the faculty must be a part of the candidate's evaluation file. These teaching evaluations must be gathered and tabulated under secure conditions. While the teaching evaluations 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 evaluations 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 FAC 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 FAC will function in an advisory capacity and 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 FAC 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 FAC 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 FAC since it is irrelevant to the criteria for promotions, tenure, and career reviews.

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

The FAC 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 the individual's department chair. The recommendation will also become a part of the promotion, tenure, and career review file.

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

Whenever a promotion, tenure, or career review evaluation must be made for a member of the FAC, that member shall recuse from the committee discussion of the case. The relevant academic department will provide a suitably qualified substitute to provide representation only for this case.

The conventions of shared governance are such that individual faculty members should vote on personnel decisions only once. A member of the FAC shall vote, if eligible, in the DFAC consideration of a candidate. In the FAC, that FAC member shall recuse from voting, and the DFAC vote shall be used instead; however, the FAC member may fully participate in the FAC discussions regarding the candidate.

Candidates for promotion and tenure may challenge the participation of no more than two members of the FAC committee. If a majority of the remaining FAC 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

Steps in the promotion and tenure evaluation procedure are described below. The schedule of dates for the Promotion and Tenure process are provided in Appendix II; these dates should normally be followed unless circumstances warrant alterations. 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 (consistent with Appendix II) will be set for the remaining evaluation steps. The Dean shall formulate the schedule in consultation with the FAC and department chairs, and it shall be published in a timely manner.

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

Promotion and/or tenure reviews initiated by department chairs: The DFAC will receive memoranda from department chairs indicating the names of faculty members who are under consideration for promotion and/or tenure by the departmental faculty. A copy of the memoranda will also be transmitted to the Office of the Dean, the FAC chair, and to the individual faculty member under consideration. The DFAC will receive all evaluation files initiated by department chairs. A separate confidential copy of both the recommendations of the DFAC, and of the department chair will be forwarded to the individual faculty member.

Promotion and/or tenure reviews initiated by faculty members: The DFAC will receive memoranda from all faculty members who plan to submit claims for promotion and/or tenure on their own behalf. A copy of the memorandum will also be transmitted to the Office of the Dean, the FAC chair, and to the appropriate department chair. The DFAC will forward a complete evaluation file to the appropriate department chair. A copy of the memorandum of transmittal shall also be forwarded to the Office of the Dean.

Promotion and/or tenure reviews initiated by the DFAC: The DFAC will issue memoranda to the appropriate department chairs indicating that it plans to initiate a promotion/tenure review. A copy of the memorandum will also be transmitted to the Office of the Dean and to the concerned faculty member. The DFAC will forward a complete evaluation file to the appropriate department chair. A copy of the memorandum of transmittal shall also be forwarded to the Office of the Dean and to the faculty member.

If the DFAC 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 department chair, to the Office of the Dean and to the individual faculty member concerned.

The DFAC will have returned to them by the department chairs all evaluation files which had previously been channeled through the FAC by claimants for self-initiated promotion or tenure, or which had been initiated for promotion review by the FAC. 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 FAC 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 department chair.

The FAC 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 Executive Vice President and University Provost.

Each individual being considered for promotion or tenure will receive a confidential copy of the Dean's recommendation to the Executive Vice President and University Provost. The appropriate department chair will also receive a copy.

The Dean will forward the files to the Executive Vice President and University Provost.

Article 3. Conditions of Faculty Employment

The performance of each faculty member shall be evaluated in accordance with the annual review (see Section 2.1). 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 (see Section 3.1). Evaluations of performance must be made in accordance with annual work plans. Every faculty member under review, upon being informed in writing of the recommendation at any stage of the review, may enter rebuttals in writing.

Each department shall have a department faculty activity committee (DFAC) consisting of all tenured faculty who are not administrators. However, if the number of tenured, non-administrator faculty members exceeds three, the department may choose to use a subset of at least three members of this group as the DFAC; in such cases, the department shall specify the manner of their choosing. No person may participate during deliberation of his/her own case, and each department shall develop a method for alternate selection in such cases.

The J.B. Speed School of Engineering Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) will act as the school-wide Committee on Appeals. Any faculty member may request a review by the FAC of the Dean's decision regarding review matters. The result of that review will then be forwarded to the Dean as a recommendation.

Section 3.1 Annual Work Plan

The steps to be used in the annual work plan development are described below; the dates for each step are specified in Appendix IV. The department chair will provide 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 department chair. 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, annual work plans will be negotiated with the Dean or his/her representative and the individual.

The department chair 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 department chair and faculty member cannot agree on an annual work plan, each shall submit a proposed plan and explanation to the DFAC for review. The DFAC may request copies of other approved departmental work plans in order to evaluate consistency and fairness. The DFAC will prepare and approve, by majority vote, a suitable faculty work plan and distribute it to the chair and faculty member for implementation.

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 Section 2.0 ("General Criteria"). Each faculty member in full-time status for the year must account for 100% of a full work load by allocation of effort, in some combination, in the areas of activity listed in Section 2.0. 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 salary increment.

After distribution of salary increment 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 department chairs 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.

The Dean will inform each faculty member in writing of his or her salary increment. 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 electronic 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. Amendments receiving sufficiently many votes will be forwarded, as necessary, through appropriate channels to the Board of Trustees for approval. Changes to the Appendices of this document do not require approval beyond the Speed School Faculty.

APPROVED BY SSE FACULTY ON July 13, 2016, December 28th, 2016
APPROVED BY FACULTY SENATE _____
APPROVED BY BOARD OF TRUSTEES ON _____

Appendix I. Scope and Definitions

Section I.A Purpose

The Redbook requires units to adopt policy and procedure documents on faculty appointment, promotion, tenure, as consistent with its Minimum Guidelines for Faculty Personnel Reviews (Addenda to Chapter 4 of The Redbook). Appendix I is intended to fulfill that requirement.

Section I.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.

Section I.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 4.2.2.8 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."

APPROVED BY SSE FACULTY ON _July 13, 2016_____

Appendix II. Promotion and Tenure Review Schedules

The following schedules describe the review process for promotion and tenure cases. Should any date fall on a holiday or weekend, the associated correspondence is due on the previous business day. Reviews initiated by the department chair (DC) are referred to as standard reviews. Reviews initiated by the faculty member (FM) or the department faculty activity committee (DFAC) are referred to as self-initiated reviews and DFAC-initiated reviews, respectively. The DFAC in this usage is to be interpreted as the subset of members comprising either the department tenure committee or department promotion committee depending on the type of review (see Section 2.5.A). The Speed School Faculty Affairs Committee is referred to below as the FAC.

Section II.A Standard Schedule for Chair-Initiated Promotion and Tenure Reviews

This schedule applies for all promotion cases of tenured faculty, and for tenure / promotion and tenure cases for faculty with tenure dates falling between May 1 and November 30 in which the department chair initiates the review. For tenure cases that are not early, the process timing is such that the triptych is delivered to the Provost on January 15th at least 1 year, but not more than 2 years, prior to the tenure date.

| Date* | Correspondence Due |
|---------------|--|
| Sep 1 | Memo from DC to DFAC chair indicating name of FM to be reviewed. Copy sent to FM, FAC chair and Dean. |
| Oct 25 | DC recommendation letter, DFAC letter, and complete evaluation file sent from DC to FAC. Copy of DFAC letter and DC recommendation letter sent to FM. <u>For tenure cases only</u> : If DC recommendation letter is negative, copy to FM must be sent to home address by certified mail. |
| Nov 15 | FAC recommendation letter and evaluation file sent from FAC to Dean. Copy of FAC recommendation letter sent to FM and DC. |
| Dec 15 | Dean notifies FAC regarding each promotion and tenure case recommendation. FAC has opportunity to draft response letter and add it to the evaluation file prior to delivery of triptych to the Provost. Copy of Dean's recommendation letter sent to FM and DC. <u>For tenure cases only</u> : If Dean's recommendation letter is negative, copy to FM must be sent to home address by certified mail. |
| Jan 15 | Triptych sent from Dean to Office of the University Provost. |

* If a date falls on a holiday or weekend, correspondence is due on the previous business day.

Section II.B Alternate Schedule for Chair-Initiated Promotion and Tenure Reviews

This schedule applies for tenure / promotion and tenure cases for faculty with tenure dates falling between December 1 and April 30 in which the department chair initiates the review. For tenure cases that are not early, the process timing is such that the triptych is delivered to the Provost on September 1st at least 1 year, but not more than 2 years, prior to the tenure date.

| Date* | Correspondence Due |
|---------------|--|
| Feb 15 | Memo from DC to DFAC chair indicating name of FM to be reviewed. Copy sent to FM, FAC chair and Dean. |
| Apr 10 | DC recommendation letter, DFAC letter, and complete evaluation file sent from DC to FAC. Copy of DFAC letter and DC recommendation letter sent to FM. <u>For tenure cases only</u> : If DC recommendation letter is negative, copy to FM must be sent to home address by certified mail. |
| May 1 | FAC recommendation letter and evaluation file sent from FAC to Dean. Copy of FAC recommendation letter sent to FM and DC. |
| Jun 1 | Dean notifies FAC regarding each promotion and tenure case recommendation. FAC has opportunity to draft response letter and add it to the evaluation file prior to delivery of triptych to the Provost. Copy of Dean's recommendation letter sent to FM and DC. <u>For tenure cases only</u> : If Dean's recommendation letter is negative, copy to FM must be sent to home address by certified mail. |
| Sep 1 | Triptych sent from Dean to Office of the University Provost. |

* If a date falls on a holiday or weekend, correspondence is due on the previous business day.

Section II.C Standard Schedule for Self-/DFAC-Initiated Promotion and Tenure Reviews

This schedule applies for all promotion cases of tenured faculty, and for tenure / promotion and tenure cases for faculty with tenure dates falling between May 1 and November 30 in which either the faculty member or the DFAC initiates the review. While this approach is permitted, the chair-initiated review process is typical (see Sections II.A and II.B). For tenure cases that are not early, the process timing is such that the triptych is delivered to the Provost on January 15th at least 1 year, but not more than 2 years, prior to the tenure date.

| Date* | Correspondence Due |
|---------------|--|
| Sep 1 | <u>Self-Initiated Review</u> : Memo from FM to DFAC chair requesting a review. Copy sent to DC, FAC chair and Dean. <u>DFAC-Initiated Review</u> : Memo from DFAC chair to DC indicating DFAC intention to review FM. Copy sent to FM, FAC chair and Dean. |
| Sep 15 | <u>DFAC-Initiated and Self-Initiated Reviews</u> : Evaluation file sent from FM to DFAC. Copy of cover memo sent to DC and Dean. If file is found to be incomplete, DFAC notifies FM and requests required information with a copy of memo sent to DC and Dean. |
| Oct 1 | <u>DFAC-Initiated and Self-Initiated Reviews</u> : Complete evaluation file received and reviewed by DFAC. Evaluation file sent from PAT to DC for review. Copy of cover memo sent to FM and Dean. |
| Oct 25 | <u>DFAC-Initiated and Self-Initiated Reviews</u> : DC recommendation letter, DFAC letter, and complete evaluation file sent from DC to FAC. Copy of DFAC letter and DC recommendation letter sent to FM. <u>For tenure cases only</u> : If DC recommendation letter is negative, copy to FM must be sent to home address by certified mail. |
| Nov 15 | FAC recommendation letter and evaluation file sent from FAC to Dean. Copy of FAC recommendation letter sent to FM and DC. |
| Dec 15 | Dean notifies FAC regarding each promotion and tenure case recommendation. FAC has opportunity to draft response letter and add it to the evaluation file prior to delivery of triptych to the Provost. Copy of Dean's recommendation letter sent to FM and DC. <u>For tenure cases only</u> : If Dean's recommendation letter is negative, copy to FM must be sent to home address by certified mail. |
| Jan 15 | Triptych sent from Dean to Office of the University Provost. |

* If a date falls on a holiday or weekend, correspondence is due on the previous business day.

Section II.D Alternate Schedule for Self-/DFAC-Initiated Promotion and Tenure Reviews

This schedule applies for tenure / promotion and tenure cases for faculty with tenure dates falling between December 1 and April 30 in which either the faculty member or the DFAC initiates the review. While this approach is permitted, the chair-initiated review process is typical (see Sections II.A and II.B). For tenure cases that are not early, the process timing is such that the triptych is delivered to the Provost on September 1st at least 1 year, but not more than 2 years, prior to the tenure date.

| Date* | Correspondence Due |
|---------------|--|
| Feb 15 | <u>Self-Initiated Review</u> : Memo from FM to DFAC chair requesting a review. Copy sent to DC, FAC chair and Dean. <u>DFAC-Initiated Review</u> : Memo from DFAC chair to DC indicating DFAC intention to review FM. Copy sent to FM, FAC chair and Dean. |
| Mar 1 | <u>DFAC-Initiated and Self-Initiated Reviews</u> : Evaluation file sent from FM to DFAC. Copy of cover memo sent to DC and Dean. If file is found to be incomplete, DFAC notifies FM and requests required information with a copy of memo sent to DC and Dean. |
| Mar 15 | <u>DFAC-Initiated and Self-Initiated Reviews</u> : Complete evaluation file received and reviewed by DFAC. Evaluation file sent from PAT to DC for review. Copy of cover memo sent to FM and Dean. |
| Apr 10 | <u>DFAC-Initiated and Self-Initiated Reviews</u> : DC recommendation letter, DFAC letter, and complete evaluation file sent from DC to FAC. Copy of DFAC letter and DC recommendation letter sent to FM. <u>For tenure cases only</u> : If DC recommendation letter is negative, copy to FM must be sent to home address by certified mail. |
| May 1 | FAC recommendation letter and evaluation file sent from FAC to Dean. Copy of FAC recommendation letter sent to FM and DC. |
| Jun 1 | Dean notifies FAC regarding each promotion and tenure case recommendation. FAC has opportunity to draft response letter and add it to the evaluation file prior to delivery of triptych to the Provost. Copy of Dean's recommendation letter sent to FM and DC. <u>For tenure cases only</u> : If Dean's recommendation letter is negative, copy to FM must be sent to home address by certified mail. |
| Sep 1 | Triptych sent from Dean to Office of the University Provost. |

* If a date falls on a holiday or weekend, correspondence is due on the previous business day.

APPROVED BY SSE FACULTY ON _July 13, 2016_____

Appendix III. Periodic Career Review Schedule

The following describes the periodic career review (PCR) schedule. PCRs are conducted on a five-year cycle for all tenured faculty during the Spring semester. This schedule is designed to: 1) allow enough time for chairs to complete the most recent annual faculty evaluations by March 15 so that they can be included in the PCR review process; and 2) to be completed prior to summer break, during which it is difficult for Speed School Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) to meet. For more information of the PCR process, see Section 2.4 of this document or Section 4.2.4 of The Redbook. Should any date fall on a holiday or weekend, the associated correspondence is due on the previous business day.

| Date* | Correspondence Due |
|-----------------|---|
| Feb 15 | Dean's Office notifies faculty member (FM) scheduled for PCR review as well as the associated department chair (DC). |
| Mar 1 | FM sends updated Curriculum Vitae (CV) to DC. |
| Mar 15 | DC sends CV and copies of previous five FM annual performance reviews (including most recent year) to department faculty activity committee (DFAC). |
| Apr 1 | DFAC sends the recommendation letter and the <u>summary</u> of annual performance reviews to DC as separate documents. |
| April 15 | <u>If a Stage 2 review is not warranted</u> (see Section 2.4.A), the DC sends the recommendation letter and the DFAC summary to the Dean (copy to FAC chair and FM) and the PCR process is complete. |
| April 15 | <u>If a Stage 2 review is warranted</u> (see Section 2.4.A), the DC sends the recommendation letter and the DFAC summary to the FAC (copy to FM). |
| May 1 | <u>If a Stage 2 review is warranted</u> (see Section 2.4.A), the FAC sends the recommendation regarding Stage 2 review to the Dean. If the Dean agrees that a Stage 2 PCR review is warranted, the process is described in Section 2.4.B. |

* If a date falls on a holiday or weekend, correspondence is due on the previous business day.

APPROVED BY SSE FACULTY ON _July 13, 2016_____

Appendix IV. Annual Work Plan and Review Schedule

The following describes the schedule for annual work plans and review. Annual work plans and annual reviews are conducted each year for all tenure-track, tenured and term faculty. This schedule is designed to allow enough time for chairs to complete the most recent annual faculty evaluations by March 15 for incorporation into the PCR review process (if applicable). Should any date fall on a holiday or weekend, the associated correspondence is due on the previous business day.

| Date* | Correspondence Due |
|---------------|--|
| Dec 20 | Department chair (DC) communicates with department faculty with list of proposed instruction and other duties for the upcoming calendar year. |
| Jan 20 | Annual work plan submitted by faculty member (FM). Any digital faculty effort reporting system in use by Speed School is updated by the FM. |
| Feb 15 | DC approves annual work plan that is mutually agreeable to DC and FM. If the FM and DC cannot agree on an annual work plan, the DFAC will review the matter and specify a suitable annual work plan (see Section 3.1). |
| Feb 28 | FM submits activity report for previous academic year. |
| Mar 15 | DC completes annual review of FM. |
| Apr 1 | Meeting between DC and FM to discuss annual review of FM is completed. See Section 2.1 should disagreements about the annual review remain between the DC and the FM. |

* If a date falls on a holiday or weekend, correspondence is due on the previous business day.

APPROVED BY SSE FACULTY ON August 16, 2016

Appendix V. Procedure for Extramural Review Letters

The following describes the procedure by which extramural review letters are to be solicited and received for use in promotion and tenure cases. The faculty member (FM), department chair (DC), and department faculty activity committee (DFAC) chair each have a role in completing this process. This appendix does not provide a schedule but the steps below should be undertaken after careful consideration of the dates outlined in Appendix II (Promotion and Tenure Review Schedules).

This procedure satisfies Section IV.D.5(a) of the Minimum Guidelines for Faculty Personnel Reviews (Addenda to Chapter 4 of The Redbook, henceforth referred to as the Minimum Guidelines), which states: “Each unit document must specify the process by which extramural evaluators shall be solicited. This process shall be designed to certify the professional expertise and objectivity of the evaluators, whose comments regarding the quality of the work under review shall be solicited along with justification of those comments.” The promotion and tenure process determines what constitutes objectivity; however, it is stipulated that close colleagues, close collaborators, former mentors, co-authors, and so on, are not generally considered objective evaluators. The FM and DC statements regarding the suitability of potential reviewers may be used by the Speed School Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) to satisfy Section IV.D.5(c) of the Minimum Guidelines which states, in part, that “The unit personnel committee shall provide a written analysis of the validity and significance of the evaluations received.” The FAC may choose, at its discretion, to create its own written analysis of the extramural evaluators in place of the FM and DC suitability statements.

The steps for the extramural review letters are listed below. However, it is understood that individual circumstances may require alteration of these steps; in such cases, the DC should discuss the matter with the FM and the DFAC chair, outline the proposed changes in writing, and forward to the Dean for approval (with a copy to the FM, DFAC chair and FAC chair).

- 1) FM shall provide to the DC (copy to DFAC chair) a list of 4-6 potential reviewers, along with a brief statement for each one as to why they are suitable to serve as extramural reviewers.
- 2) DC shall provide to the FM (copy to DFAC chair) a list of 4-6 potential reviewers, different from those in (1), along with a brief statement for each one as to why they are suitable to serve as extramural reviewers.
- 3) DC and FM will review the combined lists from (1)(2) and come to consensus regarding a list of 8-12 potential reviewers, eliminating and/or adding additional potential reviewers if necessary.
- 4) DC sends requests for 6 extramural letters, selecting 3 from the candidate’s list and 3 from the chair’s list in a manner of his/her choosing. The DFAC chair receives copies of each request.
- 5) If a potential reviewer declines, an additional review request should be sent, with the chair selecting from the remaining potential reviewers by alternating between the FM and DC lists.
- 6) The triptych must contain 4-6 extramural review letters. The department chair and the DFAC chair will determine when the period to receive extramural review letters has closed. Any

letters received by this date will be included in the triptych, while any received after this date will be discarded without consideration.

- 7) The DFAC chair is responsible for adding the extramural review letters to the triptych; the associated statement written about the reviewer's suitability in (1)(2) also becomes part of the record. Once extramural review letters are added to the triptych, the candidate no longer has access to the triptych to ensure the confidentiality of the reviewers.
- 8) Once the letter receipt period has closed in (6), the DFAC chair will create a single text document consisting of the redacted language of each extramural letter (e.g. beginning after the salutation and ending prior to the signature). These letters will be labeled in order of receipt as Extramural Reviewer 1, Extramural Reviewer 2, etc. Reviewers should be encouraged to avoid including identifying information in the body of the letter to ensure anonymity. (This process can also be facilitated by requesting that the individual reviewers email this language as a text file along with their letter.)
- 9) The DFAC chair will provide the candidate with the text document from (8), with a copy to the DC. This will include a cover letter indicating that the FM has 7 days to respond, in writing, to the extramural review letters if desired; the DFAC chair has the discretion to grant additional time if requested by the candidate. A response to the extramural letters received in the allowed timeframe must be added to the triptych prior to consideration by the DFAC. The FM has the right to add a response at a later time but this will not alter any discussions or decisions that have preceded it.
- 10) Upon conclusion of the 7 day (or longer if agreed) extramural reviewer letter response period, the DFAC chair calls a meeting of the DFAC to consider the FM candidate further.

APPROVED BY SSE FACULTY ON August 16, 2016