

**Department of Civil, Environmental, and Architectural Engineering
College of Engineering and Applied Science
The University of Colorado at Boulder**

**PROCEDURES, POLICIES AND CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT,
PROMOTION AND TENURE**
(effective October 29, 2010)

These procedures, policies and criteria are subject to the current laws and actions of the Regents and to other university policies and procedures and described on the Faculty Affairs website and as may be subsequently revised. Each policy and rule is to be applied in a manner consistent with current Regents Rules. In the event of conflict, Regental Rules shall govern.

Every eligible faculty member will be reviewed in a timely manner for reappointment, promotion and tenure, depending upon his or her progress and on University mandates.

I. REVIEW BY PRIMARY UNIT

The primary unit in the Department of Civil, Environmental, and Architectural Engineering (CEAE) is the Personnel Committee, comprised of all the Full Professors in the Department. CEAE Department policy requires that Personnel Committee members who have not participated in at least one discussion of the candidate's dossier are authorized to vote on matters of appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion provided they have reviewed the dossier and conveyed any concerns to the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) members and the Department Chair. Although the Department Chair participates in the discussion of candidate's dossier, he/she does not vote on reappointment, promotion and tenure.

Primary Unit Evaluation Committee and Report

The Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) *is* an ad hoc group of 2-3 people who are appointed by the Chair after consultation with members of the Personnel Committee. The PUEC is responsible for assisting the candidate in assembling his or her dossier, selecting and soliciting opinions from outside reviewers, and providing a written and oral summary of the candidate's dossier to the full membership of the Personnel Committee. The PUEC report should include a description of the findings of the Committee with regards to (A) teaching performance, (B) scholarly and creative work, and (C) university and professional service and outreach. The written report of the PUEC, including the vote of the Personnel Committee, becomes part of the dossier. The names and affiliations of the external reviewers should not be revealed in these materials. The Department Chair should not serve on the PUEC or write its report (as his or her recommendation is expressed in a separate report).

Primary Unit Review of Dossier

All faculty members who are eligible to vote on a particular case must be allowed to review the entire dossier and must participate in a discussion of the candidate before they are asked to vote on the case. If faculty members have an excused absence from the discussion, they must have read the candidate's dossier and voiced any concerns or comments to the PUEC and Chair before they are asked to vote. Votes should be recorded in the categories of 'for' the proposed action, 'against' the proposed action, 'abstain' or 'excused absence'. For tenure cases, Personnel Committee members vote on a rating of 'excellent,' 'meritorious,' or 'less than meritorious,' for teaching and research/scholarly/creative work, and 'at least meritorious' or 'not meritorious' for service/outreach. Excused absences should be limited to faculty members who are on leave and unable to participate in the review and vote. The Department Chair should not vote, but he or she may be present during the discussion by the primary unit.

Report of the Chair or Director

In addition to the primary unit evaluation committee report, the Department Chair writes a recommendation, to the Dean commenting on the discussion and vote by the primary unit, including the results of the vote, reasons for the recommendation, and an explanation of any dissenting opinion as expressed in the vote. The report should include a description of the review and the voting process that was followed. It should also include the recommendation of the Chair on the proposed personnel action, along with reasons for disagreement if this recommendation differs from the majority vote of the primary unit. If the Chair disagrees with the recommendation by the majority of the primary unit, then the primary unit shall reconsider the case and provide a brief statement of its reconsidered judgment (including a new vote, if there is any change) to the Chair for inclusion in the dossier. The report or letter from the Chair to the Dean must not identify the external reviewers by name or in any other way. This report becomes a part of the dossier.

II. REVIEW BY COLLEGE

First-Level Review Committee

The Dean will appoint a First-Level Review Committee (FLRC) of faculty to provide a report on the merits of the cases considered in any given academic year. The members should be tenured full professors. The FLRC is to serve as a college committee, not representing any individual department. Departments with more than 20 full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty shall have two representatives; it shall be the option of each department with 10-20 faculty to have one or two members in any given year. Departments with less than 10 faculty will have at most one member in any given year. Members shall serve for three-year terms, staggered across departments. If a member is not able to complete his or her term, the Department shall recommend a replacement to complete the term of the original member. Department Chairs may not serve, but they are to recommend potential members to the Dean. A member may be reappointed for one or more additional terms.

The Dean shall appoint the Chairperson of the Committee. The Committee shall determine its own working procedures and establish a working committee of two or more of its

members for each case. The entire First-Level Review Committee, except for members who have a potential conflict of interest (see below) and/or are in the same department or program as the faculty member whose case is before the Committee, shall vote on the results of each case. The vote shall be reported to the Dean along with a written report for each case.

To promote open consideration of the candidates within the First-Level Review Committee, confidentiality of operations is essential. Identification of subgroups assigned to review each case shall not be disclosed, and all correspondence both to and from the Committee shall be through the Committee Chair.

The Dean will broadly outline his or her charge to the FLRC in writing and/or through a meeting with the Committee. In making their recommendation, the members of the Committee will take into account the criteria listed for each action of reappointment, promotion or tenure. In accordance with university policy, no person shall be disadvantaged by gender, marital status, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, or age, although the number of years of professional work in the discipline may be a factor for consideration in the evaluation.

The First-Level Review Committee must meet as a group to discuss each case, and must record a vote recommending an action on the case to the Dean. The purpose of this committee review is to provide an independent assessment of the dossier to the Dean and to calibrate or relate the standards of the primary unit to those of the College as a whole. In its evaluation, the FLRC will use the material supplied by the Department. If it believes that adequate information has not been supplied, it may request additional information from internal or external sources. The committee members shall evaluate the evidence and the candidate's scholarly work to the degree they are qualified to do so. Additional expert opinion from scholars in the field may also be sought. The FLRC should focus on the excellence of the candidate's scholarship, teaching, and service and his or her potential for future contributions to the College. The FLRC provides a written assessment and records its vote, which become part of the dossier. Reasons for any disagreement with the majority opinion of the primary unit shall be discussed in the report, as should be any dissenting opinions within the FLRC. External reviewers and their affiliations must not be identified.

Dean

The First-level Review Committee will participate fully with the Dean in the review of the recommendations of the primary units. Such participation shall include discussion of any reasons for disagreement between the Dean and the majority position of the FLRC, prior to forwarding the recommendations of the Dean and the FLRC to the chief academic officer. Should either the FLRC or the Dean disagree with the majority opinion of the primary unit, the Dean shall discuss the nature of this disagreement with the head of the primary unit. The primary unit shall then reconsider its original recommendation and provide a brief statement of its reconsidered judgment (including a new vote, if there is any change) to the Dean for his/her consideration and that of the FLRC.

The Dean then writes a report with his or her evaluation of the case and recommendation. If the recommendation of the Dean differs from the majority of the primary unit, the head of the primary unit, and /or the majority of the First-Level Review Committee, the Dean shall outline the areas of disagreement and the reasons for his or her recommendation in that context. The recommendation of the Dean, the results of the votes of the primary unit and the college review committee, and the comprehensive dossier on the candidate, shall be forwarded together to the chief academic officer.

III. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

While collaboration and cooperation are encouraged in the College of Engineering and Applied Science, it is also important that all reviews be unbiased. Faculty members who have a professional or personal potential conflict of interest with a candidate should not serve on the candidate's PUEC or FLRC (though they may be consulted by the PUEC or FLRC), or in writing the Chair's or Dean's report. Potential conflicts of interest include PhD or postdoctoral mentoring relationships and close collaborations (typically indicated by status as co-authors or co-investigators on multiple peer-reviewed publications or grants in the past three years). Family members should recuse themselves from personnel reviews of immediate family members (see www.cu.edu/policies/Personnel/nepotism.html). Questions on potential conflicts of interest should be directed by the Chair to the Dean or the Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs.

IV. DOSSIERS

Two dossiers (one original dossier and one copy) should be submitted to the Dean's office by the appropriate deadline set by the Dean's office. The deadlines set for the different cases will be staggered and will generally be during the time frames listed below; assembling the dossier and requesting external letters should be initiated 3-4 months before the deadline.

Mandatory cases: October - November

Nonmandatory cases: January

Mandatory cases include reappointment and tenure/promotion at the time mandated by the candidate's offer letter or contract. Nonmandatory cases include promotion to Professor and early consideration for reappointment, promotion to Associate Professor, or tenure.

The candidate is entitled to submit any material or information that s/he believes will be helpful to the case. Material can be added at any review level, but copies must be provided to all levels that have already considered the case. A description of the basic information, required to be included in dossiers for reappointment, promotion and tenure, is listed below:

1. Dean's Recommendation

The Dean is to offer his/her independent assessment of the candidate's research, teaching, and service records, along with a recommendation on the proposed action. Where differences of opinion between the primary unit, the First-Level Review Committee, and/or the Dean have occurred and have not been resolved, a brief statement discussing the areas of disagreement should be included.

2. Dean's First-Level Review Committee Statement

A brief summary of the Committee's evaluation and recommendation should be provided, giving the specific votes and explanation for any dissenting votes and for differences between the FLRC and the primary unit, if any.

3. Chair's Report of Primary Unit Evaluation and Recommendation

The Chair should report the actions taken by the primary unit, including the vote results, the number of faculty eligible to vote, reasons for the recommendation, and an explanation for any dissenting opinion as expressed in the vote. A description of the review and voting process that was followed should be included. All for, against, abstentions, and absences should be recorded as part of the vote. The report should also include the Chair's evaluation and recommendation.

4. Statement of the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee

This statement, usually several pages in length, should include a description of the findings of the Committee with regards to (a) teaching ability (b) scholarly and creative work, and (c) university and professional service and outreach. The primary unit report is expected to comment on the quality and significance of the reviewed papers or other research and creative work published by the candidate, and on the quality, reputation and appropriateness of the publication venues selected by the candidate. The latter issue is particularly important when peer-reviewed conference proceedings are part of the candidate's record, as conference proceedings have become increasingly important in some fields and yet have wide variations in prestige, selectivity, paper length, and review processes. In addition to addressing these factors, the primary unit report should identify which of the candidate's proceedings papers (if any) are considered equivalent to top journal papers in the field.

5. Current Vita

Most CV's have major sections dealing with:

- Educational background
- Academic employment history
- Honors and awards
- Research and/or creative works
 - a) List scholarly publications. List publications that have been refereed in a separate section than those that have not been peer-reviewed. Include authors, year, article title, journal or proceedings name, volume, and inclusive page numbers. Written work in press or submitted but not yet accepted for publication should be clearly identified as such.
 - b) Publications in conference proceedings should be distinguished as being peer-reviewed or not peer-reviewed.
 - c) List research funding received and pending proposals. Include agency, title, amount received, beginning and end dates, names of all co-investigators, candidate's role (Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator), and candidate's portion of the funding.
- Teaching accomplishments

- a) List classes taught.
 - b) List any textbooks, study guides, manuals, workbooks, or electronic media produced for student or class use.
 - c) List individual undergraduate and graduate students mentored. Include names, period mentored, and completion dates (with degrees or honors) of the students for whom the candidate served as primary mentor.
- Service activities. Service to professional organizations, government agencies, department, college and university should be detailed. Include outreach activities to the community undertaken on behalf of the University.

6. Faculty Statement on Research/Creative Work

This narrative of typically 2-4 pages is an opportunity for the candidate to communicate research accomplishments to the reviewers, highlighting his/her major contributions, describing the impact of his/her research/creative work, and addressing any unique aspects of the scholarly record.

7. Faculty Statement on Teaching

This narrative of typically 2-4 pages is an opportunity for the candidate to communicate teaching accomplishments to the reviewers, highlighting his/her major teaching activities, the innovative aspects of his/her teaching, and the successes in undergraduate and graduate training and individualized instruction, and addressing any unique aspects of the teaching record.

8. Faculty Statement on Service/Outreach

This narrative of typically 1-2 pages is an opportunity for the candidate to communicate service accomplishments to the reviewers, highlighting his/her major contributions or activities in the areas of service and outreach to the University, to professional organizations, and/or to the public.

9. Comprehensive Review Letters from the Dean's Review Committee and the Dean

When dossiers for candidates seeking tenure are submitted, two additional documents are required. The first is the letter of evaluation and recommendation authored by the Dean's First-Level Review Committee as part of the comprehensive review, and the second is the letter of evaluation and recommendation written by the Dean regarding comprehensive review. The purpose of these required documents is to provide the review committees some indication of the assessment of the candidate at the time of the comprehensive review, and to help evaluate the candidate's progress since that time relative to any advice that was provided in these two documents.

10. Multiple Measures of Teaching

Multiple types of teaching evaluation are required. In addition to the FCQ (Faculty Course Questionnaire) results as a measure of teaching quality, class interviews, peer evaluation, student letters and portfolios are recommended. If letters from students or alumni are requested, please indicate how the individuals were selected. The candidate should not select them nor be involved with any correspondence requesting letters. Include all FCQs for faculty considered for reappointment or tenure. For promotion to

the rank of Professor, include only the FCQs since the last review for this individual. Fall FCQs should be added when they become available in January. Provide an explanation for semesters that the candidate did not teach. The teaching section of the dossier should include:

- Faculty Course Questionnaires (required). Submit the complete record of faculty course questionnaire summaries of each course taught and the instructor summary compiled by the Office of Budget, Planning, and Assessment, for the period of review (see above).

- In addition to the required FCQ documents, submit two or more additional forms of teaching assessment. Candidates and units are urged to use whatever form of assessment that is most appropriate for the type of instruction. Suggested forms of assessment include:
 - (a) Peer reviews of teaching. These reviews, especially for junior faculty, should not be just one or two classroom visits in the semester of the review. They instead should be representing a series of visits over several years, providing opportunity for feedback, improvement, and assessment.
 - (b) Report of class or group interviews. Interviews of a class or group of students should be performed without the candidate present, and the students should be asked to describe both the positive aspects of the course and instructor and areas for improvement. Feedback for improvement should be provided to the candidate.
 - (c) Letters from randomly solicited students who have taken courses from the faculty member being evaluated, both on the undergraduate and graduate level, including current students and alumni and alumnae. At least six such letters should be included, preferably for a couple different times to gauge development over time, if this measure of assessment is used. Unsolicited comments from students submitted to the Chair, Dean or an advisor may also be included.
 - (d) Letters from randomly solicited students or former students who have been research advisees of the candidate.
 - (e) Significant contribution to curriculum and course development, with internal or external assessment of teaching portfolios or other teaching materials developed by the candidate.
 - (f) External evaluation and promotion of teaching excellence through awards, development of textbooks or other teaching materials used elsewhere, educational grants, teaching publications and presentations, and/or significant participation in activities of the American Society for Engineering Education or in the educational functions of the professional societies of which the candidate is a member.
 - (g) Additional ongoing teaching contributions and outreach activities, such as participation in the College's High School Honors Institute.

11. Copy of the Letter of Solicitation

- A. The template for letters of solicitation to external reviewers is available at: <http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/deskref/> (in the A-Z section look in section

“E” for External Letters of Solicitation). Primary units wishing to make substantive changes to the letter should seek permission from the Office of Faculty Affairs.

- B. Evaluators should be asked to specify clearly if the candidate would be reappointed, promoted, or receive tenure at their institutions.
- C. Each evaluator should be asked to state what his/her relationship is to the candidate.

12. External Letters of Evaluation

At minimum six external letters are required for promotion/tenure. Three external letters are required for reappointment. More letters may be solicited at the discretion of the PUEC.

- A. Letters must be submitted from professional colleagues not affiliated with the University of Colorado. Letters from mentors and direct collaborators are not to be included in the minimum number of required letters, but they may be added at the request of the candidate or review committee.
- B. Evaluators must be selected by the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee and chosen to avoid any known or apparent biases, either positive or negative.
- C. All letters received must be submitted with the dossier. Individuals contacted but not able to review must also be listed, along with the reason for the declination.
- D. Candidates may not select their own evaluators, but they are asked to recommend names to the primary unit. They may also indicate individuals whom they do not want to be contacted. A list of who recommended each reviewer (the candidate, the department, or both) should be included in the dossier.
- E. A CV from external reviewers is not required. However, a short summary of the qualifications for each reviewer is to be provided at the front of the external reviewer section.

All contact with outside reviewers should be noted and fully documented. All requests for information from external reviews must go through one representative from the primary unit. External letters should be requested at least three months before the dossier is due in the Dean’s office.

13. Copy of the Primary Unit’s Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

A document describing the procedures, criteria, and evidence that the primary unit has agreed upon for evaluating comprehensive review, tenure, and promotion cases is to be included in the dossier. The College of Engineering and Applied Science’s *Procedures, Policies, and Criteria for Reappointment, Promotions and Tenure* may be tailored and approved by the individual units to serve as this document.

14. Examples of Publications

In most cases, three representative examples of scholarly work are sufficient. When photographs, videos, or CDs are the appropriate record of scholarly or creative work, candidates are urged to submit examples.

15. Summary of Personnel Action Form (formally UCDF-7 Form)

The Chair should sign the Summary of Personnel Action Form before the dossier is sent to the Dean.

Confidentiality

Only the letters from outside reviewers are currently considered confidential and cannot be seen by the candidate. This restriction also includes the list of those external reviewers, including their vitae information.

Research Funding History

The candidate's research funding history must be included in the dossier, either as part of the candidate's CV (see item 5) or as a separate list. Include all funded grants and also pending proposals. Indicate whether the candidate is the Principal Investigator or a Co-Principal Investigator and his/her portion of the funding.

V. NOTIFICATION

A candidate for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure is to be informed of the recommendations in writing at each step of the review process. In particular, copies of the Chair's report and the PUEC report are sent to the candidate by the Dean's office after they are received by the Dean's office, and copies of the Dean's report and FLRC report are sent to the candidate by the Dean's office when they are forwarded to Faculty Affairs.

VI. REAPPOINTMENT

Initial appointments for probationary tenure-track faculty members are usually for a period of four years, and they are usually reviewed during the last year of the appointment period. Following campus policy, a faculty member who starts in the spring semester has the option of delaying his/her review to the fourth full year rather than the third full year. Upon successful review, normal reappointment for tenure-track faculty is for three years.

General Principles: The comprehensive review of an Assistant Professor focuses upon whether or not the candidate is making normal progress towards meeting or exceeding the standard for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. In particular, the standard for reappointment is that the candidate is on a trajectory to achieve at the time of tenure an evaluation of meritorious in teaching, research and service, and excellence in research and/or teaching, or that the candidate has a high likelihood of achieving these evaluations with reasonable corrections to the trajectory.

Research Criteria:

- Does the candidate have a vigorous research program?
- Has the candidate selected problems that are recognized as significant by experts in the field?
- What is the candidate's record in previous positions at other institutions (if applicable)?

- What is the candidate's record in attracting graduate students and directing their research work?
- If the research is part of a group effort, what contributions has the candidate made to the initiation and development of projects?
- Does the candidate have refereed publications of high quality that have appeared in or been accepted in appropriate venues of high stature, including highly respected journals, that are based on work done in the current position as well as PhD and post-doc research? (At reappointment, it is expected that some of the publications will be based on research done before coming to CU.) Are additional articles under review?
- Is the candidate active in presenting scholarly work at professional conferences?
- What initial external funding has the candidate received to support his/her research program? What additional proposals are pending for major support of this program?

Teaching Criteria:

- Does the candidate have a thorough knowledge of the subject matter of the courses he or she has taught?
- Does the candidate keep his or her courses up-to-date by incorporating new material?
- Has the candidate taught at both the undergraduate and graduate level? Has the candidate taught a mix of fundamental and specialty courses?
- Has the candidate demonstrated an ability to develop new courses, or to make substantial revisions in old ones? At the undergraduate level? At the graduate level?
- Is the candidate an enthusiastic teacher?
- Do the students consider the candidate to be an effective teacher?
- Is the candidate active in student affairs as demonstrated by his or her willingness to spend adequate time with students outside the classroom?
- Is the candidate a conscientious and effective mentor and advisor of individual students in research at both the graduate and undergraduate levels?
- Has the candidate introduced examples of contemporary engineering design where appropriate in courses or supervised student design or independent-study projects?
- Has the candidate made effective use of peer evaluation and programs or training to improve teaching?

Professional Activities and Service Criteria:

- Does the candidate willingly cooperate with his or her colleagues in teaching, research, outreach, curricular development, and other academic activities?
- Does the candidate participate in department, program, college, and/or university activities intended to improve the quality of the University's program?
- Has the candidate participated effectively in external professional activities while in the current position, such as chairing sessions at conferences and serving on program boards or review panels?

VII. PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND TENURE

The mandatory tenure and promotion evaluation for tenure-track faculty normally occurs during the seventh year of the probationary period. Generally, the recommendation of

promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and a recommendation of tenure will be concurrent. Thus, the criteria for this promotion and for tenure are similar and normally considered at the same time. Early promotion to Associate Professor without tenure will be considered only in exceptional cases in which the Assistant Professor has exhibited highly successful performance and is clearly “on track” toward tenure. Early tenure may also be considered for those candidates who have substantially exceeded the standards for tenure prior to the mandatory review time. The comprehensive review of an Assistant Professor must be successfully completed prior to undertaking a tenure review. The person considered for early promotion and/or tenure should have had at least five years of experience beyond his/her Ph.D. and at least three years of academic experience at the time of promotion.

General Principles:

The Rules of the Regents state that “Associate Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, considerable successful teaching experience, and promising accomplishment in research.” The standard for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure is defined as demonstrated meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, research and creative work, and service, and demonstrated excellence in either teaching or research and creative work.

The granting of tenure implies a long-term commitment on the part of the University and is, consequently, the most critical decision made regarding a faculty member. Such commitments must be limited to persons who are judged most likely to remain valued assets to the University for the rest of their careers. The granting of tenure is to be based primarily on the quality of the candidate’s research and effectiveness of his or her teaching. Professional activities and service on and off campus should be considered to a lesser degree. Implied in a recommendation to grant tenure is the judgment that the candidate’s future performance will lead to promotion to Professor after a suitable period of time as Associate Professor. In particular, this judgment would be based on evidence that the candidate, if granted tenure, will achieve the distinguished reputation in research, the effectiveness in teaching, and the level of activity in professional service required for promotion to Professor. Implicit in any tenure consideration is the possibility of selecting and appointing someone else. The recommended person must be one of the best people the University could expect to attract to this position.

Research Criteria:

- Does the candidate have a vigorous research program?
- Has the candidate selected topics and approaches that are recognized as significant by experts in the field?
- What is the candidate’s record of contributed and invited presentations, and of publication in refereed journals, conference proceedings, books and other outlets? Are the publications of high quality and what has their impact been on his or her field? Are the candidate’s journal papers and published proceedings in highly-regarded journals and conferences? How does this record compare to that of peers? Has the candidate published significant papers based on research at this university?

How many of them are in top journals or other venues of equivalent quality and impact?

- What is the candidate's record in previous positions at other institutions?
- What is the candidate's scholarly reputation at other universities and in industry? Has s/he received any major awards for research?
- Will the candidate be able to develop new areas of research in the future and establish competence in them?
- What is the candidate's record in attracting graduate students and directing their research work?
- An important component of peer evaluation of one's research work is obtained through funding support from sponsoring agencies. What is the candidate's record in seeking and attracting such support for his or her research program? How does his/her funding level compare to that of peers? Is it sufficient to support a research group including several graduate students?
- If the research is part of a group effort, what contributions has the candidate made to the initiation and development of projects?

Teaching Criteria:

- Does the candidate have a thorough knowledge of the subject matter of the courses he or she has taught?
- Does the candidate keep his or her courses up-to-date by incorporating new material?
- Has the candidate demonstrated an ability to develop new courses, or to make substantial revisions in old ones? At the undergraduate level? At the graduate level?
- Has the candidate taught at both the undergraduate and graduate level? Has the candidate taught a mix of fundamental and specialty courses?
- Is the candidate an enthusiastic teacher?
- Do the students consider the candidate to be an effective teacher?
- Is the candidate willing to spend adequate time with students outside the classroom?
- Is the candidate a conscientious and effective mentor and advisor of individual students in research, at both the graduate and undergraduate levels?
- Has the candidate introduced examples of contemporary engineering design where appropriate in courses or supervised student design or independent-study projects?
- Has the candidate displayed the flexibility and cooperativeness required to carry a full share of his or her department's teaching responsibilities over the long term?
- Is the candidate an effective teacher at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, or at one of the levels if dictated by the nature of the program? Has s/he received any teaching awards?
- Is the candidate actively involved in student affairs and welfare, and has he/she demonstrated effectiveness of the candidate as a mentor and advisor of individual students, both on the undergraduate and the graduate levels.

Professional Activities and Service Criteria:

- Does the candidate willingly cooperate with his or her colleagues in teaching, research, outreach, curricular development, and other academic activities?
- Does the candidate participate in department, program, college, and/or university activities intended to improve the quality of the university community?

- Does the candidate participate in professional activities and leadership intended to promote the development of his or her field?
- Has the candidate engaged in outside industrial or governmental activities that have contributed to his or her effectiveness as a faculty member?
- Do the outside professional activities of the candidate enable him or her to keep up-to-date with the current developments in his or her field in academic, industrial, and governmental institutions?

VIII. PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR

There is no standard or mandatory time at which consideration for promotion to the rank of Professor occurs. For faculty who develop their careers along a very fast and steep trajectory, promotion may be considered within six years, or even less in exceptional cases, after the previous promotion. For faculty members whose career trajectory is less steep, or whose scholarly work, by its nature, requires a longer period of development, the period between promotions may be a decade or longer. Review for promotion to Professor is conducted in the same manner as is the tenure and promotion review, including the solicitation of external letters of assessment.

General Principles:

Consideration of an Associate Professor for promotion to Professor is to be based on his or her research, the effectiveness of his or her teaching, and the scope of his or her professional activities and service on and off campus. For promotion to Professor, the candidate should have the terminal degree appropriate for his or her field or its equivalent and (A) a record, which, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (B) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or department circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other, and (C) a record since tenure and promotion to Associate Professor that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, and service.

The following items are some of the factors to be considered in evaluating the candidate's qualifications for promotion.

Research Criteria:

- The quality and quantity of the candidate's research contributions, as evidenced by a strong record of invited and contributed presentations and of publications in recognized journals and other appropriate venues of high caliber.
- The evaluation by recognized authorities outside the University of the candidate's national and international reputation and innovative contributions in scholarly accomplishment, including awards received.
- The candidate's record in attracting graduate students, stimulating their research efforts, and promoting and directing significant thesis/dissertation research.
- The initiation, development, funding, and direction of significant research projects by the candidate, including in new areas that represent substantial growth from the candidate's earlier work.

Teaching Criteria:

- Effectiveness of the candidate as a teacher in the classroom and/or laboratory at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. This effectiveness includes adopting efficient teaching styles appropriate to each course environment, motivating the students, and reacting with sensitivity to the students' responses. Measurements of effectiveness include course questionnaires, student letters or interviews, peer evaluations and teaching awards.
- Maintenance of knowledge of current developments in the candidate's field and application of them to teaching through timely development of new courses and modernization of existing courses.
- Publications, presentations, and grants by the candidate related to teaching, including textbooks, new teaching methods and aids, and the introduction of new laboratory experiments.
- Active involvement in student affairs and welfare, and demonstrated effectiveness of the candidate as a mentor and advisor of individual students, both on the undergraduate and the graduate levels.

Professional Activities and Service Criteria:

- Professional recognition of the candidate outside the university community, as evidenced by membership and leadership in significant professional and scientific committees, conferences, councils, boards, and review panels.
- Participation and leadership by the candidate in important faculty assignments and committees within the University or College.
- Outside industrial or governmental experiences of the candidate to the extent that they contribute to his or her effectiveness as a faculty member.

Given the spectrum of differences in individual attitudes and preferences, it is not expected that an individual would rate highly on every point in each of these categories. However, the quality of the candidate's performance in regard to the listed items and the number of those in which he or she has proved successful should make for reasonable uniformity of judgment in considering promotion. Age shall not be considered a factor. The fundamental objective is to recognize the likelihood of continued high quality academic performance throughout the individual's career. For promotion to Professor, the individual's record as an Associate Professor must be more than an extension of his or her work as an Assistant Professor, and there must be a clear indication that the candidate's previous promise has matured to scholarly stature of national and international standing.