

Promotion and Tenure Document
Department of Materials Science and Engineering
(12/04/15)

Approved March, 2017

I. Principles and Practices

Faculty members in the Department of Materials Science and Engineering are promoted to a higher rank or receive tenure as a result of demonstrated achievement in educational, intellectual and professional activities. The departmental goal is to be one of the outstanding departments in the country. Since such a status is the result of peer recognition, the candidate for promotion must present evidence of the development of such. Recommendations for promotion will be based upon all the accomplishments by a faculty member; however, emphasis will be placed on accomplishments since the candidate received his/her present rank.

II. Criteria for Promotion to Rank

Assistant Professor - For appointment to assistant professor, the candidate is expected to have earned a doctoral degree in an area relevant to materials science and engineering and to demonstrate the ability and desire to achieve excellence in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service

Associate Professor (tenure track) - For promotion to associate professor, tenure track, the candidate is expected to demonstrate excellence in scholarship, a proven commitment to excellence in teaching and service, and high quality performance in all areas. This evidence must include at least six external peer reviews written by top scholars in the candidate's field to judge the significance and impact of the candidate's scholarship.

Promotion to associate professor (tenure track) normally carries tenure. For the granting of tenure to an associate professor hired without tenure, the requirements are the same, but with special attention as to the candidate's scholarship, teaching, and service since joining this University.

Associate Professor (continuing track) – For promotion to associate professor, continuing track, the candidate will be evaluated relative to the workload distribution between scholarship, teaching, and service, with excellence expected in the area(s) assigned as the largest workload proportion and high quality performance expected in all areas.

Professor (tenure track) - For promotion to professor, tenure track, the candidate must have

established national and international stature and recognition as a leader in her or his field of research, demonstrated a commitment to excellence in teaching, and performed significant service to the university and professional communities. Excellence in all areas is expected. The scholarly excellence and reputation must be supported by clear evidence of the significance and impact of the scholarly work obtained from evaluations of at least 6 experts outside the University through the external peer review process. Particular attention is paid to accomplishments at rank and there must be unmistakable evidence of significant development and achievement in scholarship, teaching, and service since the last promotion.

Professor (continuing track) - For promotion to professor, continuing track, the candidate will be evaluated relative to the workload distribution between scholarship, teaching, and service, with excellence expected in all areas.

III. Evaluation Criteria

- Research, professional and scholarly performance
- Teaching performance and effectiveness
- Service to the University and the engineering profession and citizenship within the department.

Evaluation of research, professional and scholarly performance

Research, professional and scholarly performance have as their objectives several or all of the following:

1. To maintain active and creative participation in a subject area, developing the subject and advancing the skills used to study it.
2. To involve graduate (and advanced undergraduate) students in research, and to educate them through this participation and through mentorship.
3. To contribute to the general reputation and stature of the department and university as a center for learning and scholarship.
4. To employ specialized professional knowledge and skills to solve engineering problems for industry, government, and the community, thereby enhancing the professional stature of the faculty member and the department.

Publication in refereed scientific and technical journals and publications of scholarly books will be considered important indications of professional scholarly achievement. In a similar way patents or other indications of innovative accomplishments will be considered important professional invention achievements. Lesser weight shall be attached to non-refereed publications, unless the significance of such work is established through outside evaluations conducted by the department or by selection procedures for the publications that are equivalent to peer evaluations. The number of publications is secondary to their quality.

Candidates will identify a small number of key publications and will indicate the number of citations of the published work and any other evidence, such as invited talks to universities and conferences that will assist the university committees in evaluating the impact on the professional community. The candidate will also provide a statement of the qualities embodied in these key publications and of plans for future research.

The success of a candidate in obtaining contracts and grants to carry out high quality research or engineering development is also a measure of scholarly achievement. It is expected that faculty will develop and maintain vigorous research programs; clear evidence of the sustainability of this research is expected, in conformity with national trends, although specific funding levels will not be employed as a condition for promotion or the granting of tenure.

Evaluation of teaching performance and effectiveness

Teaching of high quality is expected of all faculty, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. It is understood that good teaching implies excellence in activities both inside and outside the classroom, the latter involving the availability of the faculty member for counseling and assistance of students on an individual basis and one-on-one work to take research projects to successful conclusion. Classroom teaching performance evaluation will be based upon faculty observations that attest to the candidate's competence (knowledge of subject, ability to stimulate thought, innovative capacity), student course evaluations administered by the College, samples of student comments from evaluations and demonstration of initiative and innovation in the introduction and development of significant new courses and course materials, and improvement of teaching techniques.

The candidate will provide a statement of teaching objectives, evidence of assessment of these objectives, documented efforts to meet the needs of diverse student learners, and evidence of a continuous effort to make appropriate refinements and approaches to teaching and to demonstrate objectively that teaching skills are evolving and improving.

Evaluation of service to the University and the engineering profession and citizenship within the department

Service on departmental, college and university committees is expected of all faculty members, and is considered a factor in evaluation of the candidate for promotion. Service to the university will be measured by the contributions made by the faculty member on university, college and departmental committees and administrative assignments. Evaluation letters from the committee chair or from those affected by the candidate's work and having knowledge of it may be sought in the case of especially significant or demanding activities. Service to the community and the materials science and engineering profession will be considered to the extent that such service contributes to the department's scholarship and teaching.

It is recognized that the effectiveness of a department, its stature and the quality of the educational experience of students, all depend upon the unselfish devotion of a faculty

member to the shared goals of the department. This responsibility for citizenship may normally be assumed to be present to a reasonable degree but especially salutary events are to be recognized as significant. Activities such as the mentoring of students and the initiation and development of joint teaching and research activities are expected.

The candidate will provide a statement of service activities at the department, college, university and/or external professional service.

IV. Definition of Promotion and Tenure Committee, Eligible Voting Faculty

Composition of the Promotion and Tenure Committee – The Departmental Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee (hereafter referred to as P&T Committees) will include all voting departmental faculty members at or above the rank being sought, with a minimum membership of five. The P&T committee will be chaired by an appropriate faculty member, preferably a full professor in a related field to the candidate, who will be appointed by the chair of MSE. Faculty with Joint appointments in the Department, as defined by a Memorandum of Understanding, are included as voting faculty for promotion and tenure in MSE.

Eligibility of Voting Faculty at the Department Level - All tenured faculty and CT faculty at the associate or full level within the Department are eligible to vote on the promotion and tenure of assistant professors to the level of associate professor. All tenured full professors and CT full professors are eligible to vote on promotions to the rank of full professor.

Faculty on leave are eligible to vote only if they are able to participate in the departmental discussions prior to the vote. Faculty may also declare themselves ineligible for cause.

Faculty who serve in positions permitting them to vote on the dossier at a later time may not participate in the discussions or vote at the departmental level.

Emeritus and visiting faculty at the appropriate rank may be encouraged to participate in the promotion and tenure process but they may not vote.

V. Procedures

It is each faculty member's right and responsibility to know all relevant departmental, college and university promotion criteria, policies and practices. It is likewise the right and responsibility of each assistant professor to meet with the department chair and senior faculty who may be formally assigned as mentors, as soon as possible following the initial

appointment in order to develop a coordinated plan of career development aimed at preparing the individual for promotion. Guidelines to such career development planning are contained in the Faculty Handbook.

An assistant professor must be considered for promotion no later than five years following the initial appointment. An associate professor will be considered for promotion when the candidate has compiled a record of achievement that warrants the initiation of this process. If a faculty member wishes to be considered for promotion and/or tenure, it shall be that person's responsibility to initiate the process by so informing the Department Chair in writing by March 15th. Only the faculty member has the right to withdraw the dossier at any point in the promotion process.

The candidate is responsible for preparing the dossier within the allotted time frame and organizing it as clearly and effectively as possible (with the exception of naming and collecting external reviewer letters). The candidate may provide new or updated objective information, such as new publications, journal acceptances, and new honors, to the dossier at any time during the promotion process and the addition will be so noted in the file. Instructions for the Promotion Dossier content and organization are available in the Faculty Handbook.

The dates noted by parentheses in the following section are for guidance only and the University's schedule for promotion should be consulted for binding deadlines.

[March 15 of the candidacy year]

1. The candidate notifies the Chair in writing of his/her intention to apply for promotion and/or tenure.

[April-May]

2. A candidate for promotion will assemble a draft dossier, with assistance from the chair, mentors and other senior faculty. Also, with the exception of the external reviews, the primary responsibility for organizing the dossier as clearly and effectively as possible, within the allotted time frame, and in accordance with materials required by the university as stated in the faculty handbook rests with the candidate. The draft dossier will be used for the information of the external peer reviewers when writing their respective reviews of the candidate.

[By end of May]

3. The candidate shall supply a list of 10 potential peer reviewers who are expert and well established in the candidate's field and a statement indicating the extent and nature of the candidate's relationship with each suggested reviewer. The candidate may also provide a short list of individuals not to be used as peer reviewers and comment on the expected

biases of those individuals.

[June-August]

4. Confidential letters of peer evaluation shall be obtained from at least six highly qualified referees. For tenure track faculty the external letter writers will be expert in the candidate's research area and will be asked to thoroughly comment on the candidate's scholarship. The external reviewers will also be asked to comment on the other areas of evaluation if they so desire. For Continuing Track faculty the letter writers will include experts in the candidate's area of primary workload distribution as well as experts in the other areas of evaluation. For Continuing Track faculty evaluations, letter writers will be asked to comment particularly on the area of primary workload of the candidate as well as the other areas of evaluation. All letters of evaluation shall be included in the dossier. The peer review letters will be treated as confidential in accordance with University policy so as to preserve the confidentiality of the reviewers.
5. Peer reviewers will be selected as follows:
 - The departmental P&T committee will prepare a list of proposed reviewers
 - The list will include the entire list supplied by the candidate plus an additional ten names suggested by the P&T committee
 - The candidate is informed of all of the names on the list and is given the opportunity to comment on them.
 - The P&T committee then selects peer reviewers from the list.
 - The number of candidate-selected reviewers and P&T committee-selected reviewers will be, as a goal, an equal number, and the dossier will identify the source of reviewer selection.
 - The names of the reviewers selected are not divulged to the candidate.
6. Letters requesting peer evaluations are sent, together with copies of the draft dossier and representative publications

For tenure track faculty, the information requested from the external referees will include the following:

- a) Please comment on the quality, impact, and the significance of the candidate's research. Additionally, please address how the candidate's record of work compares with other top scholars at a similar career stage.
- b) Please provide a curriculum vita or short biography describing the reviewer's credentials, and a statement of the reviewer's relationship to the candidate.

For Continuing Track faculty, the information requested from the external referees will

include the following:

- a) Please comment on the quality, impact, and the significance of the candidate's work in their area(s) of primary workload distribution. Please also comment on the quality, impact, and the significance of the candidate's work in the other areas of evaluation.
- b) Please provide a curriculum vita or short biography describing the reviewer's credentials, and a statement of the reviewer's relationship to the candidate.

In the dossier, each peer review should be accompanied by the request letter, a curriculum vitae or biographical sketch describing the reviewer's credentials, and a statement indicating the nature of the peer/candidate relationship.

[By September 1st]

7. The candidate submits the final version of the dossier to the Department's P&T Committee Chair

[September 1³⁰]

8. Copies of the dossier will be made available to each faculty member serving on the P&T committee along with the letters of the external reviewers. The chair of the departmental committee will call for a meeting to consider all of the evidence.
9. The committee vote will be by a written ballot in which each committee member will be asked to indicate a vote. These ballots, as well as the external reviews, are for the confidential use of the department and are not shared with the candidate.
10. The departmental P&T committee will prepare a letter of recommendation to be added to the candidate's dossier. The letter must be addressed to the chair, to whom it is transmitted. The letter must indicate the numerical vote, describe the committee's composition and explain the reasons for the decision. The letter must be signed by all committee members. Minority opinions, also signed, may be appended to the letter. The candidate is to receive a copy of the letter in full.

[October 1]

11. The full dossier will now be forwarded to the chair for assessment and reporting. At the same time the decision of the departmental committee, including the numerical vote, shall be forwarded to the candidate.
12. In the case of an unfavorable recommendation, the candidate may appeal the decision within five working days of his/her receipt (by hand delivery) of the committee's letter. The appeal, in writing, is to be submitted to the chair of the committee and should lay out the basis for the appeal. The committee will meet to consider the appeal within ten working days of its receipt. A letter containing the results of the committee's appeal

deliberations will be given to the candidate within a further ten working days. Copies of the appeal letter and of the committee's reply will be added to the dossier.

[October 15]

13. The Department P&T Committee's and the Chair's recommendations are transmitted to the College P&T Committee. The University's schedule for promotion should be consulted for the remainder of the process.

VI. REVISIONS OF THIS DOCUMENT

To revise this document, a majority vote of the full Materials Science and Engineering voting faculty is required, with each full-time member, including the Department Chair, having one vote. Voting faculty are defined within the Materials Science and Engineering Bylaws.