

DEPARTMENT OF METALLURGICAL ENGINEERING

Criteria for Retention and Tenure Reviews
and Standards for Promotion

CRITERIA

The performance of a faculty member being considered for retention, promotion, and/or tenure will be evaluated in the areas described below. Evidence of competence and a commitment to achievement in all areas is required. Indications of originality and leadership by the candidate in these areas are important.

1. Evidence of Teaching Ability

Insofar as education of undergraduate and graduate students is a primary function in a university, excellence in teaching at all levels should be ensured. Five major factors in good teaching are course content, depth of knowledge of subject, logical organization, originality, and presentation. The classroom is a medium for transfer of information to the student, and the level of presentation should match the expected achievement level of the student at that point in his/her academic career.

During all phases of his/her academic program the student should be encouraged to think and apply his/her skills. Problem solving should be an important part of this activity. Familiarity with current research should be expected of those faculty members teaching senior undergraduates and graduate-level courses.

Formal classroom teaching is but part of the overall teaching function. Active participation in tutorials, thesis direction, group discussions, seminars, etc., should also be part of the teaching activities of a faculty.

Evidence of teaching ability may be acquired in a number of different ways, as follows:

1. Peer evaluation both on and off campus.
2. Student evaluation, departmental and university-wide.

3. Documented written reports prepared by members of the Student Advisory Council.
4. Exit interviews.
5. Alumni comments.
6. Receipt of outstanding teacher awards.
7. M.S. and Ph.D. theses supervised.
8. Demonstrated ability to provide a stimulating learning environment for students.

All factors should enter review committee debate on evidence of teaching ability. This listing is not intended to suggest priorities or equivalence of values of items.

2. Evidence of Scholarly Activities

Insofar as a university is defined as a community of scholars, every faculty member is expected to engage in scholarly activities related, at least in substantial part, to his field of major interest. Scholarly activity may be expressed by the writing of papers in specific areas of endeavor or in the writing of textbooks wherein broad syntheses are made or where original ideas and concepts are displayed.

For those involved in research, the merit of their scholarly activities may be judged by the quality and quantity of published research articles, and by the significance and editorial standards of the journals in which they appear. Review committees should study the field of major interest, the complexities of problems attacked, and the journals in which articles are published, rather than study solely the number of articles published.

3. University, Professional, and Public Service

Each faculty member is expected to engage in governance of the University. Additionally, each faculty member is expected to respond to demands upon his/her time by civic, state, federal, and service agencies. Adequate recognition of his/her contributions in these activities is important to any university and accordingly should be a factor in retention, tenure, and promotion deliberations. Service to scientific and professional societies, service in editorial functions, and related activities are also an important part of this criterion.

4. Professional Reputation and Ability

The candidate's professional reputation and his/her abilities as a professional are also important criteria. As an example, consulting activities may be judged by the stature of the client for whom the consulting is performed. Letters of reference from peers frequently make reference to a candidate's professional reputation and/or ability. Special awards should be considered in this context.

5. Other

Other pertinent matters such as the candidate's undergraduate and graduate education, prior academic experience, and relevant industrial experience will also be considered in the review process.

PROCEDURES

Each faculty member should be accorded due process, which in turn requires that the above criteria be considered, weighed carefully, and commented upon in any report by a review committee. Absolute judgement of the merits of an individual becomes extremely difficult to establish. The welfare of students, the university, and the individual all require consideration. Deficiency under one criterion may be balanced by exceptional merit under another.

Quantitative objective assessment of an individual faculty member, under the above criteria, is extremely difficult to establish. However, as a guide to review committees, the following schedule is suggested.

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Relative Value</u>
1. Evidence of Teaching Ability	40
2. Evidence of Scholarly Ability	40
3. University and Public Service	10
4. Professional Reputation and Ability	<u>10</u>
	100

The review committee must consider these four criteria but may choose to not be as quantitative in this consideration as the above suggests. An individual may be given a greater weight for teaching

if he/she is truly outstanding as a teacher, for instance. Likewise for the other criteria.

The appropriate review committee is required to draw upon letters of recommendation and documents of evaluation provided by students and colleagues; however, in addition, the chair of the department will solicit letters of reference from qualified peers knowledgeable about the candidate and his/her activities. Potential external reviewers shall be recommended by the candidate, the Department RPT Committee, and the department chair.

Review committees are strongly encouraged to solicit written comments from recently graduated alumni (e.g., two to five years beyond the date of graduation) relative to the evaluation of teaching ability.

The appropriate review committee is charged with the responsibility for assuring a fair, objective evaluation free of prejudice. In addition, the review committee is required to destroy all drafts of reports before the report is forwarded to the Department Chair and the candidate.

It is essential that all faculty be made aware of the level of achievement expected for tenure and promotion. Judgement of ability for tenure action ranks fully with expectation for promotion when the candidate is an Assistant Professor. The four basic criteria listed provide a basis for judgement.

Information regarding the beginning and ending of the pre-tenure probationary period, credit for prior service, waiver of pre-tenure probationary service, or extension of the pre-tenure probationary period can be found in P&PM 8-6, Section 2B. (The probationary period is normally seven years for an assistant professor and five years for individuals appointed as untenured associate professor.) Required actions prescribed by the University regulations concerning promotion and tenure are initiated by the department chair. An early review for promotion and/or tenure may be initiated by a written request from the faculty member to the department chair and forwarded to the dean or, with concurrence of the faculty member, upon the recommendation of the department chair.

STANDARDS

1. Retention

University policy requires that annual retention reviews be conducted during the untenured faculty member's probationary period (PPM 9-5.1, Sec. 2C(1)). These may be formal or informal. Formal reviews are required: (1) for recommendations of termination; (2) during the third probationary year for all untenured faculty. For Assistant Professors, one additional formal review is required in either the fifth or the sixth year. Although it has been customary in the College to conduct the second formal review during the sixth probationary year, the choice is to be made by the faculty member in consultation with the Department Chair and members of the Department RPT Committee. A decision to retain a faculty member after his or her formal review conveys a message that the individual is performing well, is making acceptable progress toward meeting the requirements for promotion and/or tenure, and is meeting the goals of the Department, College and University. He/she should, however, seriously consider concerns, deficiencies, and/or suggestions for improvement noted by each level of review. The candidate should carefully review these with the department chair and identify what accomplishments are necessary prior to obtaining promotion and/or tenure. The nature of reporting requirements for informal and formal retention reviews is in P&PM 9-5.1, Chapter V, Section 2, C(1)(a).

2. Tenure

Tenure is recommended only for individuals of substantial past achievement and future promise. Tenure is not awarded to Assistant Professors except under extenuating circumstances as outlined in P&PM 9-5.1, Chapter V, Section 2. Awarding of tenure carries an obligation on the part of the candidate for continued excellent performance for which the University in turn offers a stable environment. Early tenure recommendations will be considered only when unequivocal evidence is provided of the candidate's advanced professional development.

3. Promotion

For promotion to Associate Professor, an individual must show demonstrated effectiveness in teaching, research and scholarship, and service. The file should state what has been done to address previously noted concerns, and tangible signs of progress must be apparent. It is the responsibility of the faculty member and the department chair to document this progress and/or these accomplishments.

To achieve the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate should have a reasonable number of publications and have started the process of establishing a national reputation for quality research work.

For promotion to Professor, an individual should be a widely recognized contributor in his/her own field of research and an outstanding teacher in the broadest sense with a solid record of achievement and influence in the lives of students and colleagues. A faculty member must have established a niche in which he/she is making a major contribution to the department.

Prior to advancement to the rank of Professor, there should be persuasive evidence that the candidate's scholarship reputation has been established as demonstrated by activities such as publication of original papers in recognized technical journals, publication of monographs, patents and textbooks, development of publicly released software, establishment of a professional reputation through publications, invited lectures at significant meetings, publication of reports and papers in conference proceedings, and participation in the work of technical committees of professional societies.

Promotion to the ranks of Distinguished Professor, Presidential Professor, and University Professor is reserved for selected individuals whose achievements exemplify the highest goals of scholarship. The definitions of these ranks and procedures for nomination of faculty members are outlined in P&PM 9-2, Section 2, Para. 1-3.