

February 17, 2012

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERING
TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES

Approved by UCTP December 5, 2012

| | Page |
|--|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION..... | 2 |
| II. PROCEDURES..... | 3 |
| II.a Tenure and Promotion Committee Composition..... | 3 |
| II.b Approximate Schedule for T&P Process..... | 4 |
| II.c Candidate's File..... | 6 |
| II.d Committee Consideration of Files..... | 7 |
| II.e Third year review..... | 8 |
| II.f Annual Review..... | 9 |
| II.g Retention/Reappointment of Untenured Faculty..... | 9 |
| II.h Procedures for Recommending Changes to this Document..... | 9 |
| III. TENURE AND PROMOTION IN DME..... | 9 |
| III.a Background..... | 10 |
| III.b Eligibility for Tenure and Promotion..... | 10 |
| III.c Evaluation Areas for Tenure and Promotion..... | 11 |
| III.c.1 Teaching..... | 11 |
| III.c.2 Research & Scholarly Activity..... | 12 |
| III.c.3 Service..... | 13 |

| | |
|---|----|
| III.d Criteria for Evaluating Areas for Tenure and Promotion..... | 15 |
| III.d.1 Tenure..... | 15 |
| III.d.2 Promotion to Associate Professor..... | 15 |
| III.d.3 Promotion to Full Professor..... | 16 |
| III.e Definition of Descriptive Terms Used in Criteria..... | 16 |
| III.e.1 Teaching | 16 |
| Outstanding, Excellent, Good, Fair, and Unacceptable | |
| III.e.2 Research and Scholarly Activity..... | 17 |
| Outstanding, Excellent, Good, Fair, and Unacceptable | |
| III.e.3 Service..... | 18 |
| Outstanding, Excellent, Good, Fair, and Unacceptable | |

I. INTRODUCTION

Tenure and promotion procedures are set forth in The Faculty Manual of the University of South Carolina. While The Faculty Manual provides guidelines for department and college policy, it is the responsibility of each department to formulate specific criteria and procedures for tenure and promotion. This document details specific criteria to be used by the Department of Mechanical Engineering (hereafter designated as DME) to implement University guidelines.

Decisions to recommend promotion and/or tenure for faculty are the most important which this department must make, for these decisions will determine the quality and strength of the department for many years. For faculty in DME, the basis for these decisions will be evidence presented by the candidate of their activity in the areas of teaching, research, and scholarly activity, and professional service. In this regard, it is recognized that achievements in teaching, research & scholarly activity and professional service in the DME generally require a significant element of advisement and mentoring of both students and faculty. Hence, such activities are an integral part of a faculty member's activities and are important to the DME. Furthermore, as faculty develop and grow professionally, it is important that they contribute in a positive way to the overall strength of the DME.

Thus, it is the explicit intent of these criteria that excellence in all of these areas be encouraged, while recognizing that equal excellence in all areas for each individual is an exception. However, tenure and/or promotion will be awarded to those candidates who present evidence of high quality in teaching

and research & scholarly activity as defined in these criteria, while maintaining a good record in service and contributing positively to the DME.

II. PROCEDURES

The DME procedures outlined below should be consistent with those given in "University Committee on Tenure and Promotions, Guide to Criteria and Procedures, Revised, 2011" (hereafter designated as the UCTP Guide) and in the USC Faculty Manual (Latest revision June 25, 2010). Each candidate is encouraged to read both documents carefully and discuss any questions that they have with the DME T&P Committee Chairperson. If the procedures outlined below are in conflict with the current USC Faculty Manual, then the candidate must follow the procedure(s) described in the current USC Faculty Manual. The DME will follow tenure and promotion procedures for Faculty with Joint Appointments as specified in the current USC Faculty Manual.

II.a. Tenure and Promotion Committee Composition

The DME has a tenure and promotion committee of the whole, the DME T&P Committee, comprised of all tenured faculty. A DME T&P Committee Chairperson for the committee is elected by majority vote of the full professors on the committee of the whole for a two-year period. The chairperson must be a tenured full professor. If the DME T&P Committee Chairperson -elect is unable to fulfill his/her duties, then the Department Chair shall appoint a full professor to serve as interim DME T&P Committee Chairperson until a new DME T&P Committee Chairperson can be elected.

The duties of the DME T&P Committee Chairperson are to (a) call meetings as necessary to conduct committee business, (b) appoint committee members to assist in performing committee duties, (c) maintain the security of all candidate's files, (d) maintain a list of outside evaluators supplied by the faculty, (e) secure letters from candidates' outside evaluators, (f) make files of the candidates available to appropriate DME T&P subcommittee for examination, (g) conduct annual review of faculty, (h) arrange for peer evaluation of teaching for faculty, when requested to do so, (i) maintain a log which faculty members must initial to indicate their having reviewed the file, (j) arrange for any absentee voting, including faculty on sabbatical, (k) conduct the T&P subcommittee meeting prior to the deadline mandated by the university calendar, ensure that the balloting process is finished on schedule and complete each candidate's file, (l) forward completed files to the Department Chair, (m) keep adequate files of the tenure and promotion committee, including past and current minutes, criteria and procedures, information on outside evaluators, university documents related to tenure and promotion, and letters from outside evaluators, and (n) assure that any letters or other materials that must remain confidential are filed in a manner and place that ensures confidentiality.

To evaluate a candidate for tenure, all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank on the committee will comprise the DME T&P subcommittee. To evaluate a candidate for promotion, all faculty of higher rank than the candidate will comprise the DME T&P subcommittee. Where possible, on matters other than consideration of a full professor for tenure or consideration of an associate professor for promotion to full professor, a subcommittee shall include both professors and associate professors. The Departmental Chair and Dean shall not serve as a member of either the DME T&P Committee or a DME T&P subcommittee.

The T&P subcommittee for each candidate must have at least five members. In consultation with other T&P subcommittee members, the DME T&P Committee Chairperson will add members of appropriate rank and tenure from other appropriate academic units of the university when this minimum number is unavailable from its own faculty.

II.b. Approximate Schedule for T&P Process

Each year, the University-wide T&P schedule will be transmitted to the DME by the Dean's office. Each faculty member can request a copy of the Annual T&P Schedule from the Provost's office, the DME Department Chair, or the DME T&P Committee Chairperson. To assist faculty in the DME in understanding the T&P process, a synopsis of the T&P process for T&P decisions is provided in the remainder of this section. Since two tenure and promotion cycles occur annually, dates for the following activities in the process should be obtained from the University-wide T&P schedule that is applicable.

(a) The DME T&P Committee will meet April 15 of each year to elect the DME T&P Committee Chairperson for a two-year term (every other year). The DME Committee shall report the DME T&P Committee Chairperson's name to the provost and the Faculty Senate Office. The DME T&P Committee Chairperson's term begins on the day after the spring term ends.

(b) Potential candidates for tenure and promotion shall be advised in writing of their eligibility for tenure or promotion by the Dean, Department Chair or other appropriate administrator by the date stated on the university calendar posted on the provost's web site. Since two tenure and promotion cycles occur annually, two dates will be given. Each date will be two working months in advance of the first due date for the submission and consideration of files.

(c) As soon as possible after notification and no later than two weeks after written notification has been given, faculty must notify the Departmental Chair and Dean indicating whether or not they will apply for tenure and/or promotion.

(d) Using the date specified on the University-wide T&P schedule, the DME T&P Committee Chairperson will send a request to all faculty asking that they recommend potential outside evaluators for those faculty members who have indicated they wish to be considered for tenure and/or promotion. Faculty

will be asked to provide person's name, employing institution, rank, and area of expertise for each person they suggest. The candidate cannot suggest names of outside evaluators.

(e) After consultation with T&P subcommittee members, the DME T&P Committee Chairperson will select a minimum of five outside evaluators from the total list supplied by the faculty. The DME T&P Committee Chairperson will contact the outside evaluators and obtain their agreement to review the files. Additional outside evaluators will be chosen by the DME T&P Committee Chairperson in consultation with other T&P subcommittee members to replace those who do not wish to review the file. Outside evaluators should be impartial relative to the candidate.

Typically, the outside evaluators will be (e.1) tenured faculty in an ABET accredited peer or aspirant engineering department and of a rank equal to or higher than that of the candidate. If a person can be shown to be one of the leading scholars in a particular field, that person may be used as an outside evaluator even if he or she is at an institution that is not peer or aspirant or (e.2) non-academic researchers who have established a strong publication record and who have clearly demonstrated quality in their research endeavors. The majority of outside evaluators normally must be persons with academic affiliations. Persons who have co-authored publications, collaborated on research, or been colleagues or advisors of the candidate normally should be excluded from consideration as outside evaluators. All evaluators must be asked to disclose any relationship or interaction with the candidate. The outside evaluators must be selected by the unit except as specified in USC Faculty Manual for jointly appointed faculty.

(f) The candidate must prepare his/her file and five copies of the file for the outside evaluators in accordance with University-wide T&P schedule. It is the responsibility of the candidate to assemble his/her files. The primary file, which is sent forward for review by the unit, college, and university, must be assembled according to the format distributed by the Provost's Office. However, the DME T&P Committee Chairperson and the Department Chair are available to assist the candidate in preparing his/her files (see Section II.c. for additional information on both the primary and outside evaluators' files).

(g) In accordance with the University-wide T&P schedule, each evaluator should be provided with a letter from the DME T&P Committee Chairperson requesting the evaluation and informing the evaluator of the unit's relevant criteria for tenure and/or promotion, the candidate's vita and publications, and other materials evidencing the candidate's research or such portion of the candidate's research as the evaluator is being asked to evaluate. The evaluator will be asked to evaluate the quality of the research and scholarship, including the quality of publication venues. Where appropriate, the evaluator will be asked to evaluate the quantity of the candidate's research and scholarship. A summary of the professional qualifications of each outside evaluator or a copy of each evaluator's curriculum vita must be included in the candidate's file, along with a copy of the letter sent to the evaluator.

(h) In accordance with University-wide T&P schedule, all letters and additional information will be added to the candidate's file by the DME T&P Committee Chairperson to complete the file.

(i) In accordance with University-wide T&P schedule, the T&P subcommittee will meet and vote. After the vote has been finalized, each candidate will be notified by the DME T&P Committee Chairperson of

the results of the unit vote regarding tenure and/or promotion. A negative recommendation may be appealed by the candidate as specified in the USC Faculty Manual.

If the recommendation is favorable for tenure and/or promotion or if a faculty member appeals a negative decision, the Department Chair will notify DME faculty that they may submit letters for inclusion in the candidate's file.

(j) The DME T&P Committee Chairperson will add any additional letters from faculty to the file, along with the ballots and justifications and send the file to the Departmental Chair (approximately one week after the T&P subcommittee meeting).

(k) The Departmental Chair will add his/her letter to the file and forward the file to the Dean, College of Engineering and Computing (approximately one week after receiving file).

(l) The Dean of Engineering will add his/her letter to the file and forward the file to the Provost with all support materials (about three weeks after receiving file).

(m) The Provost will add his/her letter to the file and forward the file to the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion.

(n) The University Committee on Tenure and Promotion will add their recommendation to the file and forward the file to the President .

(o) The candidate should consult the University-wide T&P schedule for all dates

II.c. Candidate's File

As noted above, it is the responsibility of the candidate to assemble his/her file. The file must be assembled according to the format distributed by the Provost's Office. However, the DME T&P Committee Chairperson and the Department Chair are available to assist the candidate in preparing his/her file. The candidate will prepare one primary file for the DME and University T&P Review. In addition, the candidate should prepare at least five copies of the file to be reviewed by outside evaluators. The candidate should try to complete the outside evaluators' files as soon as possible, but no later than the second week in August (to ensure that all outside evaluators have sufficient time to review the file, it is recommended that the candidate complete the files to be sent to the outside evaluators by mid-July).

The primary file prepared by the candidate must include at a minimum (1) a copy of the criteria under which candidate is to be reviewed, (2) an updated curriculum vitae, (3) evaluations of teaching performance, (4) complete listing of publications and other scholarly efforts, (5) complete list of proposals written, proposals funded, and amount of funding obtained, and (6) The unit is responsible for providing a synopsis of evaluations of the candidate's teaching performance. Also, the candidate's file

may include (7) additional supporting documentation, (8) letters of reference, (9) copies of annual performance review(s), and (10) any additional, pertinent information the candidate chooses to include.

The files prepared by the candidate for the outside evaluators' review shall include at a minimum (1) a copy of the criteria under which candidate is to be reviewed, (2) an updated curriculum vitae, (3) complete list of publications and other scholarly efforts, and (4) complete list of grant/funding proposals written, proposals funded, and amount of funding requested and obtained. Also, the outside evaluators' files may contain any additional, pertinent information the candidate chooses to include.

The candidate must deliver the primary file and five copies of the outside evaluators' file for review to the DME T&P Committee Chairperson no later than the due date specified on the current university tenure and promotion calendar. However, as noted above, to ensure that all outside evaluators have sufficient time to review the file, the candidate should deliver these files to the DME T&P Committee Chairperson at least one month before the due date specified on the current calendar. Before the candidates' primary file is reviewed by the committee, it is the responsibility of the DME T&P Committee Chairperson to include specific items in the file such as (a) an interpretation and summary of teaching evaluations, (b) any letters not supplied by the candidate, and (c) letters from outside evaluators.

After the candidate has turned in his/her files, and prior to the T&P subcommittee vote on the candidate's file, the candidate shall not add additional information to the files. However, after the T&P subcommittee vote, the candidate may provide the following information to the DME T&P Committee Chairperson for addition to the file prior to further consideration: (a) notification of an award received after the due date for the file, (b) notification of acceptance of a manuscript referred to in the file, (c) publication of articles/books which had been accepted prior to the unit vote, and (d) published reviews of the candidate's work which appear after the T&P subcommittee vote. The DME T&P Committee Chairperson may add letters from outside evaluators solicited before but received after the T&P subcommittee vote,

II.d. Committee Consideration of Files

The tenure and promotion subcommittee will meet to consider and discuss files before the deadline date for unit vote, based on the appropriate University tenure and promotion calendar. Subcommittee members, who are responsible for reviewing all files prior to consideration by the committee, will meet and discuss each file. After discussion, the T&P subcommittee members will cast their secret ballots with appropriate written justification. This "justification" (required for each ballot) is a written rationale, specifically related to the criteria, to support their votes.

Subcommittee members may vote "yes," "no," or "abstain" on each issue. Votes (ballots) of individual committee members need not be signed. Proxy votes are not allowed.

For any subcommittee member who must be absent from the meeting for a legitimate reason, the DME T&P Committee Chairperson will provide ballot(s) (see next paragraph for special consideration of faculty on sabbatical).

However, for DME T&P subcommittee members who will be on sabbatical leave during the proceedings of the DME T&P subcommittee, special rules apply; for such faculty to be counted as a voting member of DME T&P subcommittee, they must provide notification in writing to the Department Chair or College Dean of their desire to do so before beginning their leave. If notification is provided, then the faculty may choose to have any or all candidates' curriculum vitae and other pertinent information mailed to him/her. Included in this mailing, if appropriate, will be ballots identical to those used by other members of the tenure and promotion committee. The faculty member on sabbatical leave must respond in writing and his/her ballots must be received prior to the deadline given above.

Ballots received after the deadline and any oral votes will be counted as abstentions.

Votes will be counted by the DME T&P Committee Chairperson and one other member of the current DME T&P subcommittee. The additional member shall be selected by majority vote of the T&P subcommittee prior to beginning discussion of the files. In the absence of the elected member, a committee member appointed by the DME T&P Committee Chairperson will assist in counting the votes.

A positive vote of at least 2/3 of the total number of DME T&P subcommittee members voting positive or negative will be necessary for a recommendation for tenure and/or promotion. Abstentions are not included in the vote count. A negative recommendation for tenure or promotion is without prejudice to subsequent consideration.

II.e. Third Year Review

All untenured faculty, regardless of rank, will undergo a performance review in the third year after appointment. This review will follow the procedures outlined in the Faculty Manual and those stated below.

This review will be carried out by the proper subcommittee as outlined in Section II.a. The candidate under review will follow the procedures outlined in II.f when submitting a file for third year review.

A majority vote of the total number of DME T&P subcommittee members voting will be necessary for a recommendation whether or not the untenured faculty member should be retained. Abstentions are not included in the vote count. This recommendation will be forwarded to the Department Chair.

II.f. Annual Review

The T&P Criteria outlined in Section III for evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion in the DME will be used by the T&P subcommittee (see Section II.a.) and DME Department Chair to evaluate both the (a) yearly performance and (b) overall performance of faculty on an annual basis.

All untenured faculty and tenured faculty below the rank of full professor shall submit annually a cumulative T&P file . The cumulative file will be used each year for consideration of promotion and/or tenure, as outlined in the USC Faculty Manual, as well as for the annual review. Information for the current year should be clearly identified (e.g. underlined) within the cumulative file to facilitate the yearly evaluation process.

II.g. Retention/Reappointment of Untenured Faculty

The T&P Criteria given in Sections III for evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion in the DME will be used by the T&P Committee (see Section II.a.) to evaluate the progress of untenured faculty for retention (reappointment) in the DME.

II.h. Procedures for Recommending Changes in this Document

To recommend changes in this document, a positive vote of at least 2/3 of the faculty eligible to vote on a given file will be necessary. The voting process will be by written ballot. Proxy votes and oral votes are counted as abstentions. Abstentions are not part of the total vote count. The procedure for approval of criteria as outlined in the USC Faculty Manual (latest revision date June 25, 2010) will be followed.

III. TENURE AND PROMOTION IN DME

III.a. Background

Faculty in the DME have duties in three primary areas; teaching, research and scholarship, and service. Therefore, evaluation of each faculty member's performance in these three interrelated functions will be considered in any decision regarding retention, promotion, or tenure of faculty members in the DME.

It is the explicit intent of these criteria that excellence in all of these areas be encouraged, while recognizing that equal excellence in all areas for each individual is the exception. However, tenure and/or promotion will be awarded to those candidates that present evidence of high quality in teaching and research & scholarly activity, while maintaining a good record in service and contributing positively to the DME. Hence, it is the intent of these criteria that high quality in performance be rewarded.

In all three of the major areas of consideration, the performance of the applicant will be reviewed for the entire academic career of the candidate with primary attention given to the period during which the candidate was at the current rank. It is the expectation of the DME that performance of the candidate reflects consistent growth and improvement over the years.

In addition, the candidate's contribution to the unit and cooperation in performance of tasks in the unit may be considered.

III.b. Eligibility for Tenure and Promotion

It is generally assumed that faculty members in a tenure-track position hold an earned doctorate in mechanical engineering or in a closely-related field. To be awarded tenure and/or promotion, faculty members shall have had relevant experiences in a college or university. The DME follows the guidelines in the USC Faculty Manual relative to time in rank.

Faculty members appointed at the rank of assistant professor who have not previously held tenure-track positions at another institution of higher learning normally will not be recommended for tenure until they are in at least their fourth year at the University of South Carolina.

Faculty members appointed at the rank of associate professor or professor who have not previously held tenure-track positions at another institution of higher learning normally will not be recommended for tenure until they are in at least their third year at the University of South Carolina.

Faculty members may be hired into the DME at any rank; tenure can only be awarded at the rank of Associate or Full Professor for new hires. The granting of tenure for a newly-hired faculty member must be in accordance with the USC Faculty Manual and each prospective faculty member must meet the requirements set forth in this document to be hired into the DME with either tenure or any rank above assistant professor.

The procedure for granting tenure or promotion to jointly appointed faculty is outlined in the USC Faculty Manual (latest revision date: June 25, 2010). The procedure to be followed if the DME is the secondary unit is that the DME T&P Chairperson will collect comments from the proper DME T&P subcommittee (defined in II.a) and transmit them to the Chairperson of the primary unit for inclusion in the file of the candidate.

III.c. Evaluation Areas for Tenure and Promotion

III.c.1 Teaching

Teaching includes a full range of activities engaged in by the faculty member. A record of sustained, effective involvement in this area is required of all tenure and promotion candidates. The following activities are considered a part of the teaching function:

- (a) teaching of graduate and/or undergraduate courses,
- (b) development of laboratory for educational/research purposes,
- (c) advising and mentoring of students and/or faculty,
- (d) establishing and maintaining effective teaching relationships with students,
- (e) course development which includes innovative teaching, preparation of new courses, and participation in developing the course organization, and
- (f) engaging in planned activities to improve teaching effectiveness.

The above list is not exhaustive and candidates need not have supporting information for all areas listed. However, the candidate must supply information on at least item (a).

Evidence of effectiveness of teaching and supervision will be judged by information supplied by the candidate in the following areas:

- (a) student evaluations of teaching performance from questionnaires and/or rating scales,
- (b) peer evaluations of teaching performance derived from class observations. Classroom visits may be conducted (b.1) at the invitation of the instructor, (b.2) at the request of the DME T&P Committee Chairperson, and/or (b.3) by the DME Department Chair or her/his designee. Each peer evaluation should be documented by forwarding a written evaluation to the DME T&P Committee Chairperson (with a copy to the DME Department Chair and the candidate),
- (c) written statements from former students and/or faculty members,
- (d) documentation of participation in activities designed to improve teaching effectiveness,
- (e) teaching awards,

(f) documented new course development, including copies of syllabi and other supporting materials for courses developed and taught, and

(g) other supporting materials submitted by the candidate.

The above list is not exhaustive and a candidate need not have supporting information for all areas listed. However, summaries of student evaluations [item (a)] and peer evaluations [item (b)] are required and must be included in the candidate's promotion and/or tenure file.

III.c.2 Research and Scholarly Activity

Mechanical Engineering as a discipline has both applied and original science. Original research is defined as expanding the existing knowledge base through theoretical developments and/or experimentation and/or original thought. Applied research involves the constructive application of existing principles to current problems. Therefore, scholarly activity may involve (a) the formulation and dissemination of new knowledge and (b) the sound application of existing principles to solve modern problems. Scholarly activity is judged in terms of both quality and quantity of the work presented by the candidate. Support for the quality of scholarly activity may be evidenced by (1) statements from T&P subcommittee members, (2) statements from outside evaluators and (3) other appropriate items. As an essential part of the research/scholarly activity process, it is important that the candidate demonstrates the ability to develop and sustain a research program for his/her area(s) of interest.

The following items may serve as evidence for the quality and quantity of scholarly activity (this list is not exhaustive and candidates need not be supported by all items listed. However, each candidate must give evidence of peer-reviewed publications and presentations of scholarly work). In roughly decreasing order of weight, the items are;

(a) publication of high quality, peer-reviewed articles in professional publications,

(b) publication of monographs, books or book chapters,

(c) publication of high-quality, national laboratory research reports,

(d) documentation of presentations at professional and/or scholarly meetings, research seminars, and/or colloquia at universities,

(e) supervision of completed theses and dissertations,

(f) written evidence for the quality of the candidate's work by other authors, including (f-1) citations of the candidate's work, (f-2) evaluations of the candidates' scholarly work by recognized researchers from academia, industry, or government, and/or (f-3) proposal reviews from grant agencies that use peer review of proposals,

(g) activities related to (g-1) advising and mentoring of graduate students and/or faculty and/or (g-2) supervision of completed independent study projects and comprehensive projects,

(h) awards for scholarly research work,

(i) minimally-refereed publications such as abstracts, extended abstracts, and some conference proceedings, and

(j) editing of published books or book reviews.

The following items may serve as evidence that the candidate is developing and maintaining a research program in the department (this list is not exhaustive and candidates need not be supported by all items listed). However, funding and sincere efforts to obtain funding of a candidate's research program must be documented. The items are:

(a) continued development of expertise by the candidate, either through work with graduate students or through personal development, in his/her areas of research,

(b) list of research and/or training grants/awards from non-department sources for which the candidate has written the proposal, including an indication of the status of each grant/award,

(c) list of useable educational/research equipment obtained from non-departmental sources, and

(d) financial support for graduate students on research projects.

III.c.3. Service

A documented record of sustained, effective service is required of all tenure and promotion candidates. Documentation of the quality of the service can be of several forms, including but not limited to the following items:

(a) documentation by the candidate that may include reports from individuals who were the recipients of the service or who were otherwise knowledgeable about the service,

(b) local, state, national or international award or recognition for service, and

(c) recognition by election or appointment to a leadership position in a professional or community organization.

Service activities may be engaged in within one or more of the following settings; profession, department/university, community/society. In general, the DME encourages an increasing record of service with increasing rank. Examples of service activities are provided below. The list is not exhaustive; candidate's file need not be supported by all items listed.

Professional

The items are;

- (a) appointment to serve as an editor of professional/scientific journal,
- (b) appointment to serve on a grant review panel requiring technical expertise,
- (c) election or appointment to serve as an officer of international, national, regional or state professional organization or association,
- (d) election/appointment to serve on state/national/international technical committees,
- (e) appointment/election to serve as committee chair or member for international, national or state professional association, and
- (f) demonstrated leadership in professional conference or institute.

Department/University

The items are;

- (a) participation in or chair of a departmental/college/university committee,
- (b) director of department/college/university program, clinic, center, or institute,
- (c) advising and mentoring of students and/or faculty, and
- (d) other service activities.

Community/Society

The items are;

- (a) professional consultation,
- (b) engagement in professional practice in the community which advances the candidate's teaching and scholarly competence,

- (c) uncompensated participation in agency board of directors, community task force and/or committee,
- (d) presentation to community group, and
- (e) participation on a national or state professional task force or committee.

III.d. Criteria for Evaluating Areas for Tenure and Promotion

III.d.1 Criteria for Awarding of Tenure

For the award of tenure, it would normally* be expected that a candidate has demonstrated either (a) outstanding performance in research & scholarship, good performance in teaching, and good performance in service, or (b) excellent performance in research & scholarship, excellent performance in teaching, and good performance in service. The candidate should also show evidence of progress toward establishing a national or international reputation in a field. Furthermore, the candidate must show promise for continued growth and development in quality of professional performance in the areas of research & scholarship, teaching, and contributions to the quality of the DME for the balance of the candidate's academic career.

III.d.2 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

For promotion to the rank of associate professor, it would normally* be expected that a candidate has demonstrated either (a) outstanding performance in research & scholarship, good performance in teaching, and good performance in service, or (b) excellent performance in research & scholarship, excellent performance in teaching, and good performance in service. The candidate should also show evidence of progress toward establishing a national or international reputation in a field.

* Whenever an exception is made from applying the criteria in the manner normally expected, an explanation of the reason for the deviation from the normal procedure must be included in the candidate's file.

III.d.3 Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

For promotion to the rank of full professor, it would normally* be expected that a candidate has demonstrated outstanding performance in research and scholarship, excellent performance in teaching, and excellent performance in service.

III.e. Definitions of Key Descriptive Terms Used in the Criteria

The following definitions for the descriptive terms used in the criteria noted above will be consistently applied to evaluate teaching, research and scholarship, and service.

III.e.1. Teaching

The assessment of teaching performance is based on the T&P subcommittee's evaluation of the candidate's total teaching record documented in the file, including summaries of student ratings, peer evaluations, and other relevant data.

Outstanding: The candidate's performance is far above the minimally effective level. Candidate's teaching is assessed to be among the best in the DME. The candidate is involved in a wide variety of teaching-related activities and assumes leadership in the development of courses and curriculum matters. Thus, the candidate is performing their teaching duties effectively and well above the level that is expected for faculty in the DME.

Excellent: The candidate significantly exceeds the minimally effective level of performance. The candidate is involved in a wide variety of teaching-related activities and is performing their teaching duties effectively and above the level expected for faculty in the DME.

Good: The candidate's performance is clearly above the minimally effective level. The candidate is performing their teaching duties effectively and at the level expected for faculty in the DME.

Fair: The candidate meets the minimally effective level of performance. Candidate's teaching is assessed to be below the level expected for faculty in the DME.

* Whenever an exception is made from applying the criteria in the manner normally expected, an explanation of the reason for the deviation from the normal procedure must be included in the candidate's file.

Unacceptable: The candidate has accomplished less than the minimally effective level of performance. The range of teaching activities is very limited. The faculty member is not performing their teaching duties at the level of effectiveness expected for faculty in the DME.

III.e.2. Research & Scholarly Activity

The assessment of performance in this area is based on evaluations of the candidate's total record for Research and Scholarly Activity documented in the file by both the T&P subcommittee and outside evaluators, with particular emphasis placed on peer-reviewed articles (including book chapters) and presentations at conferences/meetings.

Outstanding: The candidate's performance is far above the minimally effective level. Output is of very high quality, and a national/international reputation is evident. Candidate is actively and consistently engaged in original and/or applied research, with resulting productive scholarship. The candidate's publication and presentation record should include high productivity (quality and quantity), including (a) published articles in recognized, peer-reviewed publications, and (b) presentations at conferences of national or international scope. In addition, the candidate has clearly shown the ability to develop and maintain a research program in his/her area of expertise. Outside evaluators should indicate that the candidate's publications, presentations, and grant award record (a) ranks in quality and quantity with that of their better colleagues of the current rank, and (b) is consistent in quality and quantity with the entry-level performance of most colleagues at the rank to which the candidate aspires in DME at similar universities.

Excellent: The candidate significantly exceeds the minimally effective level of performance. Output is already of high quality, and a national/international reputation is clearly possible, if not likely. Candidate is actively and consistently involved in original and/or applied research, with resulting productive scholarship. The candidate's publication and presentation record should include substantial productivity both in publication of articles in recognized peer-reviewed publications and in presentations at conferences of national or regional scope. In addition, the candidate has begun to demonstrate the ability to develop and maintain a research program in his/her area of expertise. Outside evaluators should indicate that the candidate's publication, presentation, and grant record is consistent in quality and quantity with the entry-level performance of most colleagues at the rank to which the candidate aspires in DME at similar universities.

Good: The candidate's performance is clearly above the minimally effective level. He or she shows promise of high quality research and scholarship in the future.

Fair: The candidate meets the minimally effective level of performance. Candidate is somewhat involved in research or scholarship. The candidate's publication and presentation record includes some publications in peer-reviewed publications and some presentations with national, regional or state scope, with many of candidate's papers in non-refereed publications. In addition, it is not clear that the candidate will be able to develop and maintain a research program in an area of interest. Outside evaluators indicate that the candidate's publication, presentation, and/or grant record does not compare favorably in quality and quantity of scholarly production with most colleagues of the same rank in DME at similar universities.

Unacceptable: The candidate has accomplished less than the minimally effective level of performance. Candidate's involvement with research and scholarship is limited. Publication and presentation record is minimal and/or limited primarily to non-refereed publications, monographs, reports, and presentations. In addition, there is minimal documented evidence that the candidate has begun developing a research program in an area of interest. Outside evaluators indicate that the candidate's publication, presentation, and/or grant record is recognizably less in quality and quantity than that of colleagues of the same rank in DME at similar universities.

III.e.3. Service

The assessment of service performance is based on the T&P subcommittee's evaluation of the candidate's total service record documented in the file.

Outstanding: The candidate's performance is far above the minimally effective level. Candidate's service record in quality and quantity is recognizable among the best in the DME in scope and recognition. The candidate's service record indicates a contribution to both the profession and practice which has significance at the national and/or international level as well as the state and local level.

Excellent: The candidate significantly exceeds the minimally effective level of performance. Candidate's service record in quality and quantity is above average in the DME and indicates a contribution to the profession and to practice and which has significance at both the state level and local level.

Good: The candidate's performance is clearly above the minimally effective level. Candidate's service record in quality and quantity is consistent with the DME average contribution and is predominantly at the local level, with either professional or community agencies.

Fair: The candidate meets the minimally effective level of performance. Candidate's service is assessed to be below the level expected for faculty in the DME

Unacceptable: The candidate has accomplished less than the minimally effective level of performance. Candidate's service record in quality and quantity is recognizably much lower than the average in the DME.