

Washkewicz College of Engineering Requirements and Procedures for Tenure & Promotion

1. INTRODUCTION

This document governs promotions in the Washkewicz College of Engineering (WCE) from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure, and promotions from Associate Professor to Full Professor. This document will be made available to all tenure-track faculty being hired by the WCE at CSU. In addition, it is the responsibility of the College Administration to make this document available to the candidates applying for tenure and promotion.

Promotion is a recognition of past accomplishments, and of the promise of greater accomplishments in the future. Promotion is based on excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. Promotion policies are dynamic in nature, so the interpretation and application of this document will evolve. If this document is changed by the College then promotion candidates will have the option to be reviewed according to either the new criteria, or the criteria that were in place at the time of their most recent personnel action.¹

1.1. THE RELATIONSHIP OF THIS DOCUMENT TO THE CSU-AAUP CONTRACT

The CSU-AAUP contract specifies the minimum standards for appointment and promotion to each faculty rank. This document elaborates those for the Washkewicz College of Engineering. In addition to the expected service contribution to the university and profession,

- (a) The promotion to Associate Professor is based on evidence that the candidate is a fully competent teacher. In addition the candidate shall demonstrate significant independent scholarship beyond his/her dissertation.
- (b) The promotion to full professor is based on evidence of sustained excellence in teaching. In addition the candidate shall demonstrate sustained outstanding record as a scholar.

1.2. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

The criteria for promotion include three components: teaching (which includes research advising), research and scholarship, and service. The candidate is responsible for compiling evidence of each component, organizing a dossier, and submitting necessary documents to demonstrate his or her academic achievements. Promotion recommendations by the College Peer Review Committee (PRC), Department Chair, and College Dean, will be based predominantly on accomplishments since the candidate's most recent personnel action, as evidenced in the dossier.

¹ A "personnel action" includes the initial hiring, the granting of tenure, or the promotion of a faculty member.

For faculty hired with no research expectations, research and scholarship will not be considered for promotion and tenure (as applicable). These expectations are typically defined in the letter of intent.

2. TEACHING

Teaching is the most important duty of a faculty member. Candidates are required to document evidence attesting to their competence and dedication to teaching and research advising. Teaching includes undergraduate and graduate instruction, curriculum development, teaching innovation, undergraduate research supervision, and graduate research supervision. The factors that are considered in the evaluation of teaching include commitment to students learning, ability to teach a diversity of courses, responsiveness to feedback from students and others (such as peer evaluators) about teaching, effectiveness in advising undergraduate and graduate students in research, effective communication skills, adherence to university academic regulations and procedure, etc.

Supporting documents for effective teaching include all student course evaluations, letters from former students and research advisees, peer evaluations, teaching awards, teaching grants, and other evidence of teaching effectiveness.

3. RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

Dedication to research and scholarship is expected of all faculty. Major consideration is given to the research and scholarship of the candidate and the impact of that research and scholarship on the academic and engineering community. The measures for research and scholarship performance include:

- A. Publications in refereed scientific and engineering journals and peer reviewed conference proceedings
- B. Publications of scholarly books
- C. Other creative work, such as patents
- D. Competitive externally sponsored research grants/contracts.
- E. Industrially sponsored contracts/awards supporting research and development at CSU
- F. Contributions to the enhancement of research programs in the Washkewicz College of Engineering, especially those that involve and support students
- G. List of students funded in research from external grants
- H. Reputation within the profession

External reviews (discussed in Section 6) are mandatory. The external reviews should evaluate the contributions, significance, and impact (realized and potential) of the candidate's research and scholarly works.

4. SERVICE

Service to the university through committee work or other assignments is expected of faculty.

Major consideration is given to the candidate's services to the university and the engineering profession. Service outside the university will be considered when (1) it enhances the reputation of the university; (2) helps attract or support CSU students, and/or clearly benefits the department, college and/or the university. The service criteria include, but not limited to the following elements:

- A. Student academic advising
- B. Committee work at the department, college, and university levels
- C. Service to the profession
- D. Service to the community at large
- E. Any additional administration-assigned service-related responsibilities.

5. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION

- 5.1. All College PRC deliberations and memos concerning the promotion application of specific candidates shall be kept in strict confidence.
- 5.2. Faculty members seeking consideration for promotion must provide their full CV and five refereed, published (or accepted) papers in electronic format to the College PRC by the first Monday in April. The five papers cannot have been used for a previous personnel action. Assistant professors or associate professors joining CSU without tenure having prior research experience can include their publications before joining CSU. The CV and the five papers are equivalent to the “preliminary dossier” that is specified in the CSU-AAUP contract.
- 5.3. The College PRC shall meet to start the external review process by the third Monday of April.
- 5.4. The candidate shall submit a completed final dossier to the College PRC by September 8.
- 5.5. The College PRC shall meet to review all dossiers for promotion and/or tenure. Separate recommendations on each candidate, with supporting reasons shall be submitted to the respective Chairs by October 1. The College PRC recommendations shall include a copy of the reviewer invitation letter the reviewer received and a list of papers sent.
- 5.6. Following review of the dossiers and all supporting materials, the respective Chairs will make their recommendations to the Dean by October 15.
- 5.7. The Dean will submit to the Provost his/her recommendation on each candidate by November 25.
- 5.8. Appendix B provides requirements for dossier organization. The AAUP contract specifies deadlines for each step during the promotion process. Table 1 quotes those deadlines and adds a deadline for the College PRC in conducting the external review.

Table 1 Tenure and Promotions Activity Deadlines.

Activities	Deadline
Candidate informs the College PRC and submit a preliminary dossier suitable for external review	First Monday in April
College PRC meets to start the external review process	Third Monday in April
Candidate submits a completed final dossier	September 8

College PRC submits recommendations to departmental Chairs	October 1
Departmental Chair's recommendations to the Dean	October 15
Dean's recommendation to Provost	November 25

6. STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR OBTAINING EXTERNAL REVIEWS

The College Peer Review Committee (PRC) shall make any reasonable effort to secure five external reviews, and must secure at least four external reviews, with each reviewer from a different institution. Reviewers can be from either within or outside the US; and they can be from academia, government, or industry. Reviewers from academia must have a rank greater than or equal to that for which the candidate is applying. Reviewers outside academia must have accomplishments that would place them at a rank greater than or equal to that for which the candidate is applying, if they were in academia. A pool of at least ten potential reviewers will be identified by the PRC. Some methods for identifying the pool of potential reviewers may include:

- Individuals who are cited in the candidate's publications
- Individuals who have cited the candidate's publications
- Individuals who are well known or widely published in the candidate's area of research
- Editors or Associate Editors of journals in which the candidate has published

The qualifications and competence of each potential reviewer will be discussed by the PRC at a spring meeting. Potential reviewers who receive a majority positive vote from the PRC will be eligible to serve as reviewers. Since an individual may decline an invitation to serve as a reviewer, the PRC may need to meet more than once to obtain enough eligible reviewers. The PRC will provide the list of eligible reviewer names to the candidate. The candidate will have an opportunity to raise objections and to identify conflicts of interest, including prior personal or professional relationships such as thesis advisor, committee member, co-author, or collaborator. The PRC will not invite reviews from individuals with conflicts of interest. The PRC will give due consideration to objections by the candidate when deciding which reviewers to invite. The dossier should contain the final list of all potential reviewers, with the candidate's statement of possible conflict of interest. Sample review request letters are available for the PRC's convenience in Appendix A.

The PRC will provide reviewers with the following documents:

- The candidate's full CV
- Five of the candidate's papers, chosen by the candidate, that have been published since the candidate's most recent personnel action

Appendix A. Sample Reviewer Invitation Letters

Subject: External Review of Dr. XXX for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Dear Dr. YYY,

Dr. XXX is an Assistant Professor in the ZZZ Department at Cleveland State University, and has applied for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. In response to this request the Peer Review Committee (PRC) of the College of Engineering has initiated an external review of Dr. XXX's credentials. Having identified you as an expert in his/her field, I am writing to see if you are available to review his/her scholarly achievements.

Your review should be based on an analysis of the candidate's curriculum vita and 5 representative publications, which are attached to this email, along with any other information that you may gather from your own resources. Your review will be due August 1, 20NN. The committee is particularly interested in your assessment of the candidate's professional accomplishments and the quality of the scholarly achievements beyond dissertation work. Are the contributions independent and original? What is the significance of the candidate's scholarship, both realized and unrealized, for advancing theory, research, or practice? Does the candidate's research to date show promise for continued growth and recognition? Per our guidelines, we ask you for your judgment of Dr. XXX' accomplishments but not for a recommendation for or against tenure and promotion.

As a token of our appreciation for your effort, we are offering you \$MMM as honorarium. If you agree to these conditions, please let me know by e-mail. If you have any conflict of interest, such as having been Dr. XXX's instructor, supervisor, co-author, or collaborator, please let me know so that the PRC can find another reviewer. If you cannot serve as reviewer, I would appreciate it if you would let me know of other potential reviewers.

Your review (a signed PDF or a mailed hard copy) will become part of the documentation that the PRC, Department Chair, and College Dean will examine to determine the candidate's application for tenure and promotion. Every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality, but confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, in keeping with Supreme Court rulings and Ohio law. Please feel free to contact me if you have questions. I look forward to receiving your reply as soon as possible. Thank you very much. Best wishes,

Professor ABC, Member, Engineering College Peer Review Committee (PRC)
Cleveland State University

Attachments: CV

- Publication #1
- Publication #2
- Publication #3
- Publication #4
- Publication #5

Subject: External Review of Dr. XXX for Promotion to Full Professor

Dear Dr. YYY,

Dr. XXX is an Associate Professor in the ZZZ Department at Cleveland State University, and has applied for promotion to the rank of Professor. In response to this request the Peer Review Committee (PRC) of the College of Engineering has initiated an external review of Dr. XXX's credentials. Having identified you as an expert in his/her field, I am writing to see if you are available to review his/her scholarly achievements.

Your review should be based on an analysis of the candidate's curriculum vita and 5 representative publications, which are attached to this email, along with any other information that you may gather from your own resources. Your review will be due August 1, 20NN. The committee is particularly interested in your assessment of the candidate's professional accomplishments and the quality of the scholarly achievements. Are the contributions independent and original? What is the significance of the candidate's scholarship, both realized and unrealized, for advancing theory, research, or practice? Is the candidate broadly recognized as an expert? Has the candidate demonstrated sustained outstanding scholarship? Per our guidelines, we ask you for your judgment of Dr. XXX' accomplishments but not for a recommendation for or against tenure and promotion

As a token of our appreciation for your effort, we are offering you \$MMM as honorarium. If you agree to these conditions, please let me know by e-mail. If you have any conflict of interest, such as having been Dr. XXX's instructor, supervisor, co-author, or collaborator, please let me know so that the PRC can find another reviewer. If you have any other conflict of interest, please let me know. If you cannot serve as reviewer, I would appreciate it if you would let me know of other potential reviewers.

Your review (a signed PDF or a mailed hard copy) will become part of the documentation that the Peer Review Committee, Department Chair, and College Dean will examine to determine the candidate's application for promotion. Every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality, but confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, in keeping with Supreme Court rulings and Ohio law. Please feel free to contact me if you have questions. I look forward to receiving your reply as soon as possible. Thank you very much. Best wishes,

Professor ABC, Member, Engineering College Peer Review Committee (PRC)
Cleveland State University

Attachments: CV
Publication #1
Publication #2
Publication #3
Publication #4
Publication #5

Appendix B Dossier Organization

The dossier shall be organized as follows, with sections separated by indexed dividers. The PRC can refuse to consider dossiers that do not meet the following format. In general, material should be included in the dossier only if it is directly related to excellence in teaching, research, or service. Candidates should avoid including extraneous padding in dossiers.

The dossier shall be a single binder, with name, department, and promotion goal clearly marked on the cover and spine of the binder.

1. Introductory Section

- 1.1. A disclaimer that the “statements made in this dossier and the evidence presented by me are true to the best of my knowledge.” Signed.. Candidate.
- 1.2. A one-page summary statement that includes the candidate’s intention to apply for promotion, and that summarizes the candidate’s teaching, research, and service accomplishments.
- 1.3. The candidate’s full CV
- 1.4. A copy of this Tenure and Promotion Requirements and Procedures document
- 1.5. A copy of the initial letter of appointment if the candidate is applying for the first personnel action after being appointed at CSU.
- 1.6. The final list of all potential reviewers, with the candidate’s statement of possible conflict of interest.

2. Recommendation Section

This is a blank section reserved for recommendations by the College PRC, the Department Chair, the College Dean, the University PRC, and the external reviewers.

3. Teaching and Research Advising Section

A summary statement describing why the candidate believes that he/she meets the promotion criteria, and the evidence being presented to demonstrate teaching and research advising related accomplishments, will be presented first. The summary will include pointed references to the accomplishments detailed in the rest of this section. Teaching accomplishments can be demonstrated by courses taught, courses developed, lab development, curriculum development, funding for teaching-related activities, teaching-related publications, etc. This section will include,

- (a) List of courses taught each semester since the candidate’s previous personnel action, including details such as new course development, course revision, enrollment, clear indications of cross-listed courses, etc.
- (b) Teaching evaluations by students for all the courses taught, a summary of the evaluations, and the actions taken by the candidate in response.
- (c) Teaching evaluations by other faculty, and the actions taken by the candidate in response.
- (d) List of graduated honors, masters, and doctoral students for whom the candidate served as the primary thesis or dissertation advisor, and list of graduated honors, masters, and doctoral students on whose thesis or dissertation committee the candidate served.

- (e) Other supporting documents, such as, list of training sessions attended by the candidate to improve his or her teaching, evidence of commitment to teaching and enforcing ethics, etc.

4. Research and Scholarship Section

In this section a summary statement describing why the candidate believes that he/she meets the research and scholarship criteria for tenure and promotion and the supporting evidence for these accomplishments, will be presented first. The summary will include pointed references to the accomplishments detailed in rest of the scholarship section. Research accomplishments can be demonstrated by publications, research grants, awards, patents, etc. This section will include,

- (a) All publications since the candidate's previous personnel action, not including publications based on dissertation work unless they are from candidates' independent research. Assistant professors or associate professors joining CSU without tenure having prior research experience can include their publications before joining CSU. Conference publications shall contain sufficient information to judge them, such as the proof of peer review and the acceptance rate of the conference.
- (b) A letter by candidate explaining the candidate's contributions to the jointly-authored papers that are in the dossier.
- (c) Evidence of the quality of scholarship, such as, list of citations to the candidate's publications, summary of impact factors of the journals in which the candidate has published, H-Index, RG Score, etc.
- (d) A list of all funded proposals, including summary information such as proposal title, funding amount, funding agency, funding performance period, budget summary, PI and co-PIs, and the candidate's role and approximate share of the grant.
- (e) A list of all student funded in research from external grants
- (f) A list of all unfunded proposals, including the summary information specified above.
- (g) A list of patents.
- (h) Other supporting documents.

5. Service Section

In this section a summary statement describing why the candidate believes that he/she meets the service criteria for tenure and promotion and the supporting evidence for these will be presented first. The summary will include pointed references to the accomplishments detailed in rest of the service section. Service accomplishments can be demonstrated by items, such as,

- (a) Description of non-research student advising in which the candidate has been involved.
- (b) List of CSU committees on which the candidate has served, including years of service.
- (c) List of conferences and journals for which the candidate has performed peer reviews.
- (d) List of other types of reviews that the candidate has performed: promotion reviews, proposal reviews, book reviews, etc.
- (e) List of conferences and journals for which the candidate has performed editorial duties: editor in chief, editorial board, associate editor, etc. with supporting document.
- (f) List of positions in which the candidate has served for professional engineering societies, with supporting document.

- (g) List of consulting assignments, including summary information such as client name, CSU students involved in the work, summary of work performed, length of consulting assignment, etc., with supporting document.
- (h) A description of service contributions to the community at large.
- (i) Other professional service components, such as, as serving on NASA, NSF, DOE review panels. Supporting evidence for these may include items such as a letter from the NSF program manager.

6. Additional Evidence Section

This optional section can be used to include other information pertaining to achievements and recognition relevant to the promotion criteria, such as, honors and awards, invited lectures, etc.

Approved by the Faculty on April 9th, 2015