

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

Approved by UCTP April 28, 2025

	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 Tenure-Progress Review.....	8
II.f Annual Review.....	8
II.g Retention/Reappointment of Untenured Faculty.....	9
II.h Procedures for Recommending Changes to this Document.....	9
III. TENURE AND PROMOTION IN DME.....	10
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 & Scholarship.....	12

III.c.3 Service.....	13
III.d Criteria for Evaluating Areas for Tenure and Promotion.....	15
III.d.1 Criteria for Awarding of Tenure.....	15
III.d.2 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor.....	15
III.d.3 Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor.....	15
III.e Definition of Descriptive Terms Used in Criteria.....	16
III.e.1 Teaching	16
III.e.2 Research & Scholarship.....	16
III.e.3 Service.....	18

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 and procedures 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 scholarship, and service. In this regard, it is recognized that achievements in teaching, research & scholarship and 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 meet or exceed the expected performance levels in teaching, research & scholarship, and service, as defined in the relevant criteria in this document.

II. PROCEDURES

The DME procedures outlined below should be consistent with those given in " University Committee on Tenure and Promotions UCTP Guidelines for Units: Preparing Criteria and Files, Approved by UCTP: 15 May 2023" (hereafter designated as the UCTP Guide) and in the USC Faculty Manual (Latest Approval Date: June 19, 2024). 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.

Faculty members hired into the tenure track after January 1, 1995, shall be responsible within their probationary period for meeting the unit tenure and promotion criteria and university standards in effect at the time of their hiring, unless the faculty member elects to be considered under the unit criteria and university standards in effect at the time of the application for tenure. For all subsequent promotions the faculty member shall be responsible for meeting unit criteria and university standards in effect at the time of their application for that promotion.

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. The chair of DME, in consultation with the full professors of the DME T&P Committee, will appoint a tenured full professor as the DME T&P Committee Chairperson.

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 candidates' 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 (defined in the next paragraph) for examination, (g) conduct annual review of faculty, (h) arrange for peer evaluation of teaching for faculty, when requested to do so, (i) 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, (j) forward completed files to the Department Chair, (k) 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 (l) assure that any letters or other materials that must remain confidential are filed in a manner that ensures confidentiality.

To evaluate a candidate for tenure, all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank on the DME T&P Committee will comprise the DME T&P subcommittee. To evaluate a candidate for promotion, all faculty of higher rank on the DME T&P Committee 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

The Office of the Provost publishes the University-wide T&P Calendar with two T&P cycles in an academic year: the Fall Cycle in the fall semester and the Spring Cycle in the spring semester. The DME T&P Committee Chairperson creates and maintains a DME Unit T&P Calendar accordingly. Each faculty member can request a copy of both calendars from 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 Calendar that is applicable.

(a) The chair of DME shall report the DME T&P Committee Chairperson's name to the Dean of the College of Engineering and Computing by April 15. 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 (by email or letter) of their eligibility for tenure or promotion by the Dean, Department Chair or other appropriate administrator by the date stated on the University-wide T&P Calendar

(c) As soon as possible after notification and no later than the date stated on the University-wide T&P Calendar, faculty must notify the Departmental Chair or Dean (and copy the DME T&P Committee Chairperson) indicating whether or not they will apply for tenure and/or promotion.

(d) At least three weeks before the date stated on the University-wide T&P Calendar for sending out files to outside evaluators, the DME T&P Committee Chairperson will send a request to the T&P subcommittee members asking that they recommend potential outside evaluators for those faculty members who have indicated they wish to be considered for tenure and/or promotion. For each T&P candidate, the DME T&P Committee Chairperson will appoint a T&P subcommittee member to act as the coordinator to compile the list of outside evaluators for this candidate. Outside evaluators should be within the candidate's field and impartial relative to the candidate, as described in a subsequent paragraph and in accordance with USC Faculty Manual (Latest Approval Date: June 19, 2024). The list of outside evaluators for each candidate should contain enough names (e.g., ten or more) to secure at least five external review letters. The candidate may not suggest nor disallow outside evaluators.

(e) The DME T&P Committee Chairperson will contact the outside evaluators and obtain agreement to review the files from at least five outside evaluators.

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 files, including a file for the outside evaluators, in accordance with the University-wide T&P Calendar. 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). The candidate will also prepare a secondary file to supplement the primary file. The secondary file will contain everything not in the primary file, for example, annual reviews from the DME T&P Committee and from the Chair of DME, copies of papers and grant applications, copies of student teaching evaluations, new course proposals, and letters of appreciation, etc.

(g) In accordance with the University-wide T&P Calendar, 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 Calendar, 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 Calendar, the T&P subcommittee will meet to discuss the file and will submit votes after the meeting by secret ballot with the deadline set by the DME T&P Committee Chairperson. After the vote has been finalized, each candidate will be notified by the DME T&P Committee Chairperson of the positive or negative recommendation of the T&P subcommittee based on the unit vote regarding tenure and/or promotion. A positive recommendation requires a positive vote of at least 2/3 of the total number of DME T&P subcommittee members voting positive or

negative. Abstentions are not included in the vote count. A negative recommendation may be appealed by the candidate as specified in Section II.d. Committee Consideration of Files and in the USC Faculty Manual.

If the recommendation is favorable for tenure and/or promotion or if a faculty member appeals a negative recommendation, the DME T&P Committee Chairperson will notify DME faculty that they may submit letters to the Chair of DME 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 Calendar 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 and one secondary file (see Section II.b) for the DME and University T&P Review. In addition, the candidate should prepare a file to be reviewed by outside evaluators. The candidate should complete the file for outside evaluators by a deadline set by the DME T&P Committee Chairperson based on the University-wide T&P Calendar.

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) a current curriculum vitae, (3) a complete list of teaching activities, including supervision of postdocs, Ph.D. students, master students and undergraduate students, classroom teaching, and curriculum development effort, (4) a complete list of publications and other scholarly efforts, and (5) a complete list of proposals written, proposals funded, and amount of funding obtained. The unit is responsible for providing a synopsis of evaluations of the candidate's teaching performance. Also, the candidate's file may include additional supporting documentation such

as publication citation statistics and Google Scholar indexes, letters of reference, copies of annual performance review(s), and any additional relevant 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) a current curriculum vitae, (3) complete list of publications and other scholarly efforts, and (4) a 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 relevant information the candidate chooses to include.

The candidate must deliver the primary file, the secondary file and the file for outside evaluators for review to the DME T&P Committee Chairperson by the deadlines set by the DME T&P Committee Chairperson based on the University-wide T&P 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) a summary of teaching evaluations, (b) any letters not supplied by the candidate, and (c) letters from outside evaluators.

After the candidate has submitted 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.

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 will fully participate in the T&P process.

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 appointed by the DME T&P Committee Chairperson.

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 positive 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.

In the case of a negative recommendation for tenure and/or promotion, the DME T&P Committee Chairperson will notify the candidate in writing (by email or letter) by a deadline set in the University-wide T&P calendar. A candidate dissatisfied with the negative recommendation may appeal in writing (by email or letter) to the DME T&P Committee Chairperson by a deadline set in the University-wide T&P calendar. Upon receiving a written appeal request, the DME T&P Committee Chairperson will (1) meet with the candidate and provide a synopsis of ballot justifications and an indication of the strength of the unit vote to the candidate, (2) announce the appeal to DME faculty and invite letters from DME faculty to the chair of DME regarding the case, and (3) send the candidate's file to the chair of DME.

II.e. Tenure-Progress 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 tenure-progress review.

A simple 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. Proxy and oral votes are not allowed. Ballots received after the deadline will be counted as abstentions. 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, which must contain student evaluations of teaching and peer reviews of teaching. Peer reviews of teaching performance are derived from classroom observations. For the annual review, at least one peer review of teaching is required for the review year. Each semester, a faculty member needing a peer review must make a request to the DME T&P Committee Chairperson, who will then appoint, based on alphabetical order and availability, a T&P Committee member of a higher rank to conduct the peer review. Each peer review will be documented by a signed letter/memorandum from the peer reviewer to the faculty member and to the DME T&P Committee Chairperson. 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.

The cumulative file for annual review must follow the T&P file format published by the Office of the Provost. The T&P Committee will meet and discuss each cumulative file and rate the performance of the faculty member in the review year in each of the three areas: (1) teaching, (2) research and scholarship and (3) service, using the descriptive terms of Outstanding, Excellent, Good, Fair or Unacceptable. The committee rating will be determined based on a simple majority vote of committee members present at the meeting.

At the DME, faculty commitments, actions, and contributions to diversity, equity, and/or inclusion (DEI) are appreciated and recognized. Faculty are encouraged to include their commitments, actions, and contributions in the annual performance in any one or more areas of teaching, research and scholarship, and service as they deem appropriate, or may discuss planned contributions for the next review period in personal statement. The cumulative activities in DEI may also be presented in the faculty's tenure progress review and T&P review files.

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 tenured faculty that voted yes-or-no, will be necessary. The voting process will be by written ballot. Proxy votes, late votes

and oral votes are counted as abstentions. The procedure for approval of criteria as outlined in the USC Faculty Manual (Latest Approval Date: June 19, 2024) 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 who meet or exceed the expected performance levels in teaching, research & scholarship, and service, as defined in the relevant criteria. Hence, it is the intent of these criteria that excellence 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.

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. 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 considered 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 considered 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 Approval Date: June 19, 2024). 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

In all three major areas (teaching, research and scholarship, and service), 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.

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.

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 reviews of teaching performance derived from classroom observations. In general, at least one peer review of teaching is expected per year. See Section II.f. Annual Review for details about peer review of teaching,
- (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 (such as grants and other awards/recognition for teaching effectiveness and course development) 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 Scholarship

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, research and scholarship may involve (a) the formulation and dissemination of new knowledge and (b) the sound application of existing principles to solve modern problems. Research and scholarship are judged in terms of both quality and quantity of the work presented by the candidate. Support for the quality of research and scholarship may be evidenced by (1) statements from T&P subcommittee members, (2) statements from outside evaluators and (3) other appropriate items such as awards, prizes and other forms of recognition for research and scholarship. As an essential part of the research and scholarship 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 research and scholarship (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 high-quality monographs, books or book chapters,
- (c) publication of high-quality, national laboratory research reports,
- (d) documentation of high-quality presentations at professional and/or scholarly meetings, research seminars, and/or colloquia at universities,
- (e) supervision of research done by graduate students, including 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,
- (f) demonstrated leadership in professional conference or institute,
- (g) reviewing books, book chapters, papers, and proposals, and
- (h) organizing or chairing conferences, symposia, and sessions.

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.

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.

* 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.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.

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 & Scholarship

The assessment of performance in this area is based on evaluations of the candidate's total record for Research and Scholarship 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) are similar 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. 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 leadership and 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.