1. Introduction

These guidelines and procedures are based on requirements and guidelines found in the following: (1) University Rule 12.01.99.M2: Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion; (2) System Policy 12.01: Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Tenure; and (3) Office of the Dean of Faculties and Associate Provost’s Tenure and Promotion Submission Guidelines and Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Review, both published annually. The university’s revisions to the annual review criteria (effective January 1, 2010) have also been incorporated.

2. Expectations and Responsibilities

The expectations of the Look College for its faculty are that they continually strive for excellence in teaching, establish and maintain an impactful research program that leads to a national and international reputation in their area, and be a contributing member of the faculty by providing a reasonable level of service to the department and by providing a reasonable level of service to the profession. More specifically, the mandatory intermediate reviews and the annual faculty reviews are expected to evaluate scholarly contributions to our undergraduate and graduate teaching programs, student advising, research, and engagement. Specifically, the impact of faculty members’ activities on academic endeavors is of paramount importance.

Department heads are primarily responsible for ensuring that university and Look College procedures are followed so that each faculty member receives a fair and timely assessment of his or her accomplishments and performance. The overall purpose of these guidelines is to ensure the integrity of the annual review, intermediate review, and tenure and promotion process in order to retain and promote the best faculty possible. Within these overall procedures, it is specifically noted that departmental practices may differ because of variations in department size, the nature of departmental faculty, the degree of inter/multidisciplinary activity, and academic mission. Departmental procedures should be reviewed regularly to ensure compliance with System Policy, University Rules, and College Guidelines while achieving departmental objectives. Recommended procedures for each of the three review processes are included in this document.

3. Faculty Annual Performance Reviews

All faculty members, whether tenured, tenure track, or non-tenure track, must have an annual written review, for which the department heads are responsible. University Rule 12.01.99.M2, section 2.5, explains the purpose, basis, and requirements for the faculty annual review process. Section 2.5.4 specifically addresses annual reviews for faculty who hold joint appointments. For faculty holding budgeted joint appointments, “… there should be one department where more than 50% of the appointment is located; the head of that department is responsible for the final evaluation.”

The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department head to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases. The Dean of Faculties’ Guidelines for Annual & Midterm Reviews states, “These reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and never later than June 15 of each year.” We will follow the spirit of these guidelines, with provisions made for providing more timely input to the faculty involved in the intermediate review process, and
to better facilitate the budgetary cycles. In the Look College, annual reviews will focus either on the immediately previous academic year or the previous calendar year, at the discretion of the department head.

3.1 Required Documentation
In December of each year, department heads should request that all faculty submit a Faculty Progress Report and Tenure/Promotion Information (FPR) form.

3.2 Process
During January through March, FPRs are reviewed by the department head, and a departmental/divisional committee as appropriate. The department head meets with individual faculty to discuss their progress and to provide and receive verbal feedback. Other individuals, such as a division head or associate/assistant department head, or tenure and promotion committee chair may also be included in the meeting with individual faculty members at the discretion of the department head. The discussion should specifically address the following areas: (1) teaching and student advising; (2) research and scholarly publications; (3) service; (4) safety and safety compliance; (5) plans for the coming year; and (6) the department head’s summary and recommendations. In evaluating teaching, research, and service, contributions made to support interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary programs and contributions made to enhancing diversity and internationalization climate and experiences should be recognized.

After meeting with the faculty member, a written evaluation of the faculty member’s progress/performance is prepared by the department head encompassing the areas listed above (sample is available from the college’s manager of faculty services). No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating if they have not complied with all mandatory university training programs. In cases where a faculty member has been notified of a mandatory training requirement near the time of the end of the evaluation period, they shall be given 30 days to complete the requirement. Likewise, the faculty member must certify their attentiveness to safety and compliance. To satisfy these requirements the following acknowledgements must be added to the “ACKNOWLEDGEMENT” portion of the department head’s written evaluation and the faculty member must initial each:

- I acknowledge that I have completed all mandatory university training programs.
- I will, on a continuing and timely basis, address any safety deficiencies, report any and all safety concerns to the department head, and demonstrate compliance with safety standards as defined by the Environmental Health & Safety Department.

Faculty members are also required to acknowledge receipt of the written evaluation by returning a signed copy of the document to the department head. A signed copy is to be placed in the faculty member’s departmental personnel file. At that time, the faculty member may add a response to the written evaluation so that it may also be included in their personnel file. If a faculty member has a complaint concerning their written evaluation they may meet with the executive associate dean (EAD), but only after providing a response and discussing that response with the department head. The department head may be included in the meeting with the faculty member, at the discretion of the EAD. As stated in 2.5.3.6 of University Rule 12.01.99.M2: Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure and Promotion, the faculty member may instead write a letter to the dean with a copy to the dean of faculties.

On or before June 15 of each year signed copies of reviews for tenure track faculty should be forwarded to the EAD. Department heads must also provide a memo, which certifies that all faculty (tenured, tenure track, non-tenure track) have been reviewed, have received feedback, and have signed a copy of their written review. In this memo the department heads should specifically indicate any tenure track faculty member
who is not progressing satisfactorily toward an affirmative tenure decision. Likewise, an unsatisfactory performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member must also be reported. As part of the university’s post-tenure review process, the faculty member must then prepare a written plan for near-term improvement approved by the department head and submitted to the EAD by the June 15 deadline.

**Reviews must be completed before merit raises may be recommended, and no later than June 15.**

4. **Intermediate Review of Probationary Faculty Members**

The process of midterm reviews was instituted to ensure that tenure track faculty members have a clear understanding of their current status and progress toward tenure and promotion. The university requires all tenure track faculty members hired with a probationary period of seven years to have an intermediate (or midterm) review. Intermediate reviews for tenure track faculty members hired with a probationary period of between four and six years are encouraged but not required by the university. Department heads may conduct a slightly more in-depth “annual review” of a faculty member on a less than seven year probationary period in lieu of a formal intermediate review. The university requires both departmental and college-level tenure and promotion (T&P) committees review and provide input into the formal intermediate review process.

As an additional note, since the mandatory intermediate review may take the place of the annual faculty performance review (at the department head’s discretion), all items and acknowledgements mentioned above must be incorporated into the intermediate review unless already stated in a separate annual review.

4.1 **Required Documentation**

Department heads should meet with intermediate review candidates during December or January to discuss the intermediate review process. The college manager for faculty services will provide each department with a list of mandatory intermediate review candidates. The following items should be requested of the candidate by a reasonable deadline to conduct the review:

- Three page statement maximum on their teaching, research, and service philosophies
- *Faculty Progress Report and Tenure/Promotion Information Form (FPR)*
- Up-to-date curriculum vitae (CV) (useful for those with experience elsewhere)
- Copies of two of their most significant papers published while at Texas A&M University

4.2 **Process**

During February or March the departmental T&P committee reviews each case and provides written evaluation and recommendations to the department head. Departmental recommendations are due to the college by the second Friday of April. At that time the department head should submit the following items to the EAD:

One original copy in single-sided, unstapled format (folders are not needed), and one electronic copy, both in the following order:

- Department head’s written preliminary report regarding the candidate’s performance in all areas of review. This report must be signed by the department head.
- Departmental T&P committee’s written evaluation/recommendation addressing teaching, student advising, research, scholarship, and service, including any individual reports on teaching, research, and service. Supporting documents, such as teaching evaluation data, may be added after this item.
- Information submitted by the faculty candidate (in the order stated under 4.1).
• During April and May the College of Engineering Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee (CETPAC) reviews each case and provides a written evaluation and recommendation on each to the dean.
• In May and/or June the dean and/or EAD will meet with department heads to discuss all recommendations and the overall outcome of each case. Department heads prepare a final report/memo to faculty members considering input from the CETPAC and the dean. Department heads meet with individual faculty to discuss their progress and present the faculty member with the formal written review. Faculty members will acknowledge receipt of their evaluation by signing the document. A signed copy is sent to the office of the EAD, and the original document is retained in the faculty member’s personnel file.

5. Tenure & Promotion Reviews

5.1 Criteria and Performance Measures for Appointment and Advancement

Section 4.5.4 of the University’s Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion (University Rule 12.01.99.M2 - Section 4.4) addresses exceptions to the normal requirements for tenure and promotion.

“Exceptions to the normal requirements for tenure and promotion may sometimes be warranted. Examples would include (a) gifted and productive master teachers who are abreast of their field but who have not contributed extensively to the development of new knowledge, (b) exceptionally outstanding researchers whose teaching is merely acceptable, and (c) tenured faculty whose sustained service to the University is unselfish, distinctive and outstanding, but whose teaching and research are only acceptable. Few faculty will possess qualities such as these, but those who do deserve recognition and advancement.”

Most faculty should be evaluated for tenure and promotion on accomplishments in each of the three major categories of performance (teaching and student advising, research, and service/engagement), but with primary emphasis on teaching and the creation and dissemination of new knowledge or other creative activities, including patents or commercialization of research, where applicable. Recent changes made to the faculty review criteria mandate awarding appropriate credit to faculty who actively work toward achieving the university’s goals in three major areas: (1) supporting multidisciplinary collaboration; (2) enhancing diversity and internationalization climate and experiences; and (3) requiring appropriate attention to safety and compliance.

Imperatives for tenure and promotion in the Look College are: effective classroom instruction, successful advising of undergraduate and graduate students, ability to sustain an independent research program, scholarly contributions, and evidence of service/engagement.

Although some quantitative measures of evaluation may be employed, excellence in performance is of primary importance; that is, the quality, significance, and impact of accomplishments are of much greater importance than their numbers. For tenure and promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required.

Please see Attachment A for information regarding criteria for tenure and promotion in the Department of Engineering Technology and Industrial Distribution.
5.2 Outside Professional Experience
It is important that engineering faculty be aware of the current state of professional practice and research. Continuing interaction with industry and the professional research community is essential to a faculty member’s maintaining professional currency. Mechanisms for accomplishing this continuing development may include: summer/temporary employment or faculty development leaves at other universities, within industry or government laboratories, and consulting activities.

5.3 Time of Service within Rank
There is no firm period of service required for advancement in the Look College. Rather, advancement will be based on accomplishments, which merit tenure and/or promotion. Determining the year of mandatory consideration for tenure track faculty is calculated as follows:

Calendar year hired + Probationary period – 2 years = Tenure Consideration Year

Normally, one academic year is required for preparation and processing of cases for promotion and/or tenure. Successful recommendations will result in the advancement becoming effective at the beginning of the following academic year (i.e., September 1).

5.4 Identifying Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion Consideration
The department head and/or the departmental T&P committee should identify candidates for tenure and/or promotion by February 15 of each calendar year. A memo should be sent to all non-tenured tenure track faculty, as well as to all associate professors (tenured and non-tenured) to 1) inform them that they are up for mandatory tenure and/or promotion, or 2) ask them if they would like to be considered for tenure and/or promotion. A reasonable deadline should be established so that the department head can begin the process. Once candidates are identified, they should receive a copy of the current tenure and promotion procedures and guidelines of the university (available from the dean of faculties website), the college and the department (if separate from the college).

5.5 Required Documentation
Department heads should meet individually with candidates to discuss the process. They should be instructed (in writing) to prepare and submit the following items to the department head or a designate (typically a staff coordinator for the process) by a reasonable deadline that will allow time for selection of the external reviewers and solicitation of letters by March 31, and no later than May 31:

- A concise statement (three pages, single spaced, maximum) on goals, philosophies, strategies and emphasis on carrying out professional responsibilities in teaching, research and service/engagement.
- Up-to-date curriculum vitae (CV) with a signed statement that the CV being submitted is current and correct as of the date of signature.
- A list of between six and eight names of potential external reviewers, together with a short biography of each. According to university guidelines, the reviewers should be from peer institutions/programs or better. The candidate should also be asked to provide a list of individuals that they do not want contacted to be an external reviewer.
- A list of up to three potential reviewers from within the Texas A&M community who can address interdisciplinary and/or internationalization activities, as applicable (optional).
- The College’s Faculty Progress Report and Tenure/Promotion Information Form (FPR).
- Copies of selected refereed publications (their most significant papers published while at Texas A&M) to be forwarded to external reviewers. Departments may set limits on the number of publications to be submitted.
• Other materials as may be requested by departmental T&P committees or the department head (e.g. a teaching portfolio)

The department head should make it clear to the candidate that these materials may be updated at any stage of the process, and that updates should be signed and dated by the candidate.

5.6 Solicitation of External Reviewers

University guidelines on the method of selection of reviewers must be followed: at least one from the candidate’s list; at least one from the department head’s or departmental T&P committee’s list; and no one designated by the candidate as not to be contacted. In addition, efforts should be made to avoid individuals with whom the candidate has had an unusually close working relationship, such as the candidate’s faculty advisor or post-doctoral advisor. Letters from former students are irrelevant except as supportive documents for the teaching evaluation.

To better facilitate the solicitation of input from external reviewers for tenure and promotion cases, the process should take place mid-spring. Department heads are required to review all potential external reviewers to ensure they are from recognized peer institutions/programs or better and are clear leaders in the field. The departmental T&P committee may provide input. Contact with these individuals requesting their service as a reviewer must be in the form of a personal letter from the department head. The department head may make telephone or email inquiries to potential reviewers prior to the letter request. This letter, along with selected materials for review, should be sent to external reviewers by March 31, and no later than May 31. The college expects a minimum of six letters with a minimum of four letters received from reviewers selected by the departmental T&P committee and/or department head, and a minimum of two letters received from reviewers selected by the candidate. Departments should request no more than eight letters in the initial solicitation, ideally four from the candidate’s selections and four from the departmental selections. The solicitation letter must contain the following statement:

Your review will be kept confidential; however, Texas is an open records state and your review could be requested and relinquished.

If a solicitation letter is sent containing a request for specific examples of the candidate’s current and potential scholarship and/or impact of teaching and service and the required statement above, and the referee declines to write a letter for the candidate, that reviewer must still be listed in the dossier reviewer chart, indicating that they declined.

At no time is the candidate to inquire about the status of the reviewers he/she nominates, or to contact them.

5.7 Process

Once the necessary number of external review letters has been received, they, along with the other items submitted by the candidate, should be made available to the departmental tenure and promotion committee (see section 7) for review. The candidate’s items may be given to the committee prior to receipt of the external letters at the discretion of the department head. In either case, confidentiality of hard copy and electronic files should be maintained throughout the process. Signed and dated updates by the candidate should be distributed immediately to the committee members and department head, and incorporated into the candidate’s original copy items.

The departmental tenure and promotion committee meets to discuss and vote on each candidate, as described in section 7.2. This committee also prepares teaching, research and service peer evaluations as required for the dossier.
The department head prepares a separate recommendation evaluating the candidate’s teaching, research, and service. This document must:

- Provide a general basis for strength and weakness of the case
- Provide an explanation of the candidate’s impact on academic endeavors
- Provide the context of this particular case within the department
- Explain special considerations (i.e., early promotion/tenure, delays in promotion/tenure, special hiring circumstances)
- Explain any mixed or negative votes if not explained in the committee’s report
- Explain the department head’s vote, especially if contrary to the departmental committee’s recommendation.

Other considerations itemized in section 7.3 should also be addressed. The departmental T&P coordinator then structures all documents into the dossier for submission to the dean.

The department head is responsible for notifying each candidate of the outcome at every level, including the departmental committee’s vote, the department head’s vote, the dean’s vote, the university’s decision, and ultimately the Board of Regents decision. The dean will notify the department heads of decisions at the college, university and system level so that they can relay that information to the candidate.

5.8 Non-tenure Track Promotion

Promotions within the non-tenure track faculty title ranks should be initiated in the same timeline and manner as stated in this section. The process for these promotions mimics the tenure track/tenured promotion process, but does not require external reviewer letters. A non-tenure track faculty may engage in one or more academic activities, but not in all three (viz: teaching; research; service). More specifically, in the “lecturer” track, faculty are responsible for only one of these activities. All those with “professor” in their title must have two academic activities. The evaluation of non-tenure track faculty promotion and retention should focus on appropriate academic activities. External reviewer letters should be replaced by a minimum of three (3) recommendation letters that may be internal or external, but should strongly address the performance and impact of the candidate’s academic activities. Departmental committee review must include peer non-tenure track faculty input (see section 7.1).

6. College Tenure & Promotion Committee

6.1 Selection and Structure

University Rule 12.01.99.M2, section 4.6.3 states, “In conducting tenure and/or promotion reviews, the dean shall draw upon the advice and counsel of a college-wide tenure and promotion committee.” The CETPAC is comprised of one member from each academic department. The college’s executive associate dean serves as ex officio chair of this committee, and does not vote in this venue.

Department heads nominate two members of the departmental review committee and the dean makes the final decision regarding appointment to CETPAC, ensuring that the committee is diverse. Members serve a two-year term, with half of the representatives being held over for the next year’s committee and half rotating off the committee. Members are not allowed to vote on cases from their home department. Committee deliberations and final votes are presented to the dean. The dean may also seek input from the college’s associate deans, but it is the dean with whom the final decision rests.

6.2 College Committee’s Report and Recommendation

The college committee’s report and recommendation should be similar to the departmental T&P committee
report, reflecting the ultimate vote of the committee and the primary issues that convinced members to vote one way or the other.

7. Department Tenure & Promotion Committee

7.1 Selection and Structure
Departmental T&P committees shall consist of five to nine members who, except as noted below, are tenured full professors in the department. The Look College requires that tenured associate professors participate in the committee evaluation of tenure track assistant professors for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. Regarding jointly funded appointments, note that only faculty members ad loc’d to the department can participate in that department’s tenure and promotion review process. This committee shall be constituted as follows: at least half or a majority of the committee shall consist of members elected by the departmental faculty. To provide area balance or interdisciplinary representation and ensure diversity of the committee, the department head may appoint not more than two full professors from outside the department, or tenured associate professors from within the department. Associate professors must recuse themselves from any deliberations or votes concerning the promotion of faculty to full professor. Care should be taken so that the size of the committee is sufficient to ensure proper evaluation of candidates for full professor once associate professors have been excused. The members of the committee should be appointed or elected to staggered terms to ensure that not more than one-half of the committee rotates off on an annual basis. Two year staggered terms are recommended. The department head shall appoint the chair of the committee.

As an alternative to the above procedure, the committee may be constituted of all tenured faculty in a department (preferably maintaining the five member minimum). Tenured associate professors in the committee are required to recuse themselves from any deliberations or votes concerning the promotion of faculty to full professor.

As stated in section 5.8, peer non-tenure track committee members (a minimum of two (2); one elected and one appointed) must be included in the departmental review of non-tenure track faculty promotions.

7.2 Operation of the Departmental Tenure & Promotion Committee
The departmental T&P committee shall review every tenure track faculty member for their intermediate and mandatory tenure reviews. Additional reviews may be done at the request of either the candidate or the department head. Tenured associate professors shall be reviewed by the committee for promotion upon request by either the candidate or the department head. Prospective faculty members whose recommended appointment is with tenure must also be reviewed by this committee. If, as a result of an annual performance review, a tenure track faculty member is recommended by the department head for non-reappointment prior to their mandatory tenure review, he or she must be reviewed by the committee and the results of this review must be submitted through the department head to the dean with the recommendation for non-reappointment.

For the tenure and promotion process, the departmental committee is charged with:

- Review and evaluation of the candidate’s dossier
- Preparing separate written peer reviews on each candidate’s teaching, research, and service/engagement (authorship of these documents should be clearly delineated, and the author/s should sign)
- Preparing a complete report and recommendation explaining the committee’s vote and reasoning for their recommendation, and, if applicable, an overview of the candidate’s progress and impact as it relates to their suitability for eventual promotion and/or tenure (see item 7.3) (to be signed by all committee members).
The committee may seek input from other sources, including division heads or other faculty. However, these individuals shall not be present during the committee's final deliberations, nor shall they be present during voting. Since the committee is viewed as advisory to both the department head and the dean, its vote should be independent of any action by the department head. Hence, the department head should not be present during committee discussions or voting.

A secret ballot should be used to record the committee's vote that will be reported by the committee chair to the department head, who will forward it to the dean. At least two committee members should count the votes and the results should be announced to the committee immediately. All committee members must be present and absentee ballots should not be used, unless an explicit waiver is received from the department head or his/her designee. A written proxy may be allowed in emergency situations. Committee members should not abstain from voting, except in unusual circumstances such as conflict of interest. In these cases, the committee member should recuse him/herself from the discussion of the candidate as well as the voting.

7.3 Departmental Tenure & Promotion Committee Report

The departmental T&P committee report should address the areas of teaching, research, and service/engagement. The report should also include information regarding the faculty member’s contributions to multidisciplinary collaborations, technology commercialization and enhancing diversity and internationalization climate and experiences (at the university and/or college levels). The committee must summarize its conclusions concerning each candidate with sufficient information for the department head, dean, and upper administration to understand the reasoning behind their recorded vote. A mixed vote would require further explanation of both the candidate’s demonstrated abilities, and the committee’s concerns.

Other considerations for the departmental committee report are:

- **Authorship** of the final report is to be made clear and the report is to be signed by all committee members.
  - University guidelines recommend that a statement such as, “The opinions and conclusions stated in this report regarding the candidate accurately reflect the views of the T&P committee,” appear at the end of each report.
- **Authorship protocol** must be addressed by the departmental committee or by the department head, especially relating to ordering of authors and how team members must contribute in order to be listed as a coauthor.
- **Quality and impact.** Departmental committees and department heads should be mindful of the multiple audiences who review the T&P files and need to address “quality and impact” factors within their specific discipline. Assume the audience is unfamiliar with the field. Some example areas: the importance of an award or citation; service and/or election to a professional organization; why published conference papers may be more significant than journal publications.
- **Acronyms** should be defined at first use, i.e., American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME). Again, assume the audience is unfamiliar with the field.
- **Identification of Courses.** If reference is made to a course at first use the complete title of the course must be stated i.e. Thermodynamics for Aerospace Engineers (AERO 212).
ALLOWED, PROMOTION AND TENURE OF FACULTY
IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY &
INDUSTRIAL DISTRIBUTION

This document supplements the Look College’s Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Procedures, specifically for the faculty within the Department of Engineering Technology and Industrial Distribution (ETID).

It is explicitly recognized that scholarly, archival journal publications are not the only indicators of professional accomplishment and excellence for the ETID faculty. Other appropriate indicators may include:

- Publications of an applied nature in refereed academic proceedings and/or journals and editorially reviewed trade publications
- Textbooks and/or chapters in textbooks
- Case studies published in peer refereed academic publications
- New processes, techniques and devices developed in response to industry needs
- Innovative teaching techniques and publications adopted by peer institutions
- Curriculum and laboratory development and enhancement

For faculty in industrial distribution, recognized publications dealing with management, marketing, logistics, distribution, or similar areas, may also be appropriate indicators.

Degree and Professional Requirements
For the ranks of assistant and associate professor on tenure track, a Ph.D. degree in a discipline appropriate to the program is normally required. While a B.S. degree in engineering or engineering technology from an ABET-accredited program is normally required for engineering technology, a degree in business or an alternative educational background may be acceptable in industrial distribution. Other circumstances may exist where relevancy and appropriateness of the faculty member’s education and experience are deemed acceptable.

All departmental programs are oriented toward serving industry. Normally, candidates for appointment and promotion will have industrial experience and remain current in industrial practices in their particular fields of study by interacting with industry and by participating in various professional activities.

Assistant professors in ETID should meet the minimum university requirements for that rank, and will typically have at least three additional years of professional experience to include (but not limited to) consulting, society or association activity in state or national conferences, invited lectures, chaired sessions, or similar activities, with continuing industrial relationships.

Professors should meet the university’s requirements for the associate professor rank, and have at least four additional years of professional experience with strong continuing industrial interaction. For promotion to or appointment as professor, an earned Ph.D., Sc.D., DEng, or other appropriate doctoral degree in a field relevant to the individual’s role in the department is normally required.

Consulting, summer/temporary employment or faculty development leaves with industry, or sponsored research on industrial projects qualifies as industry interactions and industrial experience for purposes of meeting the above requirements.
Criteria for Advancement

Evaluations for appointment and advancement will include the areas of teaching, research or successful design, publications and professional service. Candidates are expected to present evidence of originality and impact of the individual’s work (i.e., texts adopted by other schools; original devices; products or techniques used in industry; consulting expertise resulting in industry’s acceptance of new methods to increase productivity or profitability). Participation in externally funded research, design and development is strongly encouraged. Evaluation of such work will be in terms of its originality and value to the sponsor rather than the size of the funds involved. A candidate for promotion to professor would be expected to have a state and national reputation for his/her accomplishments, and be recognized as an authority in his/her field by peers and industrialists.

To be awarded tenure and/or promoted to associate professor, the ability to remain professionally viable, to lead in further development of the field, and to mentor both students and junior faculty will be strongly considered.