



The Department of Polymer Science  
Goodyear Polymer Center  
Akron, OH 44325-3909  
(330) 972-5738 Office  
(330) 972-5290 Fax

DATE:

To: Rex D. Ramsier  
Sr. VP & Provost

FROM: Eric J. Amis  
Dean

SUBJECT: Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Guidelines and Criteria


The attached guidelines have been approved by the faculty of the Department of Polymer Science on.

I have approved all attached guidelines and criteria.

If you concur, we ask that you also approve the guidelines and criteria.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Department Chair or Faculty Representative

4/27/2018  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean  
College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering

4/27/18  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sr. VP & Provost

5-21-18  
Date

---

# Table of Contents

---

<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II. COMMITTEES AND THEIR PROCEDURES .....</b>	<b>4</b>
General Procedures for all Reappointment(s), Tenure(s), and Promotion(s) - (RTP).....	4
<b>III. CRITERIA FOR RTP EVALUATIONS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
General Evaluation Criteria.....	6
<b>IV. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR ATTAINMENT OF REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION .....</b>	<b>8</b>
A.) Minimum Requirements for Reappointment in the First Year	
B.) Minimum Requirements for Reappointment after the First Year	
C.) Minimum Requirements for Tenure	
D.) Minimum Requirements for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor	
E.) Minimum Requirements for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor	
<b>V. SPECIFIC PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT .....</b>	<b>19</b>
A. Reappointment of Regular Faculty during the first year	
B. Reappointment of Regular Faculty after the first year	
<b>VI. SPECIFIC PROCEDURES FOR TENURE .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>VII. SPECIFIC PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION.....</b>	<b>22</b>

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

---

Most of the procedures for faculty retention, tenure and promotion actions are laid down by the current collective bargaining agreement (CBA) between the University of Akron and The American Association of University Professors, The University of Akron Chapter. In order to avoid having to substantially revise these guidelines when a new bargaining agreement is negotiated, reference to the text in the bargaining agreement will be made wherever possible. These references will be as general as possible in hopes of the need for revisions due simply to changing in paragraph and section numbering in the collective bargaining agreement. The procedures and criteria applicable to a particular faculty member's application for retention, tenure, or promotion may differ depending on the date of hire, as specified in the CBA. **It is imperative that candidates for RTP actions inform themselves in a timely manner of their privileges and responsibilities under applicable rules and the CBA.**

The following procedures and criteria have been adopted by the bargaining unit members of the Department of Polymer Science (DPS) to handle departmental recommendations that must be forwarded to the Dean of the College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering concerning reappointment, tenure and promotion.

### **Faculty Members with Administrative Appointment**

Cases in which a faculty member with an administrative appointment requires a RTP action will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.

### **Probationary Periods**

The length of the probationary period and when individuals may apply for tenure or promotion are specified by the current CBA.

### **General Procedures and Calendar for RTP**

General procedures and the timeline for all RTP actions are set by the current CBA.

## **II. COMMITTEES AND THEIR PROCEDURES**

---

### **General Procedures for all Reappointment(s), Tenure(s), and Promotion(s) - (RTP)**

Reappointments are mandated each year until a tenure action has been taken.

Rules to include on RTP committees individuals from outside the academic unit when necessary:

- the individual will be selected from science or engineering departments
- the individual will have appropriate research expertise
- the department chair will suggest a list of possible candidates from other departments
- bargaining unit members will nominate from this list individuals willing to serve
- the individual will be elected by a simple majority

These guidelines must enumerate the specific materials to be included in the candidate's RTP file, to the extent that materials are required beyond those specified in the current CBA.

The candidate is responsible for seeing that the following items are included in the candidate's file.

- a current vita
- narrative statement by the candidate addressing how he or she has met the university-wide and DPS-specific criteria for the personnel action in question (i.e. tenure or promotion)
- a table of contents of materials included in the RTP file. This table of contents shall be amended to reflect any additions or deletions to the RTP file.
- all previous RTP recommendations from committees, DPS chairs, or deans
- evidence of work performance, including results of teaching evaluations where applicable
- evidence of professional activity
- evidence of service

In addition, the file shall contain the following.

- external reviews, where pertinent

The chair of the RTP committee shall study the guidelines and timetable for RTP actions in the current CBA. In particular, attention must be paid to

- any requirement that the RTP committee meet with the candidate before a recommendation is issued,
- any requirements for written justification of the recommendation
- any requirements (indicated by the words "shall" or "will") for providing directions to a candidate for reappointment as to how he or she can or should enhance performance toward the goal of attaining tenure or promotion.

Appropriate notice for the candidate of the first meeting of the RTP committee in which the RTP committee report is discussed shall be achieved by requiring that the time for the RTP committee's first meeting is announced at a departmental faculty meeting in the first week of the fall semester.

The committee chair will invite the candidate to meet with the committee, providing the candidate an opportunity to remark on his or her record and to answer questions about his or her record from members of the committee. The candidate shall then be excused from the meeting. The committee will create lists of any favorable and any unfavorable comments that reflect the essence of the deliberations and these will be incorporated in the minutes. Those minutes will be made available to the candidate. Then the candidate will be asked in writing whether he/she wishes to rebut any new unfavorable comments. If the candidate wishes to rebut unfavorable comments, the candidate will be invited to appear at another meeting of the RTP committee.

Upon the call for the vote to initiate a secret ballot, a vote by secret written ballot is commenced. Tellers are appointed by the Chair of the RTP Committee to count the vote whenever all eligible committee members have voted. This process will take no longer than a calendar week, which will allow for absentee ballots to be received from those members eligible to vote based on their participation in the deliberation, but unable to attend the final meeting where the votes were cast.

### **III. CRITERIA FOR RTP EVALUATIONS**

---

The DPS is mainly engaged in graduate study programs. Hence its criteria for faculty recognition and advancement take cognizance of this emphasis. The four general areas for review are: (1) quality of teaching, (2) quality of scholarship and research activity, (3) quality of service to the department, college, university, and profession, and (4) professional conduct. The first two areas are of utmost importance, although service to the department, college, and university and professional conduct are expected of all faculty. Criteria to be considered in each of these areas must include those listed in the current CBA, but also include the criteria below.

#### **General Evaluation Criteria**

1. Teaching Activity
  - a. Courses taught with evaluations of courses by students and other faculty, including the Department Chair.
  - b. Effective mentoring of M.S. and Ph.D students
    - i) theses and dissertations completed with their abstracts
    - ii) current M.S. and Ph.D. graduate research students
    - iii) thesis and dissertation committee involvement
    - iv) evidence of successful student mentoring
  - c. Grants and funding proposals for teaching
    - i) submission of unsuccessful proposals
    - ii) successful proposals
  - d. Texts or lab manuals prepared
2. Quality of Scholarship and Research Activities
  - a. Scholarship
    - i) titles of all publications and papers accepted for publication with full reprints (or full preprints) from work done at UA or for which the candidate is a corresponding author.
    - ii) papers submitted for publication (and not yet accepted)
    - iii) invention disclosures, patents files and issued, evidence of profit or nonprofit startups
    - iv) invited lectures at regional, national, or international meetings with preprints or abstracts (if available) from work at UA or elsewhere
    - v) major awards
    - vi) research papers (or posters) presented at regional, national, or international meetings with abstracts (if available)
    - vii) meetings attended

Determining the quality and impact of the overall scholarly effort is of utmost importance in the RTP Committee evaluation of the candidate.

b. Research Activity

- i) current, and previously funded grants and contracts at UA or elsewhere, if applicable.
- ii) pending, and previously unfunded proposals submitted from UA or submitted independently elsewhere, if applicable.
- iii) current and past non-student coworkers (post-doctoral and visiting scientists) at UA or elsewhere, if applicable.

The evidence of several well-developed research proposals that have been persistently submitted for funding is most important, even though funding may not have been available. Success at some level appropriate to the research field is presumed possible after several years of effort.

3. Quality of Service

a. Service inside the university

- i) DPS and interdisciplinary/interdepartmental committee work
- ii) college (CPSPE) committee work
- iii) university committee work

b. Service outside the university

- i) to the profession
  - editorial
  - papers reviewed
  - meetings organized or chaired
  - professional society committees
- ii) to the community
  - science education at the primary or secondary level
  - civic science/engineering involvement

4. Professional conduct

There is an expectation that collegial and cooperative behavior should be evident in all of our endeavors. In all of the RTP committee work it is required because DPS faculty ultimately may have to represent the DPS attitudes to the rest of the university community and in appeal processes.

Various examples of specific university policies and professional ethics guidelines are given in the current CBA.

## **IV. Minimum Requirements for Attainment of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion**

---

Minimum requirements have been established for reappointment, tenure and promotion. The purpose of the minimum requirements is to discourage premature applications and to provide objective bounds to the degree to which outstanding performance as measured by one criterion can be considered to offset deficient performance as measured by another. It is expected that individuals progressing satisfactorily as contributing members of the faculty will have accomplishments that substantially exceed the minimum requirements in all categories of the specific criteria. **Attainment of the minimum level of performance shall not ensure a positive recommendation in response to the application.**

### **A. Minimum Requirements for Reappointment after the First Year**

#### **1. Teaching Activity**

- a. Coursework teaching
  - Student and peer evaluations of teaching by the candidate shall indicate at least adequate teaching effectiveness
- b. M.S. and Ph.D students
  - i) Candidate shall have served on at least one Formal seminar committee, Research Presentation committee, or thesis committee each year.
  - ii) Candidate shall have demonstrated due diligence in attempts to recruit qualified students to the department or to his or her research group. A candidate is expected to have at least one graduate student advisee by the end of the second year.
  - iii) Mentoring of any graduate student assigned to the candidate as an advisee shall have been performed diligently.

#### **2. Scholarship and Research Activities**

- a. Scholarship
  - i) For candidates having completed two full years of service at UA, at least one publication, for which the candidate is a co-author, shall have been submitted in a recognized scientific journal in the previous year.
  - ii) Candidate shall have given at least one talk or poster at a national meeting in the previous year.
- b. Research Activity



- i) Candidate shall have submitted at least one well-developed proposal to an external agency in the previous year.
- ii) Submission of proposals to external agencies shall be deemed considerably more important than submissions for internal UA funds. However, successful submission of an internal proposal for project funding or summer salary funding from a university fund shall be looked upon favorably.
- iii) Submission of invention disclosures and participation in patent prosecution shall be viewed favorably.

3. Service

a. Service inside the university

- i) The candidate shall have served diligently on departmental and interdisciplinary/interdepartmental committees as assigned. For candidates having completed two full years of service at UA, the committee workload shall be commensurate with an average committee workload of faculty in the department.
- ii) The candidate shall have served diligently on college committees as assigned by the dean or elected by colleagues in the college. For candidates having completed two full years of service at UA, the committee workload shall be commensurate with an average college committee workload of faculty in the department.
- iii) university committee work

b. Service outside the university

- i) the profession
  - The candidate shall have demonstrated service to the profession by serving as reviewer for at least two scientific articles or proposals to outside agencies in the last year.
- ii) to the community
  - The candidate shall have been involved in at least one type of academic service to the community during his or her time at UA prior to application for reappointment.

4. Professional Conduct

Evidence of violations of the rules of conduct outlined in the CBA shall be considered.

**B. Minimum Requirements for Tenure**

The minimum requirements for tenure are written to address primarily an application for tenure from a regular faculty member currently at the rank of assistant professor. However, the minimum requirements noted here provide guidance also for the case in which the award of tenure is sought to accompany an offer for an initial appointment in the department at a faculty rank higher than that of assistant professor. In the case of tenure with initial hire (initial hires dealt with in a separate DPS guideline document), it is the overall level of teaching, research and scholarship, and service that is considered, not where that teaching, research and scholarship, and service was done. An individual shall be considered eligible for tenure upon hiring only if he or she has attained an overall level of achievement comparable to that reflected in the following requirement, recognizing that depending on the career path that individual has followed, e.g. in industry or a government laboratory, he or she may not have had the opportunity to engage in activities that precisely match those commonly pursued in an academic department such as ours. **It is expected that an individual requesting tenure with an initial appointment will have accomplishments that substantially exceed the minimum requirements in all categories of the specific criteria.** Attainment of the minimum level of performance shall not ensure a positive recommendation in response to the application.

1. Teaching Activity

- a. Coursework teaching
  - The candidate's teaching in at least two classes shall have been positively reviewed by a peer in the department.
  - Student and peer evaluations of teaching by the candidate shall indicate at least adequate teaching effectiveness on average.
  - In the year preceding application for tenure the candidate will have carried a classroom teaching load at least equivalent to the average classroom teaching load of other faculty in the department.

- b. M.S. and Ph.D students
  - i) Candidate shall have served on at least three Formal seminar committees, at least three Research Presentation committees, and at least three thesis or dissertation committees during the probationary period.
  - ii) Candidate shall have mentored at least one graduate student to completion of a M.S. or Ph.D. degree during his/her probationary period at UA or during a previous appointment in a comparable academic environment at another institution.
  - iii) Candidate shall have demonstrated due diligence in attempts to recruit qualified students to his or her research group. A candidate is expected to have at least two, 2<sup>nd</sup> or higher year graduate student advisees in good academic standing making satisfactory progress toward a degree at the time of the application for tenure.
  - iv) Mentoring of any graduate student assigned to the candidate as an advisee shall have been performed diligently.
- c. Grants and funding proposals for teaching  
Successful grant applications for the funding of teaching initiatives shall be viewed favorably by the review committee.
- d. Texts  
The completion of a text that has been used successfully in a graduate course shall be viewed favorably by the review committee.

## 2. Scholarship and Research Activities

- a. Scholarship
  - i) Candidate shall have co-authored at least eight peer-reviewed publications, at a rate of at least two per year averaged over the previous five years, for which he or she or a lab member is corresponding author, that have been accepted for publication, are in press, or have been published in recognized scientific, archival U.S. or international journals by August 1 of the calendar year in which deliberations are held on the tenure application. Unrefereed "preprints" and camera-ready conference proceedings shall not be considered acceptable to meet this requirement. *In general, successful applications shall be expected to substantially exceed this minimum requirement.*
  - ii) Submission of invention disclosures and participation in patent prosecution and evidence of profit or nonprofit startups shall be viewed favorably.
  - iii) Candidates are strongly encouraged to collaborate with colleagues at UA and elsewhere. The candidate shall,

however, be able to explain the substantial intellectual role he or she played in the work described in the eight publications considered in requirement (i) above.

- iv) Candidate shall have successfully delivered, on average, at least one invited lecture per year at regional, national, or international scientific meetings during the probationary period or in each of the five years prior to application for tenure. This achievement should be substantiated with hard copies of the conference proceedings from those meetings and abstracts of the talks.
- v) Candidate shall have attended, after initial appointment at UA, at least three other national or international scientific meetings at which the candidate presented a contributed paper or poster.
- vi) A majority of external reviews will indicate that the candidate has made a significant contribution to his or her field of research and shows the potential for making a major impact in his or her field.

b. Research Activity

- i) Candidate shall have submitted at least three well-developed proposals to external agencies during the probationary period
- ii) Within five years of August 1 of the calendar year in which the tenure deliberation is to take place, the candidate shall have received notification of funding awarded for at least one major peer-reviewed grant from an agency external to UA. This grant may have had multiple principal investigators or authors. Faculty are encouraged to engage in collaborative work in which they play a substantial intellectual role. For the purposes of this document a "major grant" is defined to be a grant from a federal agency (e.g. NSF, NIH, DOE, DOD) or a grant from an industrial sponsor or private foundation with combined direct and indirect costs sufficient to support 3 student years for students in the applicant's research group.

3. Service

a. Service inside the university

- i) The candidate shall have served diligently on departmental or interdisciplinary/interdepartmental committees as assigned by the Department Chair . The committee workload in the previous year shall have been commensurate with an average committee workload of faculty in the department.
- ii) The candidate shall have served diligently on college committees as assigned by the dean or elected by colleagues in the college. The committee workload in the previous year shall have been commensurate with an average college committee workload of faculty in the department.
- iii) The candidate shall have diligently served on any university committee to which he or she was assigned or on which he or she agreed to serve.

b. Service outside the university

- i) the profession
  - The candidate shall have demonstrated service to the profession by serving as reviewer for at least six scientific articles or proposals to outside agencies during the probationary period or have performed editorial duties involving a comparable level of effort.
  - The candidate shall also have served as session chair or organizer for at least one scientific session at a national meeting or have served in an active role in a professional society during the probationary period.
- ii) to the community
  - The candidate shall have been involved in at least one type of academic service to the community during his or her time at UA prior to application for tenure.

4. Professional Conduct

Evidence of violations of the rules of conduct outlined in the CBA shall be considered.

**C. Minimum Requirements for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor**

A candidate may not seek promotion from the rank of assistant professor to the rank of associate professor without also requesting tenure. The minimum requirements for promotion from assistant to associate professor will therefore be identical to the minimum requirements for tenure.

**D. Minimum Requirements for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**

A minimum of two years must elapse between the granting of the rank of associate professor and the application to the rank of professor.

It is possible to come to an appointment at the rank of associate professor at UA by various career paths. Promotion to the rank of professor should reflect both a candidate's overall record of achievement and his or her record of achievement since initial appointment at UA. An individual promoted to the rank of professor should have a national or international reputation in his or her field.

**1. Teaching Activity**

- a. Coursework teaching
  - Student and peer evaluations of teaching by the candidate shall indicate at least adequate teaching effectiveness on average, while serving at the rank of associate professor.
- b. Coursework development
  - Candidate will have developed and taught at least one special topics course since attaining promotion.
- c. M.S. and Ph.D students
  - i) Since appointment at the rank of associate professor the candidate will have served on at least three Formal seminar committees, at least three Research Presentation committees, and at least three thesis committees.
  - ii) The candidate shall have successfully mentored at least two graduate students to completion of a Ph.D. degree since his/her appointment at the rank of associate professor.
  - iii) The candidate shall have demonstrated due diligence in attempts to recruit qualified students to his or her research group. A candidate is expected to have at least two, 2<sup>nd</sup> or higher year graduate student advisee in good academic standing making satisfactory progress toward a degree at the time of the application for tenure.
  - iv) Mentoring of any graduate student assigned to the candidate as an advisee shall have been performed diligently.

- d. Grants and funding proposals for teaching
  - i.) Successful grant applications for the funding of teaching initiatives shall be viewed favorably by the review committee.
- e. Texts
  - i.) The completion of a text that has been used successfully in a graduate course shall be viewed favorably by the review committee.

## 2. Scholarship and Research Activities

- a. Scholarship
  - i) Since promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate shall have co-authored at least 20 peer-reviewed publications that have been accepted for publication, are in press, or have been published in recognized scientific, archival U.S. or international journals by August 1 of the calendar year in which deliberations are held on the promotion application. Unrefereed "preprints" and camera-ready conference proceedings shall not be considered acceptable to meet this requirement. *In general, successful applications shall be expected to substantially exceed this minimum requirement.*
  - ii) Submission of invention disclosures and participation in patent prosecution and evidence of profit or nonprofit startups shall be viewed favorably.
  - iii) The candidate shall have successfully delivered at least 10 invited lectures at regional, national, or international scientific meetings or at other institutions since promotion.
  - iv) A majority of external reviews should indicate that the candidate's research is held in high esteem and that he or she has made significant contributions to his or her field of research since promotion.
- b. Research Activity
  - i.) In the two years prior to the application for promotion, the candidate shall have received notification of funding awarded for at least 1 major, peer-reviewed grant from an agency external to UA, in which the candidate is the leading principle investigators. This grant may have had multiple principal investigators or authors.
  - ii.) Candidate shall have submitted at least 3 well-developed proposals to external agencies during the time he or she served at the rank of associate professor.
  - iii.) Functioning as a lead PI in a multi-investigator center-type

proposal will be viewed very favorably.

3. Service

a. Service inside the university

- i) Department  
The candidate shall have served diligently on departmental or interdisciplinary/interdepartmental committees as assigned by the Department Chair.
- ii) College  
The candidate shall have served diligently on college committees as assigned by the dean or elected by colleagues in the college.
- iii) University committee work  
The candidate shall have diligently served on any university committee to which he or she was assigned or on which he or she agreed to serve.

b. Service outside the university

There are a variety of ways in which a faculty member approaching promotion to the rank of professor may have distinguished himself or herself in service and this section of the requirements is intentionally broad to account for the rich diversity of possibilities.

- i) the profession
  - The candidate shall have demonstrated service to the profession by serving as reviewer for at least 6 scientific articles or proposals to outside agencies since the last promotion or have performed editorial duties involving a comparable level of effort.
  - The candidate shall also have served as session chair or organizer for at least one scientific session at a national meeting or have served in an active role in a professional society since the last promotion.
- ii) to the community
  - The candidate shall have been involved in at least one type of discipline-related service to the community during his or her time at UA prior to application for promotion.
- iii) The candidate shall have demonstrated a level of service to the profession or community that is markedly greater than that characteristic of the successful candidate for promotion



to the rank of associate professor. Possible types of distinguishing service could include, but are not limited to:

- membership on editorial boards
- service on the editorial staff for a journal or book
- service in a national level office in a scientific organization
- membership in a scientific review panel or oversight board or advisory panel for a federal agency or laboratory, for review of proposals, review of programs, or recommending policy directions within that agency, laboratory, program, or facility
- leading role in a community organization or project that addresses the place of scientific endeavor and science education in society

4. Professional Conduct

Evidence of violations of the rules of conduct outlined in the CBA shall be considered.

## **V. SPECIFIC PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT**

---

**Deliberation of the Committee:** The date of this committee's first meeting must have been announced at a departmental faculty meeting in the first week of instruction and no less than one week in advance of the meeting. Typically it will be convenient to convene the Reappointment Committee meeting in conjunction with (that is, immediately before or immediately after) a departmental faculty meeting and in conjunction with meetings of other RTP committees as may be functioning. The candidate for reappointment will be present to explain his or her record and answer any questions from the faculty. With the candidate present, the date for the second meeting of the Reappointment Committee will be set. This date is to be not less than one week and not more than two weeks after the date of the first meeting. The candidate will then be excused from the meeting to allow further committee deliberation.

The Committee will determine the lists of any favorable and unfavorable comments that represent the departmental view. A report containing these lists will be made available to the candidate in writing within 72 hours after the first meeting of the Reappointment Committee. The candidate will be asked in writing whether he/she wishes to rebut any new unfavorable comments. If the candidate wishes to rebut the comments, the candidate must request in writing to do so no later than 24 hours before the 2<sup>nd</sup> Committee meeting. The date of the second Committee meeting will have been set at the first meeting in consultation with the candidate so that the meeting time does not conflict with the candidate's teaching schedule.

The second meeting is held to offer the candidate an opportunity to rebut any unfavorable comments introduced in the first meeting, to deliberate further, and to entertain a call for a vote on the reappointment. After the candidate has had his/her opportunity for rebuttal, he/she shall be excused and the deliberations continued. A call for a secret ballot vote on the reappointment will be made after the deliberations are completed. The vote will be taken in accordance with the voting rules described earlier.

The final recommendation document sent to the department chair will include the components required by the current CBA. Copies of the minutes of the committee meetings will constitute a portion of the documentation of the committee's procedures and explanation of how the criteria were applied.

## **VI. SPECIFIC PROCEDURES FOR TENURE**

---

### ***Procedures for external reviews***

Procedures for choosing the individuals from which external reviews will be solicited are given in the current CBA.

When an external reviewer agrees to serve, the Tenure Committee shall arrange to have electronic copies of the following material forwarded to each reviewer, with hard copies available upon request:

- the entire record of accomplishments (listed under heading II, page 4 of this document) submitted by the candidate

Each reviewer is to be instructed briefly in writing concerning the nature of the candidate's program (e.g. Biomimicry Research and Innovation Center or other interdisciplinary/interdepartmental programs) and the categories of accomplishment for which comments from the reviewers are being sought. This instruction should address the following points:

- i) The Department of Polymer Science is engaged primarily in serving graduate students and its criteria for faculty recognition and advancement take cognizance of this emphasis.
- ii) The four general areas of review are: (1) quality of teaching, (2) quality of scholarship and research activity, (3) quality of service to the department, college, university, and profession, and (4) professional conduct.
- iii) The first two areas are of primary importance, while service and professional conduct are expected of all faculty members.
- iv) The confidentiality of reviewers' identities and their remarks will be governed by the appropriate language in the university rules and current CBA.
- v) In the case of interdisciplinary candidates, instructions to the reviewer should include a brief description of the interdisciplinary program to which the candidate belongs.

Each reviewer will be asked explicitly to remark on the suitability of the candidate's record as a basis for tenure.

### ***Tenure Committee***

The entire written record of accomplishments will be available to all faculty members on the Tenure Committee at least one week in advance of the first Tenure Committee meeting in the fall. Committee members are urged to conscientiously review the candidate's record of accomplishments at the earliest possible opportunity and definitely in advance of the first meeting of the Tenure Committee.

The date of the first meeting of the Tenure Committee must have been announced at a departmental faculty meeting in the first week of instruction and no less than one week in advance of the meeting. Typically it will be convenient to convene the Tenure Committee meeting in conjunction with (that is, immediately before or immediately after) a departmental faculty meeting and in conjunction with meetings of other RTP committees as may be functioning. The candidate for tenure will be present to explain his or her record

and answer any questions from the faculty. With the candidate present, the date for the second meeting of the Tenure Committee will be set. This date is to be not less than one week and not more than two weeks after the date of the first meeting. The candidate will then be excused from the meeting by the Tenure Committee Chair to allow further committee deliberation.

The Tenure Committee will determine the lists of any favorable and unfavorable comments that represent the departmental view. A report containing these lists will be made available to the candidate in writing within 72 hours after the first meeting of the Tenure Committee. The candidate will be asked in writing whether he/she wishes to rebut any unfavorable comments. If the candidate wishes to rebut the comments, the candidate must request in writing to do so no later than 24 hours before the second Tenure Committee meeting. The date of the second Tenure Committee meeting will have been set at the first meeting in consultation with the candidate so that the meeting time does not conflict with the candidate's teaching schedule. An account of the deliberations of the Tenure Committee will be reported by a secretary appointed from the eligible faculty present at the meeting.

The second Tenure Committee meeting is held to offer the candidate an opportunity to rebut any unfavorable comments introduced in the first meeting, to deliberate further, and to entertain a call for a vote on the tenure application. After the candidate has had his/her opportunity for rebuttal, he/she shall be excused by the chair of the meeting and the deliberations continued. A call for a secret ballot vote on the tenure will be entertained after the deliberations are completed. The vote will be taken in accordance with the voting rules described earlier.

## **VII. SPECIFIC PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION**

### ***Procedures for external reviews***

Procedures for choosing the individuals from which external reviews will be solicited are given in the current CBA.

When an external reviewer agrees to serve, the Promotion Committee shall arrange to have electronic copies of the following material forwarded to each reviewer, with hard copies available upon request:

- the entire record of accomplishments (listed under heading II, page 4 of this document) submitted by the candidate

Each reviewer is to be instructed briefly in writing concerning the nature of the candidate's program (e.g. Biomimicry Research and Innovation Center or other interdisciplinary/interdepartmental programs) and the categories of accomplishment for which comments from the reviewers are being sought. This instruction should address the following points:

- i) The Department of Polymer Science is engaged primarily in serving graduate students and its criteria for faculty recognition and advancement take cognizance of this emphasis.
- ii) The four general areas of review are: (1) quality of teaching, (2) quality of scholarship and research activity, (3) quality of service to the department, college, university, and profession, and (4) professional conduct.
- iii) The first two areas are of primary importance, while service and professional conduct are expected of all faculty members.
- iv) The confidentiality of reviewers' identities and their remarks will be governed by the appropriate language in the university rules and current CBA.
- v) In the case of interdisciplinary candidates, instructions to the reviewer should include a brief description of the interdisciplinary program to which the candidate belongs.

Each reviewer will be asked explicitly to remark on the suitability of the candidate's record as a basis for promotion.

### ***Promotion Committee***

The entire written record of accomplishments will be available to all faculty members on the Promotion Committee at least one week in advance of the first Promotion Committee meeting in the fall. Committee members are urged to conscientiously review the candidate's record of accomplishments at the earliest possible opportunity and definitely in advance of the first meeting of the Promotion Committee.

The date of the first meeting of the Promotion Committee must have been announced at a departmental faculty meeting in the first week of instruction and no less than one week in advance of the meeting. Typically it will be convenient to convene the Promotion Committee meeting in conjunction with (that is, immediately before or immediately after) a departmental faculty meeting and in conjunction with meetings of other RTP committees as may be functioning. The candidate for promotion will be present to explain his or her

record and answer any questions from the faculty. With the candidate present, the date for the second meeting of the Promotion Committee will be set. This date is to be not less than one week and not more than two weeks after the date of the first meeting. The candidate will then be excused from the meeting by the Promotion Committee Chair to allow further committee deliberation.

The Promotion Committee will determine the lists of any favorable and unfavorable comments that represent the departmental view. A report containing these lists will be made available to the candidate in writing within 72 hours after the first meeting of the Promotion Committee. The candidate will be asked in writing whether he/she wishes to rebut any unfavorable comments. If the candidate wishes to rebut the comments, the candidate must request in writing to do so no later than 24 hours before the second Promotion Committee meeting. The date of the second Promotion Committee meeting will have been set at the first meeting in consultation with the candidate so that the meeting time does not conflict with the candidate's teaching schedule. An account of the deliberations of the Promotion Committee will be reported by a secretary appointed from the eligible faculty present at the meeting.

The second Promotion Committee meeting is held to offer the candidate an opportunity to rebut any unfavorable comments introduced in the first meeting, to deliberate further, and to entertain a call for a vote on the promotion application. After the candidate has had his/her opportunity for rebuttal, he/she shall be excused by the chair of the meeting and the deliberations continued. A call for a secret ballot vote on the promotion will be entertained after the deliberations are completed. The vote will be taken in accordance with the voting rules described earlier.

In the event of a negative recommendation from the RTP committee for promotion to full professor which is upheld, the candidate shall be strongly advised to wait a minimum of two years before applying for promotion again.

## **VIII. REVISION OF RETENTION TENURE & PROMOTION PROCEDURE**

### ***A. Initiation of revision***

- i. Any tenure-track faculty member can request that the RTP Guidelines be reviewed in order to consider a revision proposed by that faculty member. In order for the review to be initiated the request must be accepted by a simple majority vote of all tenure-track bargaining unit faculty members. Abstentions will be considered equivalent to votes against initiation of review.
- ii. A review will be initiated at a minimum of once per four years. If no faculty member requests for review have been received for four years, the department chair will notify the bargaining unit faculty members of the need for a review and formation of a review committee. Reviews according to the approved review procedures which result in no revisions to the guidelines (whether none were proposed or none were accepted) will be considered as fulfilling this requirement for periodic review, allowing a maximum of four years before initiation of a subsequent review.

**B. *Revision procedure***

- i. When either a request for review from a faculty member is accepted or the four year review comes due, a committee shall be formed of a minimum of four bargaining unit tenure-track DPS faculty members, with at least two of the members having tenure. Committee members shall be elected by a simple majority of bargaining unit members eligible to vote. This committee shall meet to address the specific request for revision or periodic review. When the committee is reviewing the Guidelines it may also propose changes beyond those in the initial request if it deems these to be necessary.
- ii. The committee shall present in writing to the bargaining unit tenure-track faculty members the revisions to the Guidelines that it proposes to consider at a forthcoming meeting. The proposed revisions should be forwarded to the bargaining unit tenure track faculty members at least one week in advance of a meeting at which the revisions are to be voted on.
- iii. If the committee does not recommend any changes to the Guidelines, this recommendation will be forwarded to the bargaining unit tenure track faculty members in writing and the review process will conclude. No vote shall be required.

**C. *Acceptance of proposed changes***

- i. If the committee forwards recommendations for changes to the Guidelines to the bargaining unit tenure-track faculty members, those recommendations will be presented at a meeting of the full bargaining unit tenure-track faculty for its consideration.
- ii. Recommended revisions can be acted upon as a collection or singly. There is no requirement that revisions be only passed as a collection unless some subset of revisions must be made together to maintain logical consistency.
- iii. Each recommended revision must be accepted by a two-thirds vote of all bargaining unit tenure-track faculty members. Abstentions will be considered equivalent to votes against accepting the proposed changes. A written record of the votes for accepting revisions will be kept, a copy forwarded to all bargaining unit members, and a copy of the record sent to the department office to be stewarded with the Guidelines document.
- iv. If any revisions to the Guidelines recommended by the committee are accepted, the revised document will be forwarded to the department chair for written approval.
- v. If the department chair returns the revised Guidelines requesting changes, that request will be referred to the revision committee for consideration and the committee will once again offer recommendations to the full bargaining unit tenure-track faculty in the same manner as for the original revisions.
- vi. If after department chair approval and forwarding to the dean the revised document is returned by the dean to the department for further revision, the document and the dean's request will be referred to the revision committee. The committee will present its resulting recommendations to the full bargaining unit tenure-track faculty as specified above.