

## Report of College of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee

May 2, 2008

<u>Members</u>	<u>Term Expiring</u>
Prof. Soura Dasgupta, Chair	May 2008
Prof. Jasbir Arora	May 2009
Prof. Jacob Odgaard	May 2010

General Actions: The P&T committee addressed the charges below by inviting the DEO's and the Dean to complete the attached questionnaires. A separate questionnaire was addressed to the Dean and the five DEO's. All the principals completed their questionnaire. Additionally, the Committee Chair followed up by requesting clarifications where appropriate.

### Response to the General Charge

*The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be responsible for reviewing and evaluating the criteria for and the appropriateness of all recommendations concerning faculty promotions, tenure, and new appointments in the college and for making such recommendations to the dean and the faculty as it deems necessary.*

Since this charge is subsumed by the specific charges below, we report our conclusions by responding to the specific charges separately. We recommend three motions to College of Engineering Faculty..

### Specific Charges

#### Response to Charge 1

*Advise the Engineering Faculty Council (EFC) as to whether the reviews of tenure-track faculty complied with College of Engineering Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Promotions and with the University's Tenure and Promotion Decision Making Guidelines. Advise the EFC as to whether College and/or University policies were implemented in ways that strike the Committee as unwise.*

Two aspects need attention. (i) The Dean noted that all P&T decisions sent to him by the departments were late. He was notified of these delays in advance and was able to make his own recommendation to the Provost in time to meet his own deadline. While the delays were short, less than a week, it is desirable that all departments meet their deadlines. Anecdotal evidence, beyond the Dean's comments suggests that deadlines are infrequently met. (ii) The Dean noted that none of the final DCG letters explicitly

analyzed the external letters. This is not in keeping with the spirit of the relevant policy. The final DCG letter should analyze the external letters to guide their interpretation by the other layers of the P&T process.

### Response to Charge 2

*Review the procedures used for new appointments of tenure-track faculty in the College of Engineering during 2006-07. Advise the EFC as to whether these appointments complied with the College of Engineering Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Evaluations.*

No problems were apparent.

### Response to Charge 3

*College of Engineering Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Promotions state that in a promotion and tenure review “A closed ballot vote of the DCG members attending the group meeting shall be taken, with the votes counted at the meeting” and that “After taking into account the recommendations of the DCG and after consulting, if feasible, members of the department who did not participate in a review of the promotion/ tenure file and/or the meeting of the DCG when the final recommendation was made, to transmit an independent recommendation to the Dean ... and to indicate in the transmittal letter the vote of the DCG and the results of consultations with those named above.” Determine departmental practices with respect to permitting Departmental Consulting Group (DCG) members to vote who are not present at the group meeting at which the vote reported to the DEO was taken. Advise the EFC whether any change(s) to the procedures is needed.*

No problems were found. The P&T committee is making a motion that recommends, with some exceptions, that a week’s notice be given of the DCG meeting at which the final vote is taken.

### Response to Charge 4

*Observation by peers of classroom teaching. The College policy requires peer observation of teaching (POT) in a minimum of three sessions for every reappointment, tenure, or promotion review. Report on the adherence to this policy in the following situations:*

- (1) a tenured associate professor being reviewed for promotion to full professor for whom at least three POT sessions were conducted earlier for an promotion/tenure decision,*
- (2) an assistant professor being reviewed for tenure/promotion to associate professor for whom at least three POT sessions were conducted earlier for reappointment,*  
*and*

*(3) an assistant professor with a three-year initial appointment is reviewed for reappointment.*

*Advise the EFC whether any change(s) to the procedures is needed.*

All departments are in compliance with this policy.

#### Response to Charge 5

*The College currently does not have formal guidelines for the appointment of individuals who are tenured or on tenure track in another college of the University. Develop and recommend to the EFC procedures for such appointments.*

A motion is attached.

#### Response to Charge 6

*Upon request, assist the EFC in producing a single document integrating the College of Engineering Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Promotions with the University of Iowa Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Decision-making.*

No such request was made.

#### Response to an additional Charge

*Review the UI promotion procedures for adjunct faculty and determine if the College of Engineering needs to include additional requirements. If yes, propose additional requirements.*

A motion is attached.