

Report of 2008-09 College of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee

April 15, 2009

Members

Prof. Jasbir Arora
Prof. Jacob Odgaard
Prof. David Rethwisch

Term Expiring

May 2009
May 2010
May 2011

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.

Committee Questionnaire

To help prepare a response to the Charge, the Committee sent a questionnaire to the DEOs and Dean. The questionnaire, which is attached to this report, asks for a response to questions pertaining to the specific charges listed below. The DEOs and Dean were also provided with a copy of the College of Engineering Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Promotions. Committee findings and recommendations are listed after each of the charges below.

Specific Charges

1. Review the procedures used in the College of Engineering promotion and tenure reviews during 2007-08 reviewed for tenure/promotion to associate professor; reviewed for tenure/promotion to full professor. 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.

Committee Finding:

Two candidates were reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, and two for promotion to Full Professor (with Tenure). Three candidates were recommended for promotion.

As per the Procedures, the candidates were all given the option to present a departmental seminar describing past, present and planned research and teaching activities. All candidates were provided the specified time to respond in writing to the various reports. In all cases, the DCGs final report states that comments provided by external reviewers were examined and evaluated. According to the response from the Dean, the DCG did not directly reference external reviews in their reports. In all cases, the DEO recommendation was the same as that of the DCG.

Most deadlines stated were met. According to the CoE guidelines, DEO recommendations are due to the Dean on December 15. In all the cases, DEO recommendations were submitted to the Dean on December 21, 2007. The Dean's office was informed of the delay. The delay did not affect the Dean's evaluation process. The Dean's final recommendations were submitted to the Provost on time, by February 1.

Except for the due date of the final report, all departments were able to comply with the procedures. However, one department (CEE) feels the procedures are unwieldy or difficult to implement. This department states: "The College expects too many letters from outside reviewers. The University recommends 4 or more but the college asks for 8-10. Getting these letters is very difficult and very time consuming. In some cases lots of letters are needed but others this is not necessary. The DEO should be allowed more latitude."

The Committee asked the DEOs whether there should be any changes made to these procedures. One department responded that "The description shall be clearer and unambiguous." Another department states: "The College Procedures and the University Procedures should be described in two side by side tables, like a flow chart. The writing style, in paragraph form, is very difficult for the DEO to follow. It is too easy to forget a task." One DEO comments that giving the candidate the option to present a departmental seminar describing past, present and planned research and teaching activities is not a good idea.

The Committee recommends that the procedures be made clearer and easier to follow. The Committee recommends that the EFC review and reformulate pertinent parts of *Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Promotions*. The Committee recommends that following such a review and reformulation, next year's P&T Committee be charged with development of a check list for DEOs to follow during promotion and tenure procedures. The check list should include items required in the University's *Tenure and Promotion Decision Making Guidelines*.

2. Review the procedures used for new appointments of tenure-track faculty in the College of Engineering during 2007-08. Advise the EFC as to whether these appointments complied with the College of Engineering *Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Evaluations*.

Committee Finding:

Four searches were conducted, one in CEE, one in MIE, and two in BME. A special opportunity hire was made in ECE. All departments state that Criteria and Procedures were complied with.

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.

Committee Finding:

The Committee asked the DEOs to review the charge as stated and respond as to whether they complied with the procedure. All departments complied with the procedure.

4. DCG meetings for Faculty Evaluations and Promotions. Report on the adherence to the following guideline adopted by the College Faculty in May 2008 for DCG meetings at which DCG votes are taken on faculty evaluations and promotions:

It is highly desirable that the DCG meeting at which the final vote is taken be held at a time when all DCG members can attend. The DCG chair shall give at least one week's notice of this meeting, unless an earlier meeting with full attendance is possible.

Committee Finding:

The Committee asked the DEOs to review the charge as stated and respond as to whether they complied with the procedure. All departments complied with the procedure.

5. 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.

Committee Finding:

All departments but one adhered to the policy. In one department (MIE) a candidate did not have 3 POT sessions due to early promotion considerations. This candidate won a teaching award.

6. The College currently does not have formal procedures for promotion and/or granting tenure for a faculty member with appointment in a department in which the Department Executive Officer cannot participate in the process. Develop and recommend procedures to be used in these cases.

Committee Recommendation / Draft Motion:

The Committee recommends that when a DEO cannot participate in the process, the department should recommend to the Dean a DEO representative from eligible members in the department. The DEO representative would then be formally appointed by the Dean. The process would be as follows (draft motion):

When the DEO of a department is unable to provide an independent review of a faculty member, an Appropriate Faculty Group (AFG) is assembled in consultation with the Dean in the spring semester of the academic year before the review. At its first meeting, the AFG will elect, by vote, a member of the group to act as the DEO designate (acting in place of the DEO) for the particular promotion case at hand. The election of the DEO designate will be subject to approval by the Dean. The DEO designate shall not participate in the DCG deliberations for the particular case. The DEO designate will handle all of the duties usually handled by the DEO, including providing communication and feedback to the faculty member being evaluated for promotion and/or granting tenure, soliciting external letters of reference, etc. This process is initiated in the spring semester the academic year before the review so the DEO designate is in place to handle the early stages of the review process.

7. 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*.

In response to the Committee Findings in Specific Charge No. 1, the Committee recommends that the EFC produce a single and easy to follow document integrating the two documents. The Committee recommends that, following EFC's review and reformulation of the criteria and procedures, next year's P&T Committee be charged with development of a check list for DEOs to follow during P&T deliberations.

8. Recommend specific charges for the 2009-10 P&T Committee.

The Committee Recommends the following specific charges for the 2009-10 P&T Committee:

Specific Charge No. 1: Following a review and reformulation of the College's Criteria and Procedures, the Committee shall develop a checklist for DEOs to follow during P&T deliberations.

Specific Charge No. 2: Review the procedures used for new appointments of tenure-track faculty in the College of Engineering during 2008-09. Advise the EFC as to whether these appointments complied with the College of Engineering *Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Evaluations*.

Specific Charge No. 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.

Specific Charge No. 4: DCG meetings for Faculty Evaluations and Promotions. Report on the adherence to the following guideline adopted by the College Faculty in May 2008 for DCG meetings at which DCG votes are taken on faculty evaluations and promotions:

It is highly desirable that the DCG meeting at which the final vote is taken be held at a time when all DCG members can attend. The DCG chair shall give at least one week's notice of this meeting, unless an earlier meeting with full attendance is possible.

Specific Charge No. 5: 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.

Specific Charge No. 6: Submit an interim report by January 15, 2010, and final report by April 1, 2010.

9. Submit an interim report by January 15, 2009, and final report by April 1, 2009.