

Department Approval: 10/22/2007
College Approval: 11/28/2007
University Committee Approval: 04/04/2008
Provost Approval: 09/02/2008

Department of Physics and Engineering Physics Criteria for Promotion in Academic Ranks

Introduction

Based on the sample Record of Service provided in the University Faculty Handbook, the faculty of the Department of Physics and Engineering Physics presents in this document (1) a format for the preparation of the candidate's Record of Service and (2) criteria for its evaluation for promotion. The purposes of this document are to help the candidate gather data and prepare his or her Record of Service and to assist departmental, college, and university committees and administrators in evaluating the candidate's Record of Service.

These criteria have been developed in accordance with University promotion policies: *the promotion considerations will be based on the demonstration of significant and sustained achievement as indicated by evidence of Teaching Effectiveness, evidence of Professional Growth, and evidence of Service.* In fulfilling the goals and objectives of the College of Science and Mathematics and the Department of Physics and Engineering Physics, several items of evidence for these three categories are routinely collected as part of operating procedure such as faculty annual reports, annual evaluations by the Chairperson and the Dean, student ratings, and peer observations (where applicable).

It is important that the candidate recognizes the fact that recommendations pertaining to promotions in academic rank are, as indicated in the Faculty Handbook, *based on qualitative judgments concerning the evidence presented* by the candidate using the departmental Record of Service format. The committees and administrators *qualitatively evaluate* the **items** of evidence provided for each category for their relevance towards *significant and sustained achievement* and express their judgments using the terms **Good, Superior, and Outstanding**. The detailed criteria outlined in this document are the minimum required for promotion.

Definitions

Review Period: Candidates may choose to be evaluated over the most recent, continuous period of time at least equal to the minimum period of time required for promotion to the next rank or over the time in the present rank.

Sustained: Sustained refers to efforts that occur during the review period. Sustained does not mean continuous or without breaks.

Instructional: An inclusive descriptor related to teaching, such as techniques in classroom presentation, curriculum, course development, and course materials development.

Peer-reviewed: A descriptor of the process in which manuscripts, articles, papers, conference proposals, conference presentations, workshops, grant proposals, etc. are subjected to peer review for content, appropriateness, style, etc.

Publication¹: A broad term used to describe the dissemination of scholarship via some public forum, such as articles in peer-reviewed journals, transactions, or proceedings in printed or electronic form. Some publications – such as, book reviews, reviews of peer-reviewed publications, abstracts, or technical reports – are also considered here which may or may not have been peer reviewed themselves.

Item: An **item** is a type of evaluative evidence. Example: a *published peer-reviewed article*.

Instance: An **instance** of an item refers to one or more occurrences of that item, which as a whole make the evidence substantial. Normally, a peer-reviewed publication of an article is an **instance** of *publish a peer-reviewed article*; whereas *three published book reviews* may constitute a single **instance** of *publish reviews of books or journal articles*.

Significance: Two aspects are used in measuring significance of an achievement: the type of evidence (**item**) and the characteristics of the specific **instance** of evidence: The **significance** of an achievement is represented by its place in one of three clusters of excellence-levels of increasing recognition: Level A, Level B, and Level C. **Items** of evidence resulting from essential activities that are expected of every candidate for promotion are in Level A. Levels B and C enumerate additional **items** from which the candidate may select for demonstrating significant achievements. An **item's** relative value, its range of impact, and its success/failure status determine its specific placement in B or C. The candidate, in order to indicate the **significance** of an **instance** of evidence, will indicate its relevance, level of recognition, benefits, and other descriptions as appropriate. The above is an interpretation of *significance* (not a definition).

¹ “Books, articles, and reviews are common forms used to demonstrate scholarly activity. Complete bibliographic information and copies of the material augmented by reviewer comments when available are helpful. Some indication of the stature of the publication (juried, circulation, national/regional scope) may provide assistance in judging the scholarly activity of the candidate. In the case of joint authorship, the candidate should indicate his/her contribution.”

Faculty Promotion Policy, “Evidence of Professional Growth”, item 1.

Academic Preparation Required for Academic Ranks

A Masters degree, in a field appropriate to the position held by the faculty member, is required for a person to hold a position at the rank of Instructor.

An appropriate doctoral degree – as determined by the department and its chairperson – is required for a person to hold a position at the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor.

Requirements for Promotion

Assistant Professor: Final evaluation of the faculty member's performance must result in a minimum rating of Good in all three categories.

Associate Professor: Final evaluation of the faculty member's performance must result in a minimum rating of Superior in Teaching, Superior in Professional Growth, and Good in Service.

Professor: Final evaluation of the faculty member's performance must result in a minimum rating of Outstanding in one category and Superior in the other two.

Criteria for Each of the Categories

Activities to produce the various evidentiary **items** are listed for each of the three levels under each category. These lists are intended as a guide to assist candidates in planning their activities and reviewers in evaluating promotion documents. Since it is impossible to anticipate every kind of achievement, candidates may include other activities and related evidence not specifically mentioned in this document, but they must present a convincing argument that these **items** are of equivalent significance to those listed.

A candidate may present an **instance** of an evidentiary **item** in the Record of Service only once in levels B and C. For example, a specific *instructional publication* may be presented either under C-5 in *teaching effectiveness* or under C-1 in *professional growth* but not under both. However, any evidence listed in levels B and C may be referred to under **items** elsewhere, including those under level A.

Criteria for the three levels of performance are stated at the end of each category. The number of evidentiary **items** and **instances** listed are the minimums needed for consideration at each performance level in each category.

I. Teaching Effectiveness.

Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness

For *teaching effectiveness*, faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of their performance in teaching and their contributions to the development and maintenance of high quality curricula. Evidentiary **items** for evaluating *teaching effectiveness* are grouped under three levels of increasing recognition. Candidates may include other evidentiary **items** in *teaching effectiveness* not specifically mentioned in any level. However, the burden of proof is on the candidate to justify their inclusion.

Note: *Teaching effectiveness* is the most important criterion in the overall evaluation of a faculty member, and is also the most difficult to evaluate. For this reason, such evidence might include, for example, student learning such as pre- and post-tests and samples of student work, peer observations, student ratings, and testimonials from current or former students. Since student ratings are influenced by many non-academic variables, their ratings should never be used as the sole measurement of teaching performance.

Evaluative Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

A. Level A

1. Carry out instructional activities expected of all faculty members as stipulated in the Faculty Handbook.
2. Use feedback from students and, where applicable, from peers to monitor and maintain or improve teaching effectiveness.

B. Level B

1. Provide evidence of effective teaching while maintaining appropriate rigor. (see note above)
2. Effectively teach a course for the first time. (see note above)
3. Supervise independent studies and/or student research.
4. Make major improvements to course content, materials or delivery methods.
5. Participate actively in overall curriculum design or re-design.
6. Share expertise and course material with departmental or professional peers, for example present a departmental seminar on a teaching innovation.
7. Attend or participate in activities that contribute to improved teaching, for example, attend instructional workshops.

8. Receive an internal instructional grant or submit a proposal for an external instructional grant or contract.
9. Submit an instructional article for peer reviewed publication.
10. Carry out a detailed review of a book that is under revision/development that will be used or is intended for instructional purposes.
11. Make a presentation at a professional conference on an instructional topic.
12. Publish a peer-reviewed instructional publication such as an abstract.
13. Justify other comparable indicators of *teaching effectiveness* at this level.

C. Level C

1. Provide evidence of outstanding teaching while maintaining appropriate rigor. (see note above)
2. Develop a new course or substantially revise an existing course.
3. Develop tools such as a comprehensive lab manual and/or a noteworthy instructional package for use in the curriculum.
4. Receive an external instructional grant or contract.
5. Publish peer-reviewed instructional material or a peer-reviewed instructional article.
6. Conduct a tutorial, seminar, or workshop on a discipline-related topic at a professional conference.
7. Justify other comparable indicators of *teaching effectiveness* at this level.

Performance Levels for Teaching Effectiveness

Good. In order for Teaching Effectiveness to be rated as good, the candidate must provide supporting evidence for all of A throughout the review period, plus evidence of one **instance** from B or C.

Superior. In order for Teaching Effectiveness to be rated as superior, the candidate must provide supporting evidence for all of A and B1 throughout the review period, plus evidence of three **instances** belonging to two or more different **items** from B and/or C.

Outstanding. In order for Teaching Effectiveness to be rated as outstanding, the candidate must provide supporting evidence for all of A and B1 throughout the review period, plus evidence of five **instances** belonging to three or more different **items** from B and/or C, with at least one **instance** from C.

II. Professional Growth

Criteria for Professional Growth

Faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of maintaining currency in the discipline and contributions to the discipline. The discipline here refers to the disciplines of Physics, Engineering, Geosciences, and closely related areas as they may evolve. Contributions to the discipline may range from theoretical results through practical products and may be presented in a variety of ways such as journal articles or reports in proceedings. Instructional publications, proposals, or grants may be considered either under Teaching Effectiveness or under Professional Growth. It is suggested that the candidates indicate briefly their specific contributions in multi-authored evidence. Evidentiary **items** for evaluating *professional growth* are grouped under three levels of increasing recognition. Candidates may include other evidentiary **items** in *professional growth* not specifically mentioned in any level. However, the burden of proof is on the candidate to justify their inclusion.

Evaluative Evidence of Professional Growth

A. Level A

Carry out professional growth activities expected of all candidates. Such activities include:

1. Remaining professionally engaged through scholarly activities such as attending discipline related conferences.
2. Being a member of a discipline-related professional organization.

B. Level B

1. Present a paper or poster at a professional meeting (state through international).
2. Publish reviews of books or journal articles.
3. Contribute to a discipline-related book.
4. Receive an internal grant.
5. Submit a proposal for an external grant or contract.
6. Submit an article for peer reviewed publication.
7. Review proposals for a granting agency or manuscripts for a journal or a conference.
8. Perform summer research and/or other professional development activities such as summer internships or joint research programs.

9. Participate as a member of a panel on a discipline related topic at a professional meeting.
10. Participate in a major workshop or short course.
11. Publish a peer-reviewed publication such as an abstract.
12. Justify other comparable indicators of *professional growth* at this level.

C. Level C

1. Publish a peer-reviewed, discipline-related article.
2. Publish a peer-reviewed chapter in a discipline-related book.
3. Publish a peer-reviewed, discipline-related book.
4. Receive an external grant or contract.
5. Conduct a tutorial, seminar, or workshop on a discipline-related topic at a professional conference.
6. Perform major editorial functions for a journal or symposium/conference proceedings, etc.
7. Perform professional consulting. The value of these results must be verified.
8. Justify other comparable indicators of *professional growth* at this level.

Performance Levels for Professional Growth

Good. In order for Professional Growth to be rated as good, the candidate must provide supportive evidence for all of A throughout the review period.

Superior. In order for Professional Growth to be rated as superior, the candidate must provide supportive evidence for all of A throughout the review period, plus evidence of four **instances** belonging to two or more different **items** from B and/or C, with at least one **instance** from B5 and at least one **instance** from C1, C2, and/or C3.

Outstanding. In order for Professional Growth to be rated as outstanding, the candidate must provide supportive evidence for all of A throughout the review period, plus evidence of six **instances** belonging to three or more different **items** from B and/or C, with at least one **instance** from B5 and two **instances** from C1, C2, and/or C3.

III. Service

Criteria for Service

Faculty members will be evaluated on the basis of service to students, service to the Department, College, and University, service to professional bodies, and professional service to society or the community. Evidentiary **items** for evaluating *service* are grouped under three levels of increasing recognition. Candidates may include other evidentiary **items** in *service* not specifically mentioned in any level. However, the burden of proof is on the candidate to justify their inclusion.

Evaluative Evidence for Service

A. Level A

Carry out service activities expected of all candidates. Such activities include:

1. Following departmental policies and procedures such as collecting assessment materials for courses taught and meeting the deadlines expected of all faculty.
2. Performing assigned departmental advising duties.
3. Participating actively in departmental decision-making and serving on departmental committees.
4. Providing information to prospective students. This may be done, for example, by participating in Show Me Days, First Steps, and in meeting with prospective students when they visit campus.

B. Level B

1. Actively serve on a college or university-level committee or council.
2. Provide support to students seeking internships, jobs, or graduate school opportunities, for example, by writing suitable reference letters.
3. Provide support for student activities, for example, by serving as an advisor or sponsor to a student organization, by leading extra-curricular field trips, or by coaching student teams in competitions.
4. Carry out *ad hoc* departmental or extra-departmental assignments such as serving on a faculty search committee, serving as a committee member for graduate students earning degrees in other departments, and volunteering for University Foundation activities.
5. Provide professionally related service to the community such as classroom presentations, Science Fair or Physics Olympics judging, career/college day

presentations, or serving on advisory boards.

6. Provide service to the discipline such as chairing a session at a professional meeting, reviewing abstracts, manuscripts, or proposals, or serving on a professional committee or task force.
7. Justify other comparable indicators of *service* at this level.

C. Level C

1. Serve as chairperson of an active departmental, college, or university-level committee or council.
2. Provide service to a discipline-related organization or a higher education professional organization, such as performing major editorial functions, holding office in a professional body, or participating actively in the organization of a workshop or conference.
3. Achieve beneficial academic-industrial cooperation.
4. Provide voluntary professional service to the public, such as a non-profit organization.
5. Justify other comparable indicators of *service* at this level.

Performance Levels for Service

Good. In order for Service to be rated as good, the candidate must provide supportive evidence for all of A throughout the review period and must provide evidence of one **instance** of active service at the college or university level.

Superior. In order for Service to be rated as superior, the candidate must provide supportive evidence for all of A throughout the review period, plus evidence of four **instances** belonging to two or more different **items** from B and/or C, with at least two **instances** that indicate active service at the college or university level.

Outstanding. In order for Service to be rated as outstanding, the candidate must provide supportive evidence for all of A throughout the review period, plus six **instances** belonging to three or more different **items** from B and/or C, with at least one **instance** from C and one **instance** that indicates active service at the university level.

***Promotion Requirements in the
Department of Physics & Engineering Physics***

<u>Minimum</u> Performance Levels to Attain the Given Rank			
	Teaching Effectiveness	Professional Growth	University Service
Assistant Professor	Good	Good	Good
Associate Professor	Superior	Superior	Good
Professor (any one of the three choices)	Outstanding	Superior	Superior
	Superior	Outstanding	Superior
	Superior	Superior	Outstanding

Requirements to Attain the Given Performance Level			
	Teaching Effectiveness	Professional Growth	University Service
Good	All items in A + one instance from B or C.	All items in A.	All items in A + one instance of active service at the college or university level.
Superior	All items in A, B1, + three instances belonging to two or more different items from B and/or C.	All items in A + four instances belonging to two or more different items from B and/or C, with at least one instance from B5 and one instance from C1, C2, and/or C3.	All items in A + four instances belonging to two or more different items from B and/or C, with at least two instances of active service at the college or university level.
Outstanding	All items in A, B1, + five instances belonging to three or more different items from B and/or C, with at least one instance from C.	All items in A + six instances belonging to three or more different items from B and/or C, with at least one instance from B5 and two instances from C1, C2, and/or C3.	All items in A + six instances belonging to three or more different items from B and/or C, with at least one instance from C and one instance of active service at the university level.