Cal Poly Humboldt.
School of Engineering

707 826-3619 PHONE
707 826-3616 FAX
engineering@humboldt.edu EMAIL

Criteria and Standards for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

Cal Poly Humboldt School of Engineering

This document has been approved by vote by the majority of tenure line faculty in the School of Engineering on February 7, 2025.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The School of Engineering (SoE) is committed to encouraging and helping faculty members in the RTP process succeed in their teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service. Faculty members in the RTP process should work closely with their mentors, Initiating Unit Personnel Committee (IUPC) and department chair. This document, which is updated every 5 years, provides the criteria for faculty in the School of Engineering for retention of Assistant Professors and Associate Professors without tenure, granting tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, and promotion to the rank of Professor. The criteria lists accomplishments in each of the three categories: teaching, scholarship, and service, with indications of expected performance at the level of “excellent,”, “good,”, and “minimum essential.” If situations that were not anticipated by this document arise, the RTP candidate, the IUPC, and the Dean must agree to any exceptions and make a record of the agreement in the WPAF (Working Personnel Action File) as described in Exceptional Circumstances at the end of this document.

RTP Expectations

The outcome for promotion (acceptable/unacceptable) is determined by the table in Section IX.2.c of Appendix J, unless the candidate was hired under special circumstances or has had an atypical teaching load, as discussed in the Exceptional Circumstances section.

The School of Engineering expects that teaching excellence, scholarship and service will increase in scope, significance and leadership with increasing rank.

- Successful candidates for **retention** will demonstrate levels of accomplishment and professional development commensurate with progress towards achieving tenure. Candidates will provide a self evaluation in their Personnel Data Sheet (PDS) in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service and provide evidence if they are working toward excellent, good or minimum essential in each of these categories.

- Successful candidates for **tenure** and **promotion** to Associate Professor will self evaluate and demonstrate “excellent” in teaching, and at least either 1) “excellent” in one of the other categories (scholarship or service) and “minimal essential” in the other or 2) “good” performance in both of the other categories.

- Successful candidates for **promotion** (and **tenure** if hired at the rank of Associate Professor) to Full Professor will self evaluate and demonstrate excellence and leadership in teaching, and demonstrate excellence and leadership in at least one of the other categories (scholarship or service).

Evaluation of Performance

It is important that the retention, tenure, and/or promotion (RTP) candidate articulate clearly how their contributions meet SoE expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service in the Personnel Data Sheet (PDS) that is included in their Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). The Initiating Unit Personnel Committee (IUPC) must evaluate the candidate based on these criteria and clearly document their evaluation in their review letter. Following review, the recommendation for retention, promotion and/or tenure is submitted to the College Personnel Committee (CPC) by the IUPC. The SoE chair may also submit a recommendation to the Dean of the College.

All faculty are expected to create inclusive learning environments and ensure that students are provided with equitable opportunities for success. Faculty may also make contributions toward equity and inclusion in scholarly/creative activities and service aspects of their duties. These contributions to equity and inclusion can take a variety of forms including but not limited to those listed below, and should be identified in the appropriate section of the WPAF.

In some cases a particular contribution may be considered in two or all three categories of teaching, scholarship or service. Candidates may not double or triple count a particular contribution. The candidate should explain in the PDS why the contribution fits in a particular category (i.e. teaching, scholarship, or service). Collegial letters that provide support for the candidate's proposed categorization are required.

School of Engineering Support

Each non-tenured School of Engineering faculty member is assigned a faculty mentor upon arrival. Non-tenured School of Engineering faculty are encouraged to work with their mentor and other School of Engineering faculty to gain a good understanding of School of Engineering expectations and culture. School of Engineering Associate Professors are not assigned a mentor, but they should feel free to seek mentoring from any School of Engineering faculty member.

Non-tenured School of Engineering faculty should review this document with their mentor and Department chair so they may seek any necessary clarifications. While this document attempts to clarify School of Engineering expectations, RTP candidates should seek clarification when necessary.

The School of Engineering has developed supporting documents – including templates for documenting and narrating teaching, research and service contributions – to assist our faculty in preparing for their periodic reviews. These templates can be accessed through links at the top of the department announcements and are presented as part of monthly SoE mentoring meetings. These templates are not part of this document, as they are living

documents that will be adjusted to best meet the needs of the SoE faculty, administrators and the personnel committees reviewing SoE faculty.

School of Engineering Accreditation Requirements

The School of Engineering has three programs: Energy Systems Engineering (ESE), Environmental Resources Engineering (ERE) and Mechanical Engineering (ME). ERE is one of the largest, oldest, and most respected ABET accredited undergraduate environmental engineering programs in the nation. The ESE and ME programs, started in Fall 2023, are currently (as of Spring 2025) seeking ABET accreditation imminently. The ABET accreditation process includes a periodic (every six years) review of program educational goals and objectives, faculty expertise, curriculum, student quality, student outcomes assessment, facilities and institutional support. The accreditation process is rigorous and requires full participation by all tenured and tenure track faculty members in the School of Engineering. This full participation includes working on assessment committees, providing careful advising of students and documenting whether student coursework differs from catalog requirements. ABET accreditation is crucial for our programs; it facilitates professional licensure for SOE graduates.

Teaching Effectiveness

The requirements described in Appendix J Section IX.B1.a shall be followed in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness for faculty members being considered for retention, tenure and promotion. The description below relates to interpretation of those requirements for the School of Engineering.

Assessment

Excellence in teaching effectiveness is assessed primarily through collegial evaluation of: classroom teaching, developed curriculum (including use of course management systems), as well as voluntary peer analysis and required IUPC analysis of student evaluations. Excellence in teaching effectiveness must be achieved for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

The School of Engineering embraces our Cal Poly Humboldt identity as an Hispanic Serving Institution that is part of the California State University System. As such, the faculty highly value the use of culturally and trauma informed pedagogy that strives to create an equitable learning environment. SoE values modern pedagogy, such as active learning, culturally

affirming pedagogy, cooperative learning, project-based learning, hands-on learning, etc. and the development of open educational resources.

Candidates for RTP must document their teaching activities as part of their WPAF. In the PDS portion of the WPAF, the candidate's teaching philosophy should address how they incorporate equity, diversity and inclusion in their approach to teaching and learning. Candidates are expected to seek and document participating in faculty development opportunities in this area and the School of Engineering can support some of these activities. Candidates must also provide critical reflection on their pedagogy and on student and faculty evaluations of their teaching. Candidates may discuss pedagogical challenges, success and modifications on a course by course basis, but not on an offering by offering basis. For example, if ENGR 115 is taught several times during the review period, the candidate may reflect on that class as a whole, not every section, or every semester it was taught. If there are patterns of negative comments from student evaluations and/or collegial observations, then the candidate should discuss how the class may be or has been modified to improve the students' experience. This APS document provides guidelines for preparing the PDS.

Collegial Evaluations

Collegial evaluations of classroom teaching must be supported by direct observations and submitted in writing for inclusion in the candidate's WPAF. Multiple observations, conducted over time, are strongly encouraged. The IUPC, with candidate support, is responsible for encouraging and facilitating School of Engineering colleagues to participate in the evaluation process. All tenured and tenure-track faculty of the School of Engineering (unless they are on an approved, extended leave such as sabbatical or parental leave or have other documented extenuating circumstances) are expected to write collegial letters that include descriptions and reflections on the observations of the candidate. Collegial letters should evaluate teaching, not just report what is observed and should describe both strengths and areas for improvement. Colleagues should avoid observing the same class at the same time. Teaching observation guides developed by the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Council's Subcommittee on Inclusive Teaching can guide faculty evaluations and can be found at https://hraps.humboldt.edu/faculty-evaluations

Faculty are encouraged to meet after collegial observations to discuss strengths and areas for improvement.

Examples of activities/materials to evaluate as part of the observation process include:

1. In-class teaching, including but not limited to: class lecture, discussion, in-class learning activities, and presentation of material;
2. Teaching in environments outside of a traditional classroom setting, such as lab, field, workshops, guest lectures;

3. Course materials, such as syllabi, handouts, assignments, multimedia, and other outside materials;

4. Course design/organization, such as use of an online learning management system, assessment strategies, and outcomes as they relate to the course and SoE curriculum goals.

In an effort to optimize the use of the learning management system across the SoE, collegial letters are encouraged to include a review of the learning management system for a course. Such a review will increase conversations and spread best practices on the use of these important tools throughout the SoE.

Student Evaluations

Secondary to collegial observations, student letters and scores and comments on course evaluations will be considered for evaluating teaching excellence. The candidate and the IUPC are responsible for analyzing student evaluations. Any pattern of unfavorable comments within or across student letters or official course evaluations, and/or average scores lower than 4.0 on a 5-point scale for any evaluative questions (on any official course evaluations) in any offering, must be specifically addressed by the candidate. Where unfavorable scores/comments are outliers, the candidate should indicate this and provide support; where unfavorable scores/comments evidence a pattern and/or raise serious issues, a plan for improvement must be provided by the candidate. Neither candidates nor reviewers should average across evaluation items, because averaging anonymous student ratings obscures variability in item ratings. Though an “Overall Instructor Rating” is provided in the student evaluation reports, it is an average of averages. Instead, candidates and the IUPC should focus on individual mean question scores as they provide the most information about potential areas of strength as well as provoke reflection and growth as an instructor.

The SoE notes that the subject position and identity of the candidate affect how students understand the instructor’s approach, knowledge, and pedagogical skill. Research clearly shows that women and people of color in STEM fields consistently face resistance, hostility, and diminishment of their expertise from both colleagues and students. This bias should be taken into consideration when evaluating candidate teaching evaluations. Candidates are encouraged to communicate their subject position and identities as part of their teaching philosophy.

Candidates should follow best practices (https://cebs.humboldt.edu/instructors) for achieving high response rates on student evaluations with a goal of at least 70% per class per semester. (The SoE recommends using class or lab time for student evaluations. Members of the IUPC or SoE Chair can proctor these evaluations to communicate the importance to students if requested). If candidates are not able to reach this response rate, they are encouraged to put

a low course response rate into context. (For example, classes with very small numbers can have low response rates with just a few students deciding not to respond.) The SoE Chair and the IUPC should monitor student course evaluation response rates and work with candidates or follow best practices to address low response rates.

Other Measures of Teaching Excellence

Ratings in the teaching effectiveness category reflect not only classroom performance, but also advising activities and pedagogical activities that improve the delivery of School of Engineering courses. Additional substantiation that may also be considered includes, but is not limited to:

- Evidence of student success (e.g., as documented in an ABET outcomes assessment process);
- Evidence of introducing new pedagogy effectively based on student and/or collegial evaluations;
- Evidence of improvement to teaching approach based on student and/or collegial evaluations;
- Evidence of improvement of use of learning management systems via collegial feedback or working with CTL to implement best practices; and
- Evidence of participation in faculty development activities.

Criteria for Excellence

The significance of the respective contributions should be documented primarily through evaluative collegial letters. Other relevant evidence may also be presented as needed. In the case of client-based projects, leadership should be documented through letters from client organizations and evaluative letters from colleagues. Candidates must provide evidence of excellence in all items in Category 1.

Category 1: Required activities for excellence in teaching effectiveness:

a) Demonstrates evidence of teaching excellence in the classroom based on observation by colleagues. Some ways to demonstrate excellence include: clearly communicating course objectives, policies, and grading criteria in all classes; utilizing course design, materials, and practices to meet course objectives using tools and approaches that are currently used in the field and that enable students to achieve course goals and outcomes; providing evidence of a rigorous approach to the teaching/learning process; being available during regularly scheduled, open door (not appointment-only) office hours for student consultation at least four hours a week for 12 WTU of teaching; participating in departmental efforts to assess and improve courses with which the

faculty member has been involved or using teaching materials that represent diverse perspectives and authors.

b) Faculty candidates going up for tenure and/or promotion should receive consistently positive student comments on evaluative letters and official evaluations. SOE faculty should strive for scores on individual items to be rated 4.0 or higher (on a 5-point scale) for all courses that the candidate has taught more than once. A faculty member however can achieve teaching excellence with a lower score if they provide a reflective statement and evidence of implementing a new teaching strategy to address that score.

c) Evidence of ongoing pedagogical training (e.g., conferences / workshops, courses) in engineering education (e.g., NETI), including in the area of culturally-responsive teaching (e.g., ESCALA), and adjustments made in the delivery of courses in response to the training.

d) Evidence of assessment of equity in student success in each class taught (e.g., calculation of an equity score for each class), and reflection on how to make the classroom more equitable[1,2].

Category 2: Examples of indicators of leadership with excellence in teaching effectiveness:

Teaching Innovation and Development

a) Develops and implements new/innovative courses effectively where effectiveness is measured by collegial evaluations based on classroom observations, responses on student evaluations, letters from students and graduates, and other relevant data;

b) Introduces or adopts new to the SoE pedagogical approaches effectively, where effectiveness is measured by collegial evaluations based on classroom observations, responses on student evaluations, letters from students and graduates, and other relevant data;

c) Adds significantly to new lab activities/active experiences, where effectiveness is measured by collegial evaluations based on classroom observations or curriculum review, responses on student evaluations, letters from students and graduates, and other relevant data;

d) Demonstrates initiative in developing departmental program curriculum; and

---

[1] Note that faculty members are not solely responsible for the equity scores in their courses, nor will they be judged on the quantitative measures. The purpose of this assessment is for faculty members to reflect upon how to improve equity in their classrooms.

[2] Note that the CSU Dashboard can assist in this process: https://cep-info.dashboards.calstate.edu/

e) Prepares significant, high-quality teaching materials such as students' solution manuals, lab activities, open educational resources, supplemental videos, worksheets, handouts, software or class-related websites that are transferable to other courses or faculty, where significance is noted by peer evaluation and collegial letters.

Mentorship and Leadership

f) Mentors and/or assists other faculty in their teaching efforts, and/or shows leadership in departmental teaching/advising efforts and goals;

g) Serves as lead instructor in classes with multiple instructors for labs (e.g. E115, E123);

h) Develops new program or curriculum and/or assessment material, including embedded assessment that supports ABET accreditation processes;

i) Conducts workshops or seminars that enhance teaching within the department, college, university, or profession;

Classroom Research and Projects

j) Directs multiple successful client-based courses (e.g capstone, design electives, etc) where the outcome is a significant learning experience for the students, a valuable service for the client, and an enhancement of the quality of our program;

Recognition and Awards

k) Receives a college-, university- or discipline-based teaching/faculty award; or

l) Submits a peer-reviewed grant application as a PI or Co-PI that is funded that directly supports the teaching mission of the university[3].

Expected Level of Accomplishment

All candidates for tenure and promotion must earn an "excellent" rating in the area of Teaching, as described in Appendix J.

Teaching Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor and Full Professor

Table 1 outlines the criteria for excellence in teaching in the School of Engineering.

Table 1: Minimum Activities Required for Achievement of Excellence in Teaching for Retention, Tenure and Promotion

[3] Any single product from an effort can only be counted in only one of the three areas of teaching, scholarship or service. However, an effort may result in multiple products, and each of those products could be counted in any of the three areas of teaching, scholarship or service. It is incumbent on the candidate to document and support with collegial letters why a particular product should be counted in a particular area.

From Assistant Professor to Associate Professor	Achievement in all required activities for excellence in teaching effectiveness listed in Category 1.
From Associate Professor to Full Professor	Achievement in all required activities for excellence in teaching effectiveness from Category 1, and Demonstration of leadership with excellence in teaching effectiveness in at least three activities distributed across a-l from Category 2 or through other activities or items that indicate leadership as documented by the candidate, collegial letters, or in alignment with the candidate's PDP.

Scholarly and Creative Activities

For the granting of tenure and promotion, the School of Engineering expects a faculty member to develop a research program that encourages and provides opportunities for student involvement.

Each faculty member is required to demonstrate contributions to knowledge in their area of specialization. The School of Engineering embraces the five dimensions of scholarship as proposed by Ernest Boyer in Scholarship Reconsidered (discovery, integration, application, teaching and community engagement) and the activities associated with those dimensions as outlined in Appendix J. However, there is no expectation that faculty would have contributions in each of the five dimensions of scholarship. At least some of the contributions should provide evidence of CPH graduate or CPH undergraduate student involvement. The timing of contributions should be made in a manner that indicates that scholarly efforts will be sustained throughout the candidate’s career.

Assessment

Candidates for RTP are assessed based on the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly contributions. Candidates are expected to self-assess their level of scholarly achievement in their PDS using these standards. Candidates should use evidence to justify how they meet standards for “Minimum Essential”, “Good”, or “Excellent” in scholarship. As a part of this justification, candidates are strongly encouraged to summarize their area(s) of work in Scholarly/Creative Activity using a narrative and the template provided by the School of Engineering that provides a list of supporting activities.

It is expected that a faculty member will provide evidence of their efforts towards the dissemination of original research in peer-reviewed publications and/or evidence of efforts towards the submission of extramural research grant proposals. The ranking and assessment of scholarship quality and impact is assessed primarily through evaluative collegial letters assessing scholarship activities from people with direct knowledge of the work, including letters from colleagues outside the university where applicable.

As per Appendix J (VII.A.1.b), it is expected that the IUPC for candidates applying for tenure and/or promotion will invite written evaluations of their scholarship/creative activities from experts in their fields at other institutions for inclusion in their WPAF. Candidates are encouraged to suggest the names of “outside” reviewers to their IUPC. However, official requests for evaluation should come from the IUPC and not from the candidate. This type of external evaluation is not expected of probationary candidates being considered for retention only.

Contributions to scholarly activities made during any service credit years granted to a faculty member will have equal standing to CPH-based contributions.

For the purposes of evaluation, scholarly activities are described in three Categories below: Category 1: Contributions of Original Research and Creative Work; Category 2: Contributions of Secondary and Applied Work; and Category 3: Leadership Activities. No relative importance or weighting is implied by the order within each category.

Category 1: Contributions of Original Research and Creative Work

Category 1 contributions are defined as peer-reviewed, significant, and high quality research projects and contributions to knowledge. Contributions that do not meet these qualifying criteria are considered to be Category 2.

- **Peer-reviewed Publications:** These are academic journal papers or similar peer-reviewed publications that represent original research contributions to knowledge in fields relevant to Engineering. For this purpose, fields may include areas related to our program such as Environmental Science, International Development, Engineering Education, Environmental Policy, Energy Policy, Data Science, Mechanical Engineering, Aerospace Engineering, Materials Science, Biomedical Engineering, etc. Peer-reviewed books, book chapters, textbooks, review articles, technical reports, software, symposium or conference proceedings, and other similar materials that compile, organize and analyze material from the field will be considered in this category. For any co-authored publications, the specific role of the faculty member in generating the final product should be indicated in the PDS and via evaluative letters. The greater the involvement of the faculty member, the more important the contribution. Additionally, publications that make an especially significant contribution to the field, such as a seminal article on a topic in a leading journal, may be given

additional weight in the evaluation process. The value of exceptional contributions must be documented through evaluative letters from colleagues that have appropriate expertise to comment on the significance of the work. Forthcoming publications may be considered for this category but candidates must include correspondence from editors, publishers, jurors, etc., that specifically confirms the acceptance of the candidate's work and provides a targeted publication date.

- **Funded Extramural Research Grants and Contracts:** These are funded extramural support for research (whether for instrumentation, personnel, student research stipends, educational opportunities, or operating expenses). Co-Principal Investigators should specifically indicate the contributions they made to the proposal and project. Exceptional size and longevity of funded grants may carry additional weight towards fulfilling the requirements for tenure and promotion.

- **Completed Graduate Theses and Projects:** Master's theses and projects for which the faculty member served as the thesis/project advisor or co-advisor. Unless the Master's degree has already been awarded to the student in question, the completeness of the thesis or project must be documented (e.g., with letters of support from colleagues). Projects that are completed as part one's teaching responsibilities, (e.g., Capstone, design electives, Master of Engineering and Community Practice) are not considered Category 1 scholarly activity.

If a candidate has made exceptional contributions in Category 1, they may confer with the SoE IUPC and Department Chair to determine if such contributions could be weighed as more than one Category 1 contribution.

Service on graduate committees as a secondary member (not the chair) shall be considered as a service activity, but not as a scholarship activity.

Category 2: Contributions of Secondary and Applied Work

Category 2 includes a range of secondary and applied scholarly work that contributes to the culture of scholarship in Engineering.

- **Funded Intramural Grants:** Seed grants for research, graduate student support, etc., awarded by on-campus or CSU-based selection committees.

- **Unfunded Extramural Grant Proposals:** Unfunded extramural grant proposals in support of original research, when such proposals were submitted to established funding agencies for competitive evaluation by peers.

- **Supporting Development of Funded Extramural Grant Proposals:** Grant proposals in which the candidate plays a supporting role but is not the Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator.
- **Technical Reports:** Non-peer-reviewed technical reports presented in completion of contracts that have a substantial scholarly value.
- **Software and Instructional Materials:** Non-peer-reviewed 'courseware', tutorials, or software developed for innovative instruction or specialized research uses and disseminated. These contributions shall be evaluated based on evidence of value to the discipline.
- **Community-based research:** We recognize the value of community-based research and collaborations with community organizations that result in reports, public hearings, opportunities for students, and/or substantive engagement with community members, all of which may indicate faculty members' stature in their fields. (Note: "community" may be academic/non-academic, and local/national/international.) Output from a class (e.g., report, presentation, etc.) that is requested by and communicated to a community group may in some cases count as community-based research. In this case, a letter from the community receiving the work is required to document the impact and significance of this scholarly contribution.
- **Other Non-Peer-Reviewed Publications:** Professional letters, professional book reviews, and other publications in the discipline that have been disseminated.
- **Extramural Meeting Presentations:** Published or unpublished papers or posters presented at regional, national or international meetings, conferences, or symposia (including such meetings when they are held on campus).
- **Academic Seminar Presentations:** e.g., School of Engineering seminars or other similar presentations at Cal Poly Humboldt or elsewhere.
- **Other Unpublished Materials:** Manuscripts in preparation, grant proposals in preparation, student theses in progress, research data sets, and the like. Such unpublished contributions must be documented and evaluated (e.g., with letters of support from colleagues).
- **Student Research Mentoring:** Mentoring or leading research projects that involve undergraduate or graduate student(s). The candidate needs to communicate the extent of the mentorship in terms of number of students and duration.
- **Applied and Translational Scholarship Activities:** Creating and developing presentations, editorials, articles, and materials in other media that communicate outcomes of scholarship to the public or targeted populations.

Category 3: Leadership Contributions for Scholarship and Creative Activities

- **Leadership in mentorship:** Guiding fellow faculty members, peers, or other research partners (including undergraduate or graduate students) in research projects, emphasizing their role in shaping the research direction and strategy.
- **Research Collaboration Leadership:** Leading interdisciplinary or multi-institution or multi-institution research teams, including collaborations with other departments, institutions, or community partners.
- **Conference and Workshop Leadership:** Organizing and leading major academic and industry conferences, workshops, or seminars, particularly those that advance the field of study. When this activity could be categorized as service, the candidate should make a judgment on how to categorize the activity and provide a justification.
- **Editorial Leadership:** Editor or associate editor for peer-reviewed journals or significant involvement in the peer review process.
- **Grant Leadership:** Securing competitive research funding, here the faculty member has initiated and led the grant proposal process.
- **Public Impact:** Producing research and/or engaging with policymakers, public groups, and others to meaningfully impact public policy, engineering practice, or community outcomes.

Other scholarly activities for inclusion to Category 1, 2 or 3: If there are other activities that contribute to the field, then the candidate should propose and support the inclusion of these activities in their file. Evaluative letters of support from colleagues should be included to document additional contributions. Candidates should carefully explain and justify the case for inclusion of any activities not defined above, and should consult with the IUPC and the Dean throughout the probationary period to ensure that activities can be adequately evaluated with reference to the standards of achievement outlined below.

Expected Level of Accomplishment

Each member of the IUPC shall evaluate the Research and Other Scholarly or Creative Activities of faculty being considered for tenure and promotion according to three categories of performance: Excellent, Good, Minimum Essential (based on Appendix J).

Scholarship Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

The criteria for each of these categories for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is available in Table 2.

Table 2: Activities Required for Achievement of "Minimum Essential," "Good" and "Excellent" in Scholarship for Retention, Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	
Excellent	*Number of distinct contributions from Category I:* five, with at least two peer-reviewed publications included among those. *Average annual contributions from Category 2:* one and a half per year, with no more than one year without a contribution unless on approved leave or some other exceptional circumstance that is negotiated with the SoE Department chair.
Good	*Number of distinct contributions from Category I:* three, with at least one peer-reviewed publication included among those. *Average annual contributions from Category 2:* one per year, with no more than one year without a contribution unless on approved leave or some other exceptional circumstance that is negotiated with the SoE Department chair.
Minimum Essential	*Number of distinct contributions from Category I:* one, that is a peer reviewed publication. *Average annual contributions from Category 2:* one per year, with no more than one year without a contribution unless on approved leave or some other exceptional circumstance that is negotiated with the SoE Department chair.

For the purpose of placing faculty under consideration for tenure and promotion into these performance groupings, additional contributions in Category 1 can be used to take the place of requirements from Category 2. However, the reverse will not be true; additional contributions from Category 2 cannot be used to offset deficiencies in contributions from Category I.

Scholarship Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

The criteria for each of the three categories for promotion to Professor are presented in Table 3. For promotion to full professor, the School of Engineering expects a faculty member to provide evidence of a research program that consistently maintains the standards required for Tenure. In addition, to be promoted on the basis of leadership in the area of scholarship, the faculty member will provide evidence of leadership in Scholarship and Creative Activities as listed under Category 3.

Table 3: Activities Required for Achievement of "Minimum Essential," "Good" and "Excellent" in Scholarship for Promotion to Full Professor[4]	
Excellent	*Number of distinct contributions from Category I:* six, with at least two peer-reviewed publications included among those. *Average annual contributions from Category 2:* one and a half per year, with no more than one year without a contribution unless on approved leave or some other exceptional circumstance that is negotiated with the SoE Department chair. Of these activities, at least seven of them should be activities that indicate scholarly leadership as indicated in Category 3.
Good	*Number of distinct contributions from Category I:* three, with at least one peer-reviewed publication included among those. *Average annual contributions from Category 2:* one per year, with no more than one year without a contribution unless on approved leave or some other exceptional circumstance that is negotiated with the SoE Department chair. Of these activities, at least four of them should be activities that indicate scholarly leadership as indicated in Category 3.
Minimum Essential	*Number of distinct contributions from Category I:* at least one peer-reviewed publication. *Average annual contributions from Category 2:* one per year, with no more than two years without a contribution unless on approved leave or some other exceptional circumstance that is negotiated with the SoE Department chair. Of these activities, at least one should be an activity that indicates scholarly leadership as indicated in Category 3.

Service

School of Engineering faculty members are expected to maintain a consistent pattern of ongoing service across their years eligible for review for retention, tenure and promotion. All

[4] Note that all activities counted for promotion to full professor are completed after the date the previous promotion file was submitted.

faculty members are expected to contribute to the effective operation of the School of Engineering, college, and university and strive, in the broadest terms, to promote the engineering discipline in society.

Self-evaluation of Service to Profession, University, or Community should be provided in the WPAF. A RTP candidate will list and describe all service activities and provide a brief statement regarding their contribution to each activity, including role(s), time commitment, and impact. The School of Engineering faculty value quality impactful service as evaluated by collegial letters. Thus, focused service efforts with documented impact are valued more highly than numerous service efforts with minimal impact.

The School of Engineering has developed supporting documents – templates for documenting and narrating service contributions – to assist our faculty in preparing for their periodic reviews.

Assessment

It is the responsibility of the candidate to describe the workload for service activities in the PDS and document activities in the WPAF so that the IUPC can make the appropriate evaluation. The candidate is expected to carefully justify with evidence their self-assessment of the level of attainment for their service (Excellent, Good or Minimum Essential).

Guidelines

1. Evidence of faculty contributions over the period of evaluation for tenure and/or promotion is collected through written letters from colleagues inside and outside of the university, students, community members, and discipline-related professionals. Any significant service effort should be documented with an *evaluative* letter describing the *quality* and *impact* of the contribution of the service the candidate provided.

2. The candidate should list their service activities and match them with the level of accomplishment necessary to meet departmental criteria for service. Where applicable, the candidate should document in hours both time spent in direct involvement (e.g., attending committee meetings) and time spent working on related tasks (e.g., engaging with materials). It is critical for the candidate to focus on the quality and impact of the service activity in the narrative rather than focusing on the number of hours spent on the activity.

3. A template is provided for communicating service contributions in the PAF so that faculty can better understand how to communicate their service achievement.

4. The faculty of the School of Engineering recognizes the cultural taxation of faculty members of color, who often provide intensive student mentoring and who are often called on to serve on multiple equity committees and institutional change initiatives. It

is incumbent on the IUPC to contextualize the candidate's service and to recognize extraordinary service where cultural taxation is a factor; it is incumbent on the faculty member to address potential instances of cultural taxation in the PDS.

5. Service activities that received assigned time or additional pay may count toward service. Candidates should clearly detail all activities and discuss time commitments for such activities in relation to assigned time. The time invested in such activities may exceed assigned time. A reasonable estimate is 2.7 hours/WTU. For tasks leveraging assigned time, candidates should clearly detail contributions over and above the assigned time or other compensation.

6. The faculty of the School of Engineering recognize three areas of service activity: 1) Essential Service, 2) Category I: Service to the University, and 3) Category II: Service to the Profession and Public. Categories I and II each have subcategories of (a) and (b), where (b) are service activities in which the candidate took a leadership role. The service activities in each category should serve as examples for interpreting service activity expectations, but are not meant to restrict anyone's service only to what is listed. In addition, the list presented below is not exhaustive. Expectations for achievement in each category follow the lists.

Appendix J, Section IX.B.5 provides that the candidate may submit an activity for evaluation that is not included in the core definition of service as put forth in Appendix J, Section IX.B.3. A candidate may make the case in their WPAF that an activity not listed in Categories I and II should count as a contribution to service for purposes of evaluation. The candidate's IUPC will determine whether the activity should be evaluated as part of the candidate's service and in which category of activity it will be placed. In addition, the candidate and the IUPC will provide documentation of the outcome of this negotiation.

Additional activities in Categories I or II cannot be used to offset deficiencies in the other category. However, in a case in which the candidate has been called upon to perform disproportionate service in one category, such as the ongoing mentoring of students or service on School of Engineering committees, the candidate can make a case in the WPAF for exceptional consideration of weighting of activities in Categories I and II.

Leadership in service (required for promotion to full Professor) is exemplified by significant service activities in Categories I.b and II.b. Specific criteria for promotion to full Professor are listed below.

The ranking of service quality is assessed primarily through evaluative collegial letters; service activities are assessed by people with direct knowledge of the work, including letters from colleagues outside the University where applicable.

In the WPAF, an RTP candidate will list and describe all service activities and provide a brief statement regarding their contribution to each activity, including role(s) and time commitment.

Evidence of the quality of faculty contributions must be supported by evaluative written letters from colleagues inside and outside of the university, students, community members, and discipline-related professionals. In assessments of performance, both the quality and quantity of service will be evaluated.

Certain responsibilities are regarded by the School of Engineering as necessary service by tenure-line faculty members and therefore listed as “Essential Service”.

Examples of additional activities beyond the minimum essential level of service typically considered as evidence of an ongoing commitment to service have been grouped into:

- Category I: Service to the University
- Category II: Service to the Public and Profession

Essential Service

School of Engineering faculty members are expected to maintain a consistent pattern of ongoing service across years eligible for review for retention, tenure and promotion. Certain responsibilities are regarded by the department as necessary service by tenure-line faculty members and therefore listed as Essential Service. Because all faculty are expected to participate in the following, there is no special leadership category.

All School of Engineering faculty are expected to:

- regularly attend School of Engineering meetings, including School of Engineering retreats that occur the week before and the week after instruction every semester;
- work collaboratively and productively with colleagues;
- mentor and advise students (note: formal advising is not required for first-year faculty members). Advising includes attending group advising sessions and providing advice to advisees;
- attend Student Awards, Capstone, Order of the Engineer, and attend at least one Commencement ceremony per academic year unless one has another work related conflict (e.g. teaching);
- serve on an ABET assessment sub-committee and conduct activities such as collecting and evaluating assessment data, writing assessment reports and sharing reports with the rest of the School of Engineering faculty;
- actively participate in the School of Engineering RTP review process by conducting direct observations of peer teaching and submitting written letters to include in peers’ WPAFs;

- participate in local outreach events on and off campus, including recruiting and alumni events;
- (*) successfully serve at the college or university level for at least two years of the review period, (e.g., a standing committee or equivalent), where success is documented by evidence, such as a letter indicating that the candidate was a contributing member;
- (*) serve as advisor for at least one university student club and/or a similar student organization or activity that serves the School of Engineering or serve as the coordinator for a graduate program option, for more than half of the review period. (Please note that the School of Engineering currently has over six different student groups and three different graduate programs).

(*) The candidate can work with the IUPC to substitute an equivalent service activity for either of the last two bullet points. The substitution will be mutually agreed upon and documented in the appropriate RTP document (PDP or IUPC letter). This type of negotiation can be particularly useful for faculty who are hired with service credit.

Category I: Service to the University

Activities to consider in the evaluation of University Service may include, but are not limited to, the following:

Category I A: General Service to the University

Governance

- Contributing to university, college, and School of Engineering policy development and governance;

Academic and Faculty Development

- Participating in faculty and staff search committees;
- Participating in academic program development;

Student Support and Curriculum Development

- Participating in student organizations as an advisor or mentor beyond the essential service requirement;
- Contributing individually and/or collaboratively to the curriculum;
- Mentoring students regularly above the proportionate load shared by other departmental faculty (e.g., advising students in other programs, departments,

institutions, or on projects in their areas of expertise but not connected to their own work or student assignments);

- Developing and maintaining services and programs that support the curriculum;
- Preparing outcomes assessment data and/or reports;
- Serving on graduate student thesis or project committees (note: serving as the chair of a thesis committee is included under scholarship rather than service);

University-wide Service

- Collaborating throughout the campus community on projects, workshops, presentations, and other campus activities;
- Contributing to School of Engineering and other University website development and/or management;
- Participating in recruiting events on and off campus (e.g. Preview, presentations at high schools, etc.); and
- Contributing to university development through corporate grants, donations of equipment, and other entrepreneurial activities.

Category I B: Service as a Leader to the University

Governance

- Fulfilling administrative responsibilities at the university, college or School of Engineering level;
- Chairing standing committee at the School of Engineering, college, or university level;

Academic and Faculty Development

- Mentoring other faculty members;
- Leading School of Engineering accreditation and assessment efforts;
- Serving as program coordinator for a graduate program or program lead;
- Chairing faculty and/or staff search committees;
- Organizing, directing and/or implementing faculty development activities;
- Leading academic program development;

Student Support and Curriculum Development

- Participating in student organizations as an advisor or mentor beyond the essential service requirement;
- Contributing individually and/or collaboratively to the development and improvement of the CPH academic program;
- Developing outreach and recruiting activities and programs that enhance the university's ability to serve the needs of a diverse and non-traditional student body;
- Seeking fundraising opportunities for new equipment, software, space etc;
- Seeking partnerships that support student professional experiences (e.g. internships, summer positions, etc.);
- Coordinating curriculum development across the School of Engineering that has a demonstrably significant impact on the academic program; and

University-wide Services

- Leading throughout the campus community on projects, workshops, presentations, and other campus activities.

Category II: Service to the Public and Profession

Activities to consider in the evaluation of Service to the Public and Profession may include, but are not limited to, the following:

Category II A: General Service to the Public and Profession

Public

- Giving presentations on School of Engineering related topics to the local community;
- Providing School of Engineering related professional services directly to the community;
- Providing extension education;
- Writing for popular and non-academic publications, including newsletters and magazines directed to agencies, professionals, or other specialized audiences as well as articles or op-ed pieces directed to the general public;
- Participating in collaborative endeavors with schools, industry, civic agencies, or other community organizations;

- Consulting with tribal, town, city, county, or state governments; schools, libraries, museums, parks, and other public institutions or governing bodies; groups; or individuals;
- Participating in professional organizations;
- Providing public policy analysis, program evaluation, technical briefings for local, state, national, or international governmental agencies;
- Serving on civic and governmental boards or committees;
- Creating working relationships with business and other community partners for the purpose of generating revenue for the university or other worthy purposes that add value to the university.;
- Providing support work for a grant that supports the teaching mission of the university;
- Serving as a coach for local youth teams or as a school volunteer, etc.
- Acting regularly as a resource for the campus or greater community regarding academic, creative or professional subject matter, for example through outreach and networking;

Profession

- Writing peer reviews for scholarly publications and funding organizations (a candidate may make the case that peer reviews could potentially count instead in the Scholarly Category 2 achievement);
- Participating in partnerships with other organizations;
- Participating in professional entrepreneurial activities.
- Serving on professional organization's committees; and
- Serving on a review panel for a funding organization (e.g., NSF, DOE, etc.).

Category II B: Service as a Leader to the Profession and the Public

Public

- Testifying before government regulatory, judicial, or legislative bodies;
- Directing service learning courses and/or projects;
- Organizing community outreach events (including K-12);

Profession

- Offering training workshops and other forums for the dissemination of technologies or demonstration of novel technologies;
- Organizing a conference in one's area of expertise;
- Holding an office in a regional, state or national professional organization; and
- Serving in an editorial role of an academic or professional journal.

Contributions to service activities made during any service credit years granted to a faculty member will have equal standing to CPH-based contributions.

Expected Level of Accomplishment

Service activities are recognized for their quality and contribution, as evidenced by evaluative letters, reflecting a committed and effective level of involvement beyond membership or basic expectations.

Service Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

Table 4 outlines the Service criteria for promotion to Associate Professor in the School of Engineering.

Table 4: Activities Required for Achievement of "Minimum Essential," "Good" and "Excellent" in Service for Retention, Tenure and Promotion

Excellent	Consistent engagement in required service activities, contributing positively to the School of Engineering and its community. Contributions in a minimum of ten significant activities across Categories 1 and 2, ensuring that at least three activities are completed within each category, leading to noticeable impacts within the academic or professional landscape. Impacts must be discussed and justified in the candidate's narrative, with supporting evidence. At least two activities in Category 1 or 2 are leadership (1.B or 2.B) activities.
Good	Consistent engagement in required service activities, contributing positively to the School of Engineering and its community.

	Contributions in a minimum of six significant activities across Categories 1 and 2, ensuring that at least two activities are completed within each category, leading to noticeable impacts within the academic or professional landscape. Impacts must be discussed and justified in the candidate's narrative, with supporting evidence. At least one activity in Category 1 or 2 is a leadership (1.B or 2.B) activity.
Minimum Essential	Fulfillment of all mandatory required service responsibilities, contributing to the basic operational needs of the School of Engineering and participating in activities that support its mission and community. Contributions in a minimum of four significant activities across Categories 1 and 2, leading to noticeable impacts enhancements within the academic or professional landscape. Impacts must be discussed and justified in the candidate's narrative, with supporting evidence. Engagement in service activities is consistent, meeting the foundational requirements set by the School, and contributing to its ongoing needs without necessarily extending into leadership or high-impact initiatives.

Service Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

For promotion to full professor, evidence of sustained high-impact service and leadership in service activities, particularly those in section B in Category 1 and Category 2, showing a pattern of significant contributions that have led to substantial improvements, innovations, or advancements within the School of Engineering, the university, or the broader engineering profession.

Table 5 outlines the Service criteria for promotion to Full Professor in the School of Engineering.

Table 5: Activities Required for Achievement of "Minimum Essential," "Good" and "Excellent" in Service for Retention, Tenure and Promotion	
Excellent	Consistent engagement in required service activities, contributing positively to the School of Engineering and its community. Contributions in a minimum of *ten significant activities* across Categories 1 and 2, ensuring that at least three activities are

	completed within each category, leading to noticeable impacts within the academic or professional landscape. Impacts must be discussed and justified in the candidate's narrative, with supporting evidence. At least *six activities in Category 1 or 2 are leadership* (1.B or 2.B) activities.
Good	Consistent engagement in required service activities, contributing positively to the School of Engineering and its community. Contributions in a minimum of *six significant activities* across Categories 1 and 2, ensuring that at least two activities are completed within each category, leading to noticeable impacts within the academic or professional landscape. Impacts must be discussed and justified in the candidate's narrative, with supporting evidence. At least *two activities in Category 1 or 2 is a leadership* (1.B or 2.B) activity.
Minimum Essential	Fulfillment of all required service responsibilities, contributing to the basic operational needs of the School of Engineering and participating in activities that support its mission and community. Contributions in a minimum of *four significant activities* across Categories 1 and 2, leading to noticeable impacts enhancements within the academic or professional landscape. Impacts must be discussed and justified in the candidate's narrative, with supporting evidence. Engagement in service activities is consistent, meeting the foundational requirements set by the School, and contributing to its ongoing needs without necessarily extending into leadership or high-impact initiatives. At least *one activity in Category 1 or 2 are leadership* (1.B or 2.B) activities.

Service Credit

Faculty hired with prior relevant service credit are expected to include relevant materials from the service credit period in their PDS. These activities are counted toward meeting the RTP standards for the School of Engineering.

Teaching

Faculty with service credit should report a summary of the courses in the table in the PDS with their best estimate for how those course loads correlate to WTUs they taught during the period for which service credit was provided, a critical reflection on each course and include teaching evaluations for those classes. Faculty should describe any curriculum or pedagogical developments during that time as well as any faculty development activities related to teaching.

Research & Scholarship

Faculty with service credit should report any scholarship activities completed during the period for which the service credit was provided.

Service

Faculty with service credit should report any service activities completed during the period for which the service credit was provided.

Early Tenure

While candidates may apply for early tenure before the traditional six-year timeline, the SOE encourages candidates to maximize their chances of success by pursuing early tenure only one year before the traditional timeline, if appropriate. Faculty who are declined early tenure can try again in subsequent years. Faculty may request to extend their tenure evaluation period before tenure if they have had an approved leave. Any candidate in year six who is declined retention or tenure, will receive a terminal year

Faculty seeking early tenure before the normal six-year probationary period must meet the following criteria:

- Such consideration is initiated in consultation with the department chair and the IUPC.

- The length and breadth of the faculty unit employee's teaching, scholarship, and service are sufficient to provide a high expectation that the prior patterns of achievement and contribution will continue.

Exceptional Circumstances

The School of Engineering acknowledges that exceptional situations related to circumstances of a professional appointment may arise in which the specific criteria and rankings delineated above for scholarship and service may not provide an appropriate rubric for the awarding of tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor or Professor. For example, such situations may arise when faculty are specifically hired to conduct activities in addition to instruction, such as program development, when they are assigned substantial administrative or research duties, or when they have a tenure track position that is partially supported by an outside entity.

These exceptional circumstances will alter the time a candidate for RTP has available to engage in Teaching, Scholarship and Creative Activities, and Service. Accordingly, the specific requirements for scholarly or service activities may be modified on a case-by-case basis, in consultation with the CNRS Dean, so long as faculty have met the primary requirement of demonstrating excellence and effectiveness in their teaching assignments.

Any requested modifications of tenure criteria should be specifically itemized and presented to the IUPC by the faculty member at least one year prior to the submission of personnel files for the tenure decision. Where applicable, the specific requirements will be outlined in the offer letter before the person is hired and clarified in additional documentation throughout their tenure and promotion review process or timeline.