

TENURE POLICIES, REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES (TPRP)

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering The University of North Carolina at Charlotte

May 4, 2012

1. Preamble

This document describes the policies, regulations and procedures of the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE) for review of reappointment, promotion and the conferral of Permanent Tenure for Faculty Members in Professorial Ranks.

1.1 Higher Level University and College Policies, Regulations and Procedures (Policy dates given are valid for May 4, 2012. Please refer to the most recent policies.)

Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, May 26, 2011, Office of Legal Affairs (University TPRP). The University TPRP is the major university document describing reappointment, promotion and tenure. The University TPRP is governed by Chapter VI of the Code and Policies of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina. When terms defined in Section 1 of the University TPRP are used in this ECE document, they are capitalized and the reader is referred to Section 1 of the University TPRP for their definitions.

Academic Personnel and Procedures Handbook, The University of North Carolina at Charlotte, date not specified, Academic Budget and Personnel, Division of Academic Affairs, (University APPH). Section VI. C, "Review for Reappointment, Promotion & Tenure" includes information concerning external reviews and the request for external reviews. Additionally, the APPH describes the documentation required for candidate dossiers submitted to the Provost.

Policies and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, The William States Lee College of Engineering at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Spring 2008, Policies and Procedures, College of Engineering. This college document contains material specific to the College of Engineering Review Committee (CERC), Program Review Committees (PRC), and individual unit Department Review Committees (DRCs).

1.2 Compliance of this ECE Policy with University and College Policies

To ensure consistent and fair candidate reviews, and to prevent Material Procedural Irregularities, the DRC, in conjunction with the department chair, will review the most current versions of the policies listed in Section 1.1 above. To the extent that this ECE document is determined to conflict with any of the above policies, the above policies prevail.

1.3 Dates Given in this ECE Policy

The dates given in this policy are intended to allow the DRC-elect to provide its list of external reviewers to the department chair prior to the end of the academic year. Additionally, the dates given are intended to permit the DRC to submit its recommendation letter(s) to the department chair by the middle of October. Reasonable efforts should be made to meet these dates. If a date given in this policy conflicts with higher level policies listed in Section 1.1 above, the date in the above policies prevails.

2. Department Review Committee Duties, Term, Composition, and Election

2.1 Duties of the Department Review Committee Pertaining to Recommendations of Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

The elected DRC seeks to represent the collective voice of the ECE faculty. The duties of the DRC are: a) to comment on the completeness and accuracy of a candidate's dossier necessary for review, b) to participate in the selection of a set of appropriately qualified external reviewers for each candidate (except for reappointment), c) to seek advice from the Permanently Tenured Faculty Members in the department, who are at or above the rank for which a candidate is under consideration and not participating in the review process at another level, d) to review a candidate's dossier and to submit recommendation(s) and rationale(s) to the department chair on whether or not to reappoint, to promote, or to confer Permanent Tenure.

2.2 Duties of the Department Review Committee Pertaining to Tenured Faculty Reviews, Annual Department Chair Review, and Revisions of This Document

Although governed by separate University and College policies, the duties of the DRC also include a review of tenured faculty (post tenure review) with recommendations to the department chair. Additionally, the DRC submits an annual review of the department chair to the dean of the College of Engineering by the end of the academic year. Finally, the DRC facilitates timely revisions to this document, which require a vote of the full faculty.

2.3 Term of Department Review Committee and Overlap with Department Review Committee Elect

The term of the DRC begins at the election by April 1 and extends slightly over one calendar year to the end of the next academic year, which is typically near May 15. The DRC duties and schedule described herein are designed to normally exclude duties during the summer. During the period between the election of the new DRC (around April 1) and the end of term of the previous DRC (around May 15), the new DRC is referred to as the DRC-elect. During this approximately one and one-half month period, the responsibilities of the DRC-elect are limited to the selection and approval of external reviewers as described in Sections 4.2 through 4.5.

2.4 Composition of Department Review Committee

The DRC shall consist of five voting Faculty Members holding full-time appointments in Professorial Ranks with Permanent Tenure at the time of election and during the following academic year. No Faculty Member who has administrative responsibilities that include line authority to affect salary, evaluation, or dismissal of Faculty Members may serve on the DRC. Additionally, no Faculty Member serving at another level of review, such as the College of Engineering Review Committee, may serve on the DRC.

The department chair shall appoint one, or two if needed, tenure-track faculty members holding Professorial Rank such that all tenure-track faculty observe the DRC review process prior to their review for tenure. Tenure-track members are non-voting members of the DRC. They are allowed to participate in all deliberations of the DRC, but are not allowed to vote in cases under consideration, or in the election of the DRC chair.

2.5 Election of the Department Review Committee by April 1

By April 1, the ECE department will conduct the DRC election in a manner that ensures full participation, and anonymity, of Faculty holding Professorial Rank (including non-tenured faculty) and full-time appointments at the time of election. As an example, faculty could select five nominees on a secret ballot that is collected and recorded by a departmental staff member.

2.6 First Meeting of the Departmental Review Committee and Election of its Chair by April 15

The department chair calls the first meeting of the DRC by April 15 and charges the DRC with its duties. This includes identifying candidates for promotion and tenure, and discussing current best practices and policy. After the department chair and DRC complete their discussions, the department chair leaves and the DRC elects its chair from its voting members.

3. Evaluation Criteria for Professorial Ranks and Conferral of Permanent Tenure

3.1 Reappointment as an Assistant Professor

Reappointment as an Assistant Professor is based upon demonstrating the likelihood for development of a strong record of achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service. Measures of performance include such areas as contributions to course and curriculum development, establishment of a research program, publications, service as advisor for undergraduate student projects, service as advisor or committee member for graduate degree candidates, involvement in departmental and college committee activities, collegiality, and participation in professional societies.

3.2 Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor and Conferral of Permanent Tenure

Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor and conferral of Permanent Tenure are based upon a record of significant contribution to undergraduate and graduate course and curriculum development, an established research program, and significant steps toward a leadership role in the Department and College. Measures of performance include such areas as a record of publications, service as advisor for undergraduate student projects, service as advisor or committee member for graduate degree candidates, sponsored and unsponsored research projects, participation in departmental, college and university committees, collegiality, and professional activities beyond the boundaries of UNC Charlotte. The candidate's potential to sustain and expand on these achievements is considered to be an important consideration for promotion.

3.3 Promotion to the Rank of Professor

Promotion to the Rank of Professor is based on a record of significant accomplishment and recognition. Measures of performance include course and curriculum development, teaching innovations, sponsored instruction research projects, research innovation, patents, direction of M.S. and Ph.D. level students, solid record of publications, participation in departmental, college and university committees, leadership role in department, college and university, collegiality, contributions to external professional activities, authorship of books, editing of professional and educational journals, consulting on industrial and governmental bodies, and other contributions to industry and society. The candidate's potential to sustain and significantly expand on these achievements and to assume a leadership role in the University are considered to be primary considerations for promotion.

3.4 Conferral of Permanent Tenure

Documented, demonstrated evidence of the attainment of, and the ability to sustain a record of vital contributions to the College of Engineering program now and for the future. Performance measures include tangible accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and professional development, and service recognized both within and beyond the boundaries of UNC Charlotte.

4. Review Process

4.1 External Review Material Received by March 31

By March 31, each candidate for promotion or tenure must submit review material to be sent to the external reviewers. The review material should consist of the following:

- a) Self-Assessment. An opening Impact Statement of the candidate's accomplishments is recommended along with a recommended maximum page length of 10 pages.
- b) Curriculum Vitae (for a recommended format, refer to the College TPRP document).
- c) Selected Publications. Three to five publications are recommended. Highly cited publications can be identified and included to illustrate their impact.
- d) Any other pertinent material for evaluation by external reviewers.

Candidates are responsible for the completeness, accuracy, and clarity of their submitted materials. Candidates are encouraged to use the current best practices for their external and internal dossiers and to ensure the consistent reporting of accomplishments over consistent time periods across their Self-Assessment and Curriculum Vitae. Although external reviewers are primarily asked to comment on the quality and impact of a candidate's research, information concerning course development, teaching load, and service activities can be useful to reviewers to help assess the available time a candidate has for research.

4.2 Qualifications of External Reviewers

Except in cases of reappointment, the DRC-elect will solicit a list of names of professionals, external to the university, qualified to review a candidate's credentials. Reviewers from academia, government, or industry should have accomplishments that exceed those of the candidate under review. Generally, the majority of reviewers are from academia, holding rank, where possible, above that sought by the candidate. For candidates seeking Full Professor, this suggests established Full Professors who may hold special honors, including Fellow of their professional society. Although the majority of reviewers are typically from academia, some reviewers from government laboratories or industry research and development groups are appropriate for candidates having industry or government experience and/or collaborations.

4.3 External Reviewers Identified by the Candidate by March 31

By March 31, each candidate for promotion or tenure must submit the name, title, position, contact information, professional honors, and a short biography describing research accomplishments for at least five qualified external reviewers. Alternatively, the College or University may recommend, or require, the use of forms or policies for listing reviewer credentials.

4.4 External Reviewers Identified by Sources other than the Candidate by April 30

During the month of April, the DRC-elect shall identify at least five qualified reviewers from sources other than the candidate. The DRC may appeal to faculty members, or other professionals, who are either active in or familiar with the candidate's area of research. The reviewer information described in 4.3 above should be provided by the DRC-elect.

4.5 Selection and Approval of External Reviewers by the End of the Academic Year

The DRC-elect shall present at least four reviewers identified by sources other than the candidate to the candidate for review. The candidate may veto reviewers, with cause, and the DRC-elect shall document the cause.

The DRC-elect shall present at least four reviewers identified by the candidate, and at least four reviewers identified by sources other than the candidate, to the department chair for approval prior to the end of the academic year. This schedule is intended to minimize DRC activities during the summer when some members may be off campus and unavailable for DRC meetings.

4.6 Submission of External Review Materials by July 1 for Receipt of External Reviews by August 15

By July 1, the department chair is responsible for contacting the external reviewers and supplying them with the candidate's external dossier and all other documentation necessary, including any relevant department, college, and university procedures. In accordance with the University APPH, the chair's letter to external reviewers is required to state that the review may be made available to the candidate and that the reviewer is required to state his relationship, if any, to the candidate. The department chair is encouraged to use a reviewer request letter template that complies with the policies identified in Section 1.1. Additional requirements may include stating who will see the review letters and guidelines for assessing a candidate's credentials in the context of differing academic institutions.

The department chair's letters to reviewers should request receipt of reviews by August 15, and the chair should follow up, as needed, to ensure receipt. The receipt of a minimum of two reviews identified by the candidate, and two reviews identified by sources other than the candidate, is strongly recommended. The ECE department and College of Engineering expectations exceed the minimum of three reviews required by the University APPH.

4.7 Internal Review Process

In all review cases, candidates must submit their internal dossiers by the first day of the academic year of review. In Mandatory Review cases, the department chair shall notify the candidates during the spring semester of the year prior to the year of review that they must submit their dossiers by the first day of the academic year of review. Candidates should refer to their responsibilities described in Section 4.1 for the completeness, accuracy, and clarity of their submitted materials. The dossiers should consist of the following (the University APPH describes particular notebook tabs):

- a) Curriculum Vitae (for a recommended format, refer to the College TPRP document).
- b) Self-Assessment of teaching, scholarship and service, beginning with a recommended summary Impact Statement of the candidate's accomplishments.

- c) Student teaching evaluations for all courses taught by the candidate for a minimum of five years (when applicable) immediately preceding the year of review.
- d) Any other supporting material such as publications, research proposals, course and curriculum development proposals, letters of invitation for conference presentations, candidate's citation index pages, patents, awards, the list of committees that the candidate served on along with a description of the duties performed for each committee, and peer evaluations of teaching for candidates without Permanent Tenure as described in Section II.3 of the "Guidelines and Procedures for Teaching Enhancement," The William States Lee College of Engineering at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Policies and Procedures.
- e) Any additional material required by University or College policies identified in Section 1.1.

The DRC shall establish a procedure for its members to review the dossiers of all departmental candidates for completeness and errors, and to request corrections and clarifications from the candidates by August 31.

4.8 DRC's Recommendation to Department Chair, Typically by the Middle of October

The Permanently Tenured Faculty Members in the department, who are at or above the rank for which a candidate is under consideration and not participating in the review process at another level, shall be provided an opportunity to review the candidate's dossier, and external review letters, and provide advice to the DRC.

Evaluations of the candidate's dossier and review letters by the DRC and by the department chair are intended to be separate and independent. However, the DRC may invite the department chair into its discussions if the DRC *unanimously* (from the University TPRP) determines that doing so will assist in its deliberations.

The DRC shall submit its recommendation(s) and rationale(s) whether or not to reappoint, promote, or confer Permanent Tenure to the department chair after considering the advice provided by such Permanently Tenured Faculty and, if applicable, the recommendation provided by the college or university-wide program review committee (PRC). When applicable, the DRC shall submit the recommendation of the PRC along with its own to the department chair.

4.9 Department Chair's Review

For each case under review, The Permanently Tenured Faculty Members in the department, who are at or above the rank for which a candidate is under consideration and not participating in the review process at another level, shall be provided an opportunity to review the candidate's dossier, and external review letters, and provide advice to the department chair.

If the department chair's determination is positive on each action under review, he or she shall, after consulting with the assembled DRC, submit his or her determination and rationale, together with the recommendation(s) and rationale(s) of the DRC, and of the PRC if applicable, to the dean of the College.

If the department chair determines not to reappoint, promote, or confer Permanent Tenure for a Faculty Member under review, after consulting with the assembled DRC, he or she shall meet with the Faculty Member to provide the Faculty Member with a copy of that determination and its rationale, and to

explain the Faculty Member's right of rebuttal. The Faculty Member should consult the University TPRP for the official rebuttal process and time requirements.

4.10 Faculty Member's Right to Terminate Review

A Faculty Member may terminate a review for reappointment, promotion, or the conferral of Permanent Tenure at any time prior to notification of the Provost's final decision. A Faculty Member should consult the University TPRP for the required notification.

5. Notification and Transmittal

5.1 Notification

The department chair's positive or negative determination and the rationale for such determination on reappointment, promotion, or conferral of Permanent Tenure shall be provided in writing to the faculty member to whom it pertains and to the dean of the College. A copy of DRC recommendation(s) and rationale(s) shall be attached to the department chair's recommendation and rationale when given to the faculty member. Faculty members shall have access to all documents that are part of the decision-making process.

5.2 Transmittal

All recommendations for reappointment, promotion or conferral of permanent tenure forwarded to the dean from the ECE department must contain at least the following:

1. Candidate's dossier (see Section 4.7).
2. An Affirmative Action Form.
3. Department chair's determination and rationale along with the recommendation(s) and rationale(s) of the DRC, and of the Program Review Committee (PRC), if applicable.

6. Confidentiality

All deliberations of the DRC concerning reappointment, promotion, or the conferral of Permanent Tenure for Faculty Members shall be held in closed session. The deliberations of the DRC concerning reviews of Faculty Members must be kept strictly confidential. Matters concerning interpretation of policy and schedule status of the review process are not considered confidential deliberations and may be discussed with the department chair with the knowledge of all members of the DRC.

All documents submitted or created in connection with the process of review for initial appointment, reappointment, promotion, or the conferral of Permanent Tenure, and the information contained therein, as well as information derived from any discussions that are part of the formal review, including DRC deliberations, are considered confidential personnel information. Such confidential records and information shall not be disclosed to or discussed with any person except: (1) review committee members; (2) those persons required or permitted to be consulted in accord with the requirements of the Department, College, or University policies; or (3) those persons permitted access to such documents by law. Violation of this section may expose any Faculty Member, including an administrator, to the imposition of serious sanctions pursuant to Section 8 of the University TPRP document.

7. Permissible and Impermissible Grounds for Decisions

According to the University TPRP document, determinations and decisions pertaining to reappointment, promotion, and conferral of Permanent Tenure are, without further recourse, the responsibility of the officers of administration authorized to make them, acting in accordance with procedures prescribed herein. In exercise of their judgment, whether in the first instance or in review of recommendations, such officers may take into account and use as the basis of decision, in whole or in part, any factors deemed relevant to total institutional interests, except that in no event shall an unfavorable decision be based upon Impermissible Grounds or Material Procedural Irregularities. As defined in Section 1.7 of the University TPRP, basing a decision on Impermissible Grounds is to base a decision on (1) exercise by the Faculty Member of rights of freedom of speech guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States or by Article I of the Constitution of North Carolina; (2) discrimination based upon the race, color, creed, sex, disability, sexual orientation, religion, age, or national origin of the Faculty Member or because of the person's honorable service in the armed services of the United States; or (3) Personal Malice as defined in Section 1.11 of the University TPRP. As defined in Section 1.10 of the University TPRP, Material Procedural Irregularities means departures from prescribed procedures governing reappointment, promotion, or the conferral of Permanent Tenure that cast reasonable doubt upon the validity of the decision not to reappoint, not to promote, or not to confer Permanent Tenure. A faculty member who feels aggrieved due to Impermissible Grounds, Material Procedural Irregularities, or Personal Malice should refer to the University TPRP for a discussion of the member's rights of a hearing.

8. Annual Performance Review for Tenure Track Faculty

As described in Section 3.3 of the University TPRP, the department chair will provide each Tenure Track Faculty Member in the department's Professorial Ranks a letter each year that provides an evaluation of the Faculty Member's accomplishments during the previous year and that discusses the Faculty Member's progress toward achieving reappointment, promotion, or the conferral of Permanent Tenure, as appropriate. The letter should clearly and specifically address strengths and weaknesses in the performance of the Faculty Member, providing for a clear plan and timetable for improvement of any deficiencies in performance. While ultimate decisions on reappointment, promotion, and the conferral of Permanent Tenure take into account many factors, not all of which are related to the Faculty Member's performance, effective annual evaluations are intended to help to eliminate unexpected results in the comprehensive reviews supporting decisions on reappointment, promotion, and the conferral of Permanent Tenure.

9. Revision History

May 4, 2012. The policy was rewritten to generally reflect the chronological order, scheduling, and date requirements of activities. Reference to higher level University and College policies was added, or expanded, to help ensure compliance. Important matters, such as DRC duties, the election, the overlapping term of office for the DRC and the DRC-elect, the qualifications for external reviewers, and other topics were separated out for easy consideration and maintenance by the faculty. Additionally, the policy was clarified to codify existing practices and policy that were previously unclear, including making reference to the University TPRP to ensure faculty comply with their rights of rebuttal, to terminate a review, and for a hearing. Material changes included: 1) interpretation of dates given (Section 1.3); 2) voting for five DRC members and the voting method; 3) the department chair's appointment of one, or two if needed, tenure-track faculty as non-voting member(s) of the DRC to

ensure this experience prior to a faculty member's review for tenure; 4) reviewer qualifications; 5) the recommendation of an Impact Statement in candidate Self-Assessments and a recommended maximum length of 10 pages for Self-Assessments in external dossiers; 6) candidate responsibilities for the completeness, accuracy, and clarity of their submitted materials; 7) requesting four reviews, from reviewers identified by the candidate, and four reviews, from reviewers identified by sources other than the candidate, with 8) the recommended receipt of at least two reviews from each set of reviewers; 9) permitting eligible faculty to review both candidate dossiers and review letters; 10) requirements for reviewer request letters; 11) recommendation for using a reviewer request letter template; 12) distinction that department chair and DRC discussions of policy or status of reviews are not confidential deliberations; and 13) revision history and footer at bottom of each page.

May 4, 2005. Previous approval by the faculty.