

Department of Biomedical Engineering and Mechanics (BEAM)
College of Engineering
Promotion and Tenure - Policies and Procedures
November 2015

1. The department will establish a standing promotion and tenure committee.
 - 1.1. The committee will be composed of seven BEAM faculty members with at least five at the rank of full professor.
 - 1.1.1. The BEAM faculty will elect four of these members and the department head will appoint the other three members.
 - 1.1.2. Committee members will serve for four-year terms that will begin on January 1.
 - 1.1.3. The chair will be responsible for holding elections as necessary to constitute the committee by December 1 of the preceding year.
 - 1.1.4. The department head will be responsible for making any necessary appointments by December 31.
 - 1.1.5. An attempt will be made to stagger the terms of elected and appointed members in order to maintain continuity by ensuring that two to three new members are replaced on a yearly basis.
 - 1.1.6. Members whose terms are expiring will serve as a nominating committee that seeks faculty members who are willing to serve.
 - 1.1.7. In the event that a member is unable or unwilling to fulfill his or her duties, the other members of the committee may vote to remove him or her. In such case, the department head will appoint a replacement to serve until the next election.
 - 1.2. The committee will elect a chair-elect during the first meeting of the fall semester; this individual will become the committee chair January 1 when the new committee becomes effective. By choosing the chair-elect well in advance, this individual has time to become more active in committee responsibilities and to plan for service on the college-level committee meeting in January.
2. The department head shall be responsible for reminding eligible faculty (assistant, associate, and untenured full professor ranks as well as instructors) of their responsibilities regarding review by the P&T committee, as provided in the following section.
3. The committee will consider four types of promotion and/or tenure cases, namely,
 - 3.1. Mandatory tenure cases.
 - 3.1.1. It will be the responsibility of the department head to alert the committee of these cases, and for seeking a dossier from the candidate

in the appropriate format based on university and college guidelines from the candidate by August 1. The purpose of this is to ensure that the dossiers are available sufficiently early so that external reviewers can be identified by the committee.

3.1.2. Failure of the candidate to respond in a timely manner to the department head request to prepare the dossier will result in a negative evaluation of the candidate's case.

3.2. Non-mandatory review cases for tenure-track faculty.

3.2.1. The candidate will initiate a discussion and express interest in promotion and/or tenure either with the department head or the committee chair by April 1 and provide a dossier draft for consideration.

3.2.2. The chair will consult with the committee to determine whether to encourage the candidate to seek promotion and/or tenure.

3.2.3. The chair will provide feedback to the department head.

3.2.4. The department head and the committee chair will consult with each other and, based on the feedback obtained from the committee, decide whether to recommend further consideration by the committee.

3.2.5. Both the head and chair will meet together with the candidate and explain the positions of the head and the committee. It is possible in rare cases that such a discussion could occur through a teleconference, videoconference, or other electronic means of communication including e-mail.

3.2.6. Based upon this discussion, a candidate will be presented with a choice of whether to pursue promotion and/or tenure, or to withdraw candidacy for that academic year.

3.2.7. If the candidate wishes to be considered for promotion and/or tenure after these deliberations, then the candidate will be required to submit a completed dossier in the appropriate format based on university guidelines by August 1.

3.3. Promotion reviews for non-tenure-track instructional faculty

3.3.1. The candidate will initiate a discussion and express interest in promotion either with the department head or the committee chair by April 1 and provide a dossier draft for consideration.

3.3.2. The chair will consult with the committee to determine whether to encourage the candidate to seek promotion.

3.3.3. The chair will provide feedback to the department head.

3.3.4. The department head and the committee chair will consult with each other and, based on the feedback obtained from the committee, decide whether to recommend further consideration by the committee.

- 3.3.5. Both the head and chair will meet together with the candidate and explain the positions of the head and the committee. It is possible in rare cases that such a discussion could occur through a teleconference, videoconference, or other electronic means of communication including e-mail.
 - 3.3.6. Based upon this discussion, a candidate will be presented with a choice of whether to pursue promotion, or to withdraw candidacy for that academic year.
 - 3.3.7. If the candidate wishes to be considered for promotion after these deliberations, then the candidate will be required to submit a completed dossier in the appropriate format based on university guidelines by August 1.
 - 3.4. Consideration of initial appointments with tenure
 - 3.4.1. For cases in which the initial appointment with tenure is being considered, the department head will initiate a discussion with the chair.
 - 3.4.2. The head will also provide a current CV for the candidate as well as other materials that would normally be part of the dossier (such as relevant teaching experience and evaluations).
 - 3.4.3. The chair will consult with the committee and will provide a recommendation to the head.
 4. The committee will be responsible for conducting a formal review of the dossier of each candidate being considered for promotion and/or tenure.
 - 4.1.1. The committee will be responsible for developing a list of referees who will be asked to evaluate a candidate's dossier. The development of this list will be consistent with university guidelines. All referees should be of the stature that they can be called upon to evaluate the candidate's dossier.
 - 4.1.2. The committee will first review the dossier and identify a list of possible referees.
 - 4.1.3. The committee will then seek a list of possible referees from the candidate, reminding candidate of relevant university and college guidelines.
 - 4.1.4. The committee will develop a composite list of referees from which to seek evaluation letters.
 - 4.1.5. The committee chair will discuss the composite list with the department head, who may suggest modifications. The committee and head will seek to achieve consensus on this matter, preferably by August 31.
 - 4.1.6. The department head will request evaluation letters based on this list but may delegate this task to the committee chair or others on the

committee. The letters should be received by October 1 so the committee will have adequate time for their deliberations.

- 4.1.7. The letters will be archived as they are received and will be provided to the committee members as appropriate. It will be understood that these letters are confidential and will not be released beyond the committee unless required by university guidelines.
- 4.2. The department head may request a meeting with the committee to discuss a promotion and/or tenure case but may not participate in the committee's deliberations.
- 4.3. The committee will consider the case for promotion and/or tenure.
 - 4.3.1. Committee members will be required to vote in the affirmative or negative and also provide a reason for any negative votes through a confidential electronic ballot.
 - 4.3.2. The chair will collate the votes and associated reasons and provide them to the committee and department head. Votes and reasons will be considered confidential, and thus will not be identified with individual committee members.
- 4.4. Following the conclusion of the voting in the committee, the chair will provide a summary assessment, in writing, to the department head. This assessment should note the vote and the reasons for it.
5. The department head will conduct an independent evaluation of the candidacy based on the candidate's dossier and reference letters in a manner consistent with university guidelines.
 - 5.1. The department head will communicate both the committee vote and reasons, and the subsequent independent evaluation (conducted by the head) to the candidate in writing.
 - 5.2. Both the head and chair will meet together with the candidate to explain the two evaluations, one by the committee and the other by the department head. It is possible in rare cases that such a discussion could occur through a teleconference, videoconference, or other electronic means of communication including e-mail.
6. If either of the evaluations is negative, the candidate will be presented with a choice to withdraw his or her candidacy for promotion and/or tenure when mandatory tenure is not involved.
7. The department head will forward a completed dossier to the College of Engineering for further consideration for mandatory tenure cases, and for cases when this action is consistent with the candidate's wish. The dossier will be prepared and forwarded in a manner consistent with university guidelines.
8. The committee shall conduct two- and four-year reviews of all probationary faculty members.

- 8.1. The term “probationary period” is applied to the succession of term appointments that an individual undertakes on a full- or part-time regular faculty appointment, and during which continued evaluation for reappointment and for an eventual tenured appointment takes place. The beginning of the probationary period for faculty members on term appointments is taken as July 1 or August 10 of the calendar year in which their initial full-time appointment begins, depending on whether they are on a calendar year or academic year appointment, regardless of the month in which their services are initiated. (The probationary period for new faculty appointed for spring semester begins the following fall even though the spring contract period officially begins December 25.)
- 8.2. The two-year review will take place during the spring semester of the second year of the probationary period. The four-year review will take place during the spring semester of the fourth year of the probationary period.
- 8.3. If an approved extension to the total length of the probationary period is granted, changes to the pre-tenure review cycle will be documented in writing.
- 8.4. The probationary faculty member will provide a dossier and annual activity reports to the department head by February 15 of the two- or four-year review year.
- 8.5. The committee will analyze the faculty member’s progress toward promotion and tenure and offer guidance regarding future activities and plans. This guidance will be provided in the form of a written review provided to the department head.
- 8.6. The chair of the committee and the department head will meet with the probationary faculty member to discuss the review and recommendations.
9. As part of its duties under section 4 and section 8, the committee will coordinate peer evaluations of teaching.
 - 9.1. For probationary faculty members and instructors below the rank of senior instructor, the committee will seek at least one peer evaluation per year (recognizing that exceptional circumstances may prevent annual peer evaluations from occurring)..
 - 9.2. Peer evaluations of teaching will be conducted by tenured BEAM faculty members.
 - 9.3. Evaluations of associate professors will be conducted by full professors; evaluations of assistant professors and instructors will be conducted by associate or full professors.
 - 9.4. For tenured associate professors, the committee will ensure that at least one evaluation is conducted after the most recent promotion.
 - 9.5. Evaluations conducted outside of the BEAM department may be included in the dossier by the candidate for the committee’s consideration.
10. Changes to these policies require approval by a majority of the tenured and tenure-track faculty and instructional faculty members eligible for continued appointment.